

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 070971163

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE
AMERICAN
CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
REVIEW.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem.

S. AUG. EPIST. CCXXXVIII. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XXIII.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1898.

PHILADELPHIA:
211 SOUTH SIXTH STREET.

COPYRIGHTED, 1898.

SEP 12 1961

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
ALFRED LORD TENNYSON: THE MECHANICS OF TENNYSON'S POETRY. By <i>Rev. H. T. Henry</i> ,	1
Survey of Tennyson's Memoir by his son; Voluminous character of his materials; Good taste displayed in the selection; Clue to "Merlin and the Gleam"; an allegory of the Poet's own life-work; The gift of song in the Poet's family; Love of nature a trait of Tennyson's; His faculty of quiet humor; Early dramatic leanings; Love of sea and sky; Moods; His imagery acquired by the most attentive study <i>sub Jove</i> ; Science as a handmaiden to poetry; Tennyson's friendship for Tyndall; A student of metre and rhyme; Striving after natural assonance; Detestation of sibilants; Illusions on the subject of originality in metre; The genesis of "Locksley Hall"; Sapphic imitations; His creative skill in the use of blank verse.	
WHAT MAKES A SPECIES? By Dr. St. George Mivart, F.R.S. ,	28
Difficulties of the Catholic scientist; Distrust of his honesty; Reasons of the naturalists; The Darwin-Wallace definition of a Species; Antiquity of the theory of Natural Selection; Nature's own testimony against the hypothesis; Color in plants and animals entirely at variance with the theory of utility; Man's intellectual part entirely inconsistent with the principle of Natural Selection; The Inorganic World quite irreconcilable with that principle.	
THE RELATIONS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH WITH THE INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA. By <i>Richard R. Elliott</i> ,	45
Labors of the Dominicans, the Franciscans, and the Jesuits, from Florida to the Pacific coast, in the sixteenth century; Permanency of the faith implanted among the Indians in that vast region; The Indian races not annihilated, but preserved under Spanish rule and Catholic civilization; Feroocious character of Puritan methods results in general extermination; Futile philanthropic efforts of John Elliot and his followers; Early Catholic missionaries in Maine and the Canadian territories; Labors of the Jesuits among the Hurons; The Jesuit martyrs in the Iroquois country; The Jesuits persevere in their heroic work despite the cruelties of the Iroquois; Martyrdom of the Recollets in Illinois; Father Andrew White, S.J., begins English missionary work among the Maryland redskins; Political causes put an end to this successful enterprise; Father Charlevoix at Detroit; Disastrous effects of the war of Independence on the Indian missions; Bishop Carroll assumes spiritual control of the new ceded territory; Renewal of missionary work among the Indians; Splendid work of Bishop Baraga and subsequently of Father De Smet, S.J.; State of the Indians of British Columbia and Alaska.	
THE LATER RELIGIOUS MARTYRDOM OF POLAND. By <i>Rev. Reuben Parsons, D.D.</i> ,	71
Design and working of the so-called Catholic College in Russia; The Czar's claims of supremacy in spirituals as in temporals; The question of divorce in Russia; Break between the Vatican and Russia in 1867, and consequent penal ukase; Lame excuse urged for persecuting the Poles by the "Orthodox" Russians; Alexander II. and the Uniate Greeks in Russia; Shameful perfidy of the Czar; Curious "conversion" trick of Prince Chowanski; Peasants driven to the Sacraments with clubs and bayonets; The remarkable case of Mary Denisov; Apostasy of Radziwill and others; Drastic measures with the Ruthenians and Uniates in Poland; Russian "Orthodox" intrigues in Austrian Poland; Cossack savagery in Chelm; Tyranny of the Holy Synod; The outrages at Krozè; Firm action of Pope Leo XIII., and disgrace and death of Prince Cantacuzene, the author of the savagery; Ambiguous action of the new Czar.	
IRISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION. By <i>Rev. George McDermot, C.S.P.</i> ,	97
Reluctant concession of Catholic Emancipation; Protestant patronage offensive to Catholics; The ascendancy spirit of Trinity College; Reasons for establishing the Queen's Colleges; Catholics start a university, with Dr. Newman as first rector; Mr. Gladstone's proposals for higher education; Causes of his failure; Earl Cairns and the experiment of the Royal University; Intolerant attitude of the Irish Presbyterians toward Catholic claims.	
MUSIC IN THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH, A.D. 50-600. By <i>Edward Dickinson</i> ,	110
Early association of music and ritual; Slow but continuous development of Christian sacred harmony; Music felt to be a true appanage of the spirit of Christianity; Adaptation of ancient forms by the early Church; St. Paul's references	

to psalmistry; Ecstasies and the glossalia or "gift of tongues"; This curious habit subordinated to regular forms; The origin of antiphonal chanting; Christian music indebted to the Hebrew and the Greek forms; Beginnings of instrumental music in the Church; Separation of the choir from the general congregation; Surviving fragments of early Greek hymns; Sombre and impressive character of early Oriental hymnology; St. Ambrose and the rise of the Italian school; Separation of vocal and instrumental music and substitution of the Gregorian chant.

RUSSIAN ORTHODOXY AND THE BULL ON ANGLICAN ORDERS. By <i>John J. O'Shea</i> ,	133
Russian obstinacy and slowness exemplified in the retention of the "Old Style"; Attitude toward the Pope's appeal for unity; The subordination of Church to State in the Empire conducive to a low grade of ecclesiasticism; Amusing position of Russian "Orthodoxy"; The Anglican case declared to be "not supported," and the decision of Pope Leo XIII. "inconclusive"; Obvious flaws in the Muscovite argument; Severe strictures on the anomalies apparent in Anglicanism; The Russian critic condemned on his own definition of the position.	
BIOLOGIC SOCIOLOGY. By <i>Rev. John J. Ming, S.J.</i> ,	142
Social organization of Divine ordinance; Early Christian conception of society as a fraternal bond; Hobbes' antagonistic theory of a state of warfare; Rousseau's definition of the "social contract" founded on a different conception; Application of the theory of evolution, and Herbert Spencer's development of the argument; Supposititious analogies between animal and human sociology; Evolution of governmental systems from early social necessities; Limitations of the theory of biologic sociology.	
THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION. By <i>Prof. W. F. P. Stockley</i> ,	165
The Pope's dictum on the law of historical writing to be applied to the dispute in Manitoba; Sketch of the position of Canada in regard to religious distribution; Past legislation on school affairs; The Manitoba Act of 1870; The Non-Sectarian Act of 1890; Decisions of the Privy Council on Catholic appeals; Conflicting opinions of Liberals and Conservatives; The Federal election of 1896 and the Laurier settlement; The mission of Mgr. Merry Del Val; The Catholic doctrine on natural goodness not the Calvinistic view of man.	
THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION: ENCYCLICAL LETTER FROM POPE LEO XIII. ,	189
DON ZEBALLOS AND THE JESUITS. By <i>Rev. C. Widman, S.J.</i> ,	195
The South American boundary arbitration; Report of Don Estanislao S. Zeballos; Pacificatory efforts of the Jesuits in the past; Testimony to their wisdom and rectitude from an unexpected quarter; Portuguese intrigues against Spanish sovereignty in South America; Scheming of Pombal; Wonderful success of the Spanish Jesuit Republic; The eyes of Spain opened to Pombal's treachery; The Jesuits expelled from South America; Disastrous results of the measure upon the Indians; The character and extent of the work done by the Jesuits; Their services to cartography.	
IN MEMORIAM: MR. CHARLES A. HARDY ,	205
SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE ,	208
The Divining Rod; The source of memory-measurement; Enormous length of geological periods; The greatest tunnel; Noxious insects in the United States; A very ingenious bridge for high level transport; Electricity in the cure of rheumatism; Remarkable effects of sunshine and oxygen; Steady increase in the French rainfall; Fallacies on immunity from disease.	
CHRISTIAN EDUCATION IN THE FIRST CENTURIES, A.D. 33-476. By <i>Rev. Eugene Magevney, S.J.</i> ,	225
The commission to teach given by our Divine Lord on Mount Olivet; Pagan education confined to the wealthy; Rich and poor alike in the Christian view; Difficulties of teaching in the days of persecution; The domestic method; Rise of the academical system in Alexandria; Scope of the Alexandrian curriculum; The catechetical method; Effects of Constantine's edict of toleration upon public education; Early beginnings of the public school system; The first universities; Rise of the Episcopal and Monastic schools; Early school legislation of the Church councils; Disastrous effects of the transference of power from Rome to Constantinople; The monasteries become the sole asylums of learning during the barbarian inroads.	
A PRECURSOR OF MARQUETTE. By <i>Henry Colin Campbell</i> ,	248
Early days of Père Menard; Begins missionary career at Quebec; Studies Indian languages; Frightful experiences among the Hurons and Iroquois; With seven companions he sets forth on a mission into the far West; Dreadful sufferings of the party in the Mississippi regions; Père Menard lost in the Wilderness; Starved to death in the inextricable forest; Doubts about the place where he died; Attempt to solve the difficulty.	

Table of Contents.

	PAGE
<p>THE EARLY MISSIONARIES OF CENTRAL AMERICA. By <i>Bryan G. Clinch</i>,</p> <p>Reasons why American historians have ignored the work of the Spanish missionaries; The faith firmly rooted amongst the Indian population, while the political rule of Spain was obnoxious; Spanish philanthropists of early days; Their efforts to protect the natives from adventurers and slavers; The missionaries show a fearless front to official tyranny; The Dominicans in Mexico; Splendid services to civilization; Las Casas and his labors for the Indians; Cruelty of some Spanish officials; Successful work of the Dominicans in Guatemala and Nicaragua; Condemnation of Indian slavery by the Spanish government procured by Las Casas; The principal figures in the great work of civilization in Central America.</p>	260
<p>THE IRISH COLLEGE, PARIS. <i>Anon.</i>,</p> <p>Expulsion of the Catholic aristocracy from Ireland and settlement on the Continent; Colleges established in Salamanca, Madrid, Seville and Louvain; An Irish foundation in Paris visited by St. Ignatius Loyola; Royal students at the College; A munificent patron of the Irish College; King Louis grants another establishment; Great generosity of the Grand Monarque; Other distinguished benefactors; The building in the Rue des Irlandais; Troubles during the Reign of Terror; Confiscation of ecclesiastical property in France; Dr. Walsh's energetic protest saves the Irish College from the general wreck; Strange and brilliant times in the establishment during the Terror; It becomes a sort of <i>salon</i>, where Josephine, Recamier, the Princess Chimay and other famous celebrities shine for awhile; Madame Vestris in charge of the dancing; Napoleon grants a decree re-establishing the college as an academy; Long and prosperous career of the college since those days; Its many distinguished <i>alumni</i>.</p>	273
<p>THE RESTORATION OF CATHOLICITY IN GENEVA. By <i>T. I. L. Teeling</i>,</p> <p>François Coppee's description of modern Geneva; Protestantism originally forced upon the city by outside fanatics; Desperate resistance of the inhabitants to these rabid sectaries and partial destruction of the town as a consequence; A "plantation" follows the expulsion of the Catholic population; The churches pillaged and burned; Entry of Calvin and establishment of the Protestant Inquisition; Widespread system of espionage and destruction of all domestic peace by the methods of the "Reformers"; Effects of the French Revolution upon the fortunes of Switzerland; Becomes a French province; Advent of Father Vuarin; He devotes himself to the task of reintroducing Catholicism in Geneva; Difficulties of dealing with the renegade priests established in Switzerland by the French convention; Wonderful success of Father Vuarin in this delicate business; Remarkable and perilous escapades of the daring priest; Opens a chapel in Geneva and is attacked by a Calvinist mob; Gradual reintroduction of Catholic worship despite all opposition; Father Vuarin an indefatigable worker; His clever methods; De Maistre describes him enthusiastically.</p>	284
<p>IRELAND LOOKING BACK. By <i>John J. O'Shea</i>,</p> <p>The '98 Rising no mere local or fortuitous outbreak but the inevitable culmination of a settled programme of oppression; Regarded as a democratic movement, the Irish agitation mercilessly dealt with by Pitt, as a warning to English democrats; Widespread character of Pitt's spy system; French and Irish in his employ meant for treacherous purposes; The atrocious methods employed to goad the peasantry to insurrection; Evidence of the political prisoners at Fort George on this head; Social state of Ireland at the period of the outbreak; Mystery surrounding Father O'Leary's action; A degenerate Anglo-Saxon aristocracy; Dwelling and rowdyism in the Irish capital; With all this an Augustan age in Irish literature and eloquence; Rottenness of the Anglo-Saxon Irish Parliament; Extent of Presbyterian disaffection; Formation of the United Irish Society; The Castle in motion; Starting of the Orange fraternity; A diabolical plan of action; The horrors of "free quarters"; Depopulation of Armagh; The Irish leaders turn to France for help; A fatal mistake in policy; Divided counsels among the Catholic bishops and clergy; The outbreak in Wexford; Horrors of its suppression; Wholesale dishonor and murder, denounced even by English generals; Rebellion, under the circumstances, a sacred duty; High social standing of the '98 leaders; The greatest political crime known to history.</p>	306
<p>MODERN APICULTURE. By <i>Rev. James Kendal, S.J.</i>,</p> <p>Supersensitive humanitarianism over animals; Early scientific cultivation of bees; Migration practiced by the ancient Egyptians; Invention of the movable comb-hive; The political economy of the beehive; Methods of subduing refractory swarms; Sir John Lubbock's study of ants and bees; Miscellaneous apiology.</p>	334
<p>CARDINAL WISEMAN. By Wilfrid Ward. Review by <i>Dr. St. George Mivart, F.R.S.</i>,</p>	358
<p>THE MIRACULOUS IN CHURCH HISTORY. By <i>Very Rev. John B. Hogan, S.S., D.D.</i>,</p> <p>Denial of the Supernatural the chief tenet of the infidel school; Similar tendency of Rationalistic Christians; The age of miracles and its literature; The "Golden Legend"; Intelligent inquiry succeeds in the Church to the stage of unquestioning credence; Inconsistent attitude of Protestants towards the Supernatural; At variance with their own prayers; Prayer an avowal of the Supernatural; Cautious proceeding of the Church with regard to alleged miracles; Proper attitude of the faithful; Value of legendary history in a survey of Christian development.</p>	382

IS GEOLOGY A SCIENCE? By <i>Rev. George C. Hungerford Pollen, S.J.</i> , . . .	399
Logicians and their bold attitude toward science; Geological truths and methods for ascertaining its certainty; Miracles and creation; Fossils, the records of a past life; The rocks, pages of the earth's history; The age of the rocks; Influence of volcanoes and earthquakes on geological phenomena.	
SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE,	424
Mind in men, the lower animals, and social organism; Is there life in metals? Getting behind the Koran; Balloons and magnets in sunken ship raising; Improvements in divers' armor; Revival of empirical science in France; Is leprosy incurable? The age of the sun.	
THE "ORIGINAL SOURCES" OF EUROPEAN HISTORY. By <i>Rev. H. T. Henry</i> , . . .	449
Want of plan in the historical work of the University of Pennsylvania; Miscellaneous character of the contents of the last volume; Half lights on the middle ages; Scrappy way of presenting the most important phases of the process of historical development; Different method of Maitland and other authoritative commentators; Artful method of sneering at Catholic beliefs; A grotesque caricature of history; The trite slander about indulgences and permission to commit sin stereotyped in these "original sources"; The Popes and the Crusaders; Suppression of the truth regarding the indispensable condition of penance before absolution; Editorial misrepresentation of St. Thomas Aquinas' counsel regarding the Bible; A hankering after obscenity an editorial weakness.	
THE RESTORATION OF CATHOLICITY IN GENEVA. II. By <i>T. L. L. Teeling</i> , . . .	487
Confusion in Genevan counsels on the approach of the allied armies; Catholic territory not wanted as a complement of independence; Trying to hunt out M. Vuarin and undo all his work; Bold stroke of the irrepressible Curé; The repartition of Europe involves deplorable results to small Catholic States; Bitter hostility of the new Genevese government to the Church; Bold subterfuge of M. Vuarin; Strenuous struggle with the Swiss authorities and interference of the Great Powers; The Pope transfers the Catholic parishes to another diocese as a settlement of the trouble; A subservient bishop; Humiliating agreement with the Genevese authorities; M. Vuarin finds a steadfast friend in Count Joseph de Maistre; Death of Pius VII. and accession of Leo XII.; M. Vuarin goes to Rome and meets the Abbé Lamennais; Failure of his attempt to effect a restoration in Geneva; His piety; His courage; His great <i>esprit</i> and wit; His beautiful death.	
CORONA SPINARUM. By <i>Alfred E. P. Raymond Dowling, B.A., Oxon.</i> , . . .	510
Mediæval folklore of trees and plants; The poets and the robin redbreast; The crown of thorns; Its true character; Various legends connected with the crown in different lands; Poetry inspired thereby.	
THE LAST OF THE HURON MISSIONS. By <i>Richard R. Elliott</i> ,	526
Beginnings of the City of Detroit; Exemplary sociology of the Hurons; Visit of Father Charlevoix to their settlements; The French government grants Father La Richardie funds for a mission foundation among the Hurons; The first mission storehouse; The economical system established thereat; A self-supporting enterprise; Troubles on the border; Visit of Sir William Johnson to Detroit; A typical Irish gentleman; Pontiac's conspiracy; Wonderful influence of Sir Wm. Johnson over the Indian warriors; Pontiac's great stratagem fails; And how; A very interesting clue; Success of the British policy in getting rid of the Hurons; Long administration of Father Potter; His end and burial-place.	
THE CHURCH AND SCHOLASTICISM. By <i>Rev. G. Tyrrell, S.J.</i> ,	550
The antagonistic philosophic schools, rationalism and traditionalism; Reasons why these extremes are to be avoided; Wise attitude of the Church; Value of the Aristotelian nomenclature to theology, but only as a vehicle; Logic and faith entirely different things; The syllogistic methods of the schoolmen injurious to religion; Inadequacy of language to express innate convictions; A golden mean between an analytical habit and an undue dependence on traditionalism needed.	
CATHOLIC MISSIONS IN THE PACIFIC. By <i>Bryan G. Clinch</i> ,	562
A time of new social theories in Europe; Frenchmen enchanted with Rousseau's pictures of idle savage life in beautiful southern islands; France sends out La Perouse to explore, and England Bligh; Beginnings of Botany Bay; Starting of the London Missionary Society; The South Sea Islands shown to be a very tempting region for easy-going people; Sailing of the first expedition to the Pacific; Organization and folklore among the Polynesian Aborigines; Large population before the coming of the English; Reduced to a fraction now; Establishment of the Apostolic Prefecture of Oceania by Pope Leo XII.; Landing of Father Bachelot and two companions at Honolulu; They begin a mission and make some hundreds of converts; The Protestant Missionaries enraged; They stir up the queen to action; Horrible tortures of the Catholic converts; Steadfastness of the victims; The French priests banished from the islands; Death of Father Bachelot; A French ship is sent to demand freedom of worship and the persecution ends; Wonderful progress of the Catholic religion as a result; Absorption of the civil government by American Protestant missionaries; The natives gradually dwindle away under the process; Arrival of Bishop Roucheze at the Gambier Islands; Speedy renovation in morals and sociology among the natives; The bishop begins the same work in the Marquesas group; Bishop Pompallier goes to Tahiti; The first Christian martyrs in the Pacific; Simple and severe lives of the Catholic priests; Suggestive difference between the results of Catholic and non-Catholic missions in Polynesia.	

Table of Contents.

vii

PAGE

<p>THE PROBLEM OF HAPPINESS IN THE LIGHT OF ECCLESIASTES. By <i>Rev. A. J. Maas, S.J.</i>,</p> <p>Early controversy over the canonicity of Ecclesiastes; Probable date of the writing of the book; A monologue with two voices; Its sententiousness and the meaning of its apparent contradictions; Ecclesiastes and the question of a future life; The allegorical method of Hebrew composition; Altruism the guiding spirit of this remarkable book.</p>	576
<p>THE CONSECRATION OF CHURCHES: ITS ORIGIN, MEANING AND RITE. By <i>Rev. M. O'Riordan, D.Ph., D.D., D.C.L.</i>,</p> <p>Two elements in the Church, the stable and the variable; This peculiarity not fortuitous, but of Divine interest; Beauty of the Church's liturgy, and its influence over outside minds; Reasons for our love of the beautiful; Barrenness of Protestantism; Its attempts to plagiarize Catholic liturgy and ritual; Catholicism confers sanctity upon all our action, when we do all for the glory of God; Protestantism a system for only one day in the week; The beginnings of consecration of men and edifices to God; Calvin and the iconoclasts detest the idea of consecration and the beautiful in worship; Consecration in the age of the Catacombs Church; The splendid ceremonial of the days of literature; Spiritual graces effected by the fact of consecration; Minute explanation of the various processes of the rite; Canon law on the subject; Growth of churches over the graves of the early martyrs.</p>	598
<p>THE OPPORTUNITIES OF EDUCATED CATHOLIC WOMEN. By <i>Rev. John T. Murphy, C.S. Sp.</i>,</p> <p>High states of the present convent schools; Their liberal curricula; Preservation of the true feminine character withal; Non-Catholics appreciate their great superiority; The Church the guardian of womanhood and morality; Learned women of the early times; Wonderful work of the religious orders in the days of infidelity and revolution; Great field for women's talents in modern American life; Their opportunities in literature; Social problems and how women may help to solve them; Woman's true sphere of influence; The "grand lady" idea a thing of the past.</p>	611
<p>ENGLAND'S SECOND GREAT COMMONER, GLADSTONE. By <i>John J. O'Shea</i>,</p> <p>Folly of the Socialist idea of "equality" in the light of lives of men like Gladstone; Their work equals that of a revolution; Democratic bent of Mr. Gladstone's mind; Not a favorite at Windsor Castle; His scorn of title; Development of his political principles from early conservatism; The first statesman to appeal to the conscience and the intellect of his countrymen; Religion a dominant element in his character; His early friendship for Newman; Failure to understand the Irish idea of education; The petulance which led to the "Vaticanism" publications; Beneficial effects of the papers; Crushing rejoinders; Immense intellectual superiority of Newman demonstrated; The Irish M. P.'s vindicated from the charge of servility; Perplexing contradictions in Mr. Gladstone's mental make-up; His admirable stand against divorce in the English ecclesiastical and judicial system; Difficulties which beset his efforts to do justice to Ireland in educational and political claims; Survey of his rank as a scholar and a statesman; His belief that morality should influence international policy; His scholarly leanings in his later days; Noble close of a noble life.</p>	618
<p>OBITUARY: SIR JOHN T. GILBERT,</p>	639
<p>SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE,</p> <p>Bishop Bagshawe and the evolutionists' cycles; Some simple disinfectants; The telescope for submarine exploration; The gold cure for snake-bite; The metal-transmutation theory again exploded; Mentality to supplant medicine; A new aspect of "Natural selection"; Ballooning in railway propulsion; False teeth made assimilable to the human system; Mineralogy and ethnology of the Philippines; The care of children's feet; The use of salicylic acid; Still another marvel in electricity.</p>	643
<p>LIVING NATURE. By <i>Prof. St. George Mivart</i>,</p> <p>The utilitarian idea in the genesis of species opposed to reason; The cause of specific characters an insoluble enigma; The testimony of inorganic matter and the mineral world to the vast antiquity of the globe; The dominant individualizing principle in nature; Uselessness of the analyzing process as an explanation of design and motive; The real forces of nature hidden from our view; Reason in men and reason in animals; The lessons of evolution in chemical transformations; The abysmal difference between intellectual man and the brute creation; The question of a future for animals; Definitions of science; Conditions of happiness for the human soul in the future.</p>	673
<p>SAVONAROLA. By <i>Rev. Albert Reinhart, O.P.</i>,</p> <p>Irreproachable character of the great Dominican; Absurdity of the pretence that he was a harbinger of the "Reformation"; Conflicting estimates of his true place and value held by Catholics; The troubled time of his nativity; Terrible effects of the Pagan Renaissance on the world of morals and the world of art and letters; Gross licentiousness of the Florentines; Savonarola's first efforts at reclamation fall flat; Returns to his studies and ponders over more striking methods; Marvellous success of his new attempt; His enemies increase as his influence grows; His correspondence with the Pope; Father Proctor's refutation of Dean Farrar's claim that Savonarola takes rank with Wyckliffe and Huss.</p>	692

	PAGE
THE IRISH PATRIOT PRIESTS OF 1798. By <i>P. G. Smyth</i> ,	702
Position of Irish Catholics in the eighteenth century; Misery of the Irish peasantry under Orangism and military brigandage; Patriotism of Father Quigley; His capture and execution; Burning of Boolavogue chapel; Father John Murphy declares for resistance; His spirited leadership; His capture and torture; Father Michael Murphy and Father Phillip Roche also driven to rebellion and death; Father Moses Kearns; The last battle on Wexford soil; Father Redmond, Father Dixon, Father Harold and Father O'Neill; Their sufferings in exile and at home.	
HAS THE CHURCH A SHARE IN DETERMINING THE SACRAMENTAL RITE?	
By <i>Rev. F. Rankin, S.J.</i> ,	720
St. Thomas Aquinas on the bestowal of sacrament; Making power on the apostles; The Canon of the Council of Trent; Mediate institution not required by the Church; The different views on the subject; Difference between the Latin and Greek rites of ordination; Essence and form of the sacraments; Papal decrees on the subject; Status of dissenting theorists.	
CHRISTIAN EDUCATION IN THE "DARK AGES." By <i>Rev. Eugene Magevney, S.J.</i> ,	734
Maitland's denunciation of the bigotry of Hallam and Robertson concerning the early monks; Dreadful state of Europe at the beginning of the "Dark Ages"; Soundness of the early monastic training; The learning of the Eastern and African Churches; Education begins to move Westward; St. Benedict founds the great school of Monte Cassino; St. Boniface sows the seeds of education in Germany; The Trivium and Quadrivium; Charlemagne's enlightened policy; The peripatetic universities; Remarkably gifted nuns; Humboldt's admiration of Albertus Magnus; St. Isidore an intellectual prodigy; He founds the school of Seville; Early cathedral schools; Beginnings of the mediæval universities; The monks reclaim all Europe from barbarism and finally overthrow Arianism; Widespread fame of the Irish schools; Irish missionaries all over Europe; Aleuin at the Court of Charlemagne; Scotus Erigena and the new Platonism; Charlemagne sits and takes his lessons among the children in the Palace School; Similar example of Alfred the Great; Foundation of Oxford; The darkest hour in European history; A break in the gloom; Birth of the Crusades; Their great influence in the diffusion of knowledge; Rise of scholasticism; Gregory the Great and his influence on learning.	
THE RECOLLETS AT DETROIT DURING NEARLY ALL THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By <i>Richard R. Elliott</i> ,	759
Early introduction of Catholic service at Detroit; Probable presence of La Salle at the site of the city; Expedition of the Chevalier de Cadillac; The Hurons and Ottawas respond to his invitation; He founds the colony of Detroit; The Jesuits disapprove of the expedition; Recall of Father de Guestis; The Compagnie du Canada get control; Attack on the post by hostile Indians; Father Constantine slain; Wonderful growth of Detroit; The Recollets invited to the colony; Murder of Father de Lhalle; Father de la Marche succeeds him at the mission; The conspiracy of Pontiac; Other eminent Recollets at Detroit; An unpopular Irish priest; A wonderful parish register.	
THE PRE-REFORMATION CHURCH IN SCOTLAND. Part I. By <i>Very Rev. Dom. Michael Barrett, Sub-Prior, O.S.B., Fort Augustus, Scotland</i> ,	779
The Pope's retrospect of the thousand years of Catholicity in Scotland; The early missionaries from Ireland; National martyrs; St. David a great ecclesiastical founder; St. Margaret; Magnificence of the Scotch cathedrals; An epoch of splendid architecture; Kings lend state to great church ceremonies; Royal pilgrimages; Poets and historians in the ranks of the clergy; The Church sets up universities; Is the patron of science and the fine arts; The laborious monks; They are tillers of the soil and developers of the fisheries; They begin the period of ship-building; Illustrious scholars among the churchmen; Splendid record of the Church down to the sixteenth century; The seeds of decay and downfall.	
FREEMASONRY IN LATIN AMERICA. By <i>Rev. Reuben Parsons, D.D.</i> ,	802
Introduction of Freemasonry into Spain; At first tolerated by the Church; Dangerous character of the fraternity discovered; Secret encouragement of Masonry in Spain and Portugal by the English Cabinet for State purposes; Masonry plans to dechristianize Spain; Zorilla endeavors to promote immigration of English Protestants; "No use for Irish Catholics"; Sagasta as Grand Master; Masonry succeeds in getting heresy taught in Spanish universities; Masonry gets a footing in South America; Instigates insurrections; Startling denunciation of it by Count Hungwitz at the Congress of Verona; Its deadly hatred of the Church; The Emperor of Brazil as Grand Master; Masonry invades the Orders of Carmelites and Franciscans; Pius IX. and Don Pedro; Masonry triumphs over the Church in Brazil; Bold stand of Mgr. Oliviero; He is prosecuted and imprisoned; Shocking impiety of Masonic orgies; Bolivar's war with the Lodges; Downfall of Columbia; Ingratitude of the people toward the Liberator; Garcia Moreno, "the modern St. Louis"; Ecuador's solitary protest against the attack on Rome; Ecuador consecrated to the Sacred Heart; The Lodges, as a consequence, decree Moreno's death; His assassination; His splendid character; Freemasonry in Argentina; In Mexico; Separation of Church and State and secularization of education and the marriage laws; Expulsion of the religious sisterhoods.	

Table of Contents.

ix

	PAGE	
BISMARCK'S DECLINE AND FALL By <i>John J. O'Shea</i> ,	836	
Mock humility of Prince Bismarck ; The "faithful German servant" in reality the irresistible master ; His unforgiving attitude toward the new régime ; A political anachronism ; His hatred of democracy ; Hated the Church because it is the friend of the people ; Marvellous effects of the Kulturkampf on the solidarity of the Church in Germany ; Windthorst's masterly leadership ; Personal magnetism of both Windthorst and Bismarck ; The latter imposes upon M. de Blowitz and Mr. Stead ; Amazing hypocrisy and double-dealing ; War declared against the Catholic party ; Windthorst picks up the challenge ; Widespread and remorseless persecution all over the empire ; Duration of the Kulturkampf ; Wholesale imprisonment, banishment and muleting of the episcopate, the clergy and the religious sisterhoods ; The Catholic laity step into the breach ; The persecution foiled because of the unexpected resistance ; Its beneficial results ; Formation of a Christian democracy and general social organization ; The real object aimed at in the starting of the Kulturkampf ; Its utter failure ; Bismarck's miserable end.		
RECENT ENCYCLICALS OF POPE LEO XIII. ,	854	
Text of the Encyclicals to the Scottish and Italian clergy.		
SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE ,	872	
The marvels of liquefied air ; Machinery and tools of the ancients ; Homœopathic treatment of yellow fever ; Artificial production of alcohol ; Mosquitoes and malaria.		

BOOKS REVIEWED.

	PAGE		PAGE
A Dictionary of the Bible, dealing with its Language, Literature and Contents, including the Biblical Theology. Vol. I. Edited by James Hastings, M.A., D.D.....	664	Life and Letters of Thomas Kilby Smith, Brevet Major-General United States Volunteers (Walter George Smith).....	655
A General and Critical Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture (A. E. Breen, D.D.).....	671	Life of the Blessed Master John of Avila (Fr. Longaro degli Oddi, S.J.).....	446
A Manual of Catholic Theology. Based on Scheeben's "Dogmatik," Vol. II. (Joseph Wilhelm, D.D., Ph.D., and Thomas B. Scannell, B.D.).....	888	Light and Peace. Instructions for Devout Souls, to dispel their doubts and allay their fears (R. P. Quadrufraui, Barnabite).....	670
Angels of the Battlefield. A history of the labors of the Catholic Sisterhoods in the late Civil War (George Barton).	666	L'Index. Commentaire de la Constitution Apostolique "Officiorum" (M. L'Abbe G. Peries).....	895
Autobiography of Madam Guyon. Translated in full by Thomas Taylor Allen.	223	Meditations on the Sacred Passion of our Lord (Cardinal Wiseman).....	669
Buddha's Tooth, worshipped by the Buddhists of Ceylon in the Pagoda called Dalada-Maligawa at Kandy....	892	Moral Principles and Medical Practice the Basis of Medical Jurisprudence (Rev. C. Coppens, S. J.).....	217
Chinese Philosophy (Dr. Paul Carus).....	661	Motion: Its Origin and Conservation (Rev. Walter McDonald, D.D.).....	433
Christian Philosophy. A Treatise on the Human Soul (Rev. John T. Driscoll, S.T.L.).....	668	Notes on St. Paul: Corinthians, Galatians, Romans (Joseph Rickaby, S.J.)	659
Commentarium in Facultates Apostolicas Episcopis (Antonio Konings, C.S.S.R.).	894	Passion Flowers; poems by Father Edmund, of the Heart of Mary, C.P. (Benjamin D. Hill).....	889
Compendium Theologiæ Dogmaticæ et Moralis unacum præcipuis notionibus theologiæ canonicæ, liturgiæ, pastoralis et mysticæ, ac philosophiæ Christianæ (P. J. Berthier, M.S.).....	663	Philosophia Lacensis: Institutiones Philosophiæ Naturalis secundum Principia S. Thomæ Aq. ad Usum Scholasticum Accomodavit. Vols. I. and II. (Tilm. Pesch, S.J.).....	437
Course of Religious Instruction. Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools.....	443	Philosophia Lacensis; Institutiones Psychologicae. Vol. III. (Tilm. Pesch, S.J.).....	665
De Actibus Humanis, Ontologicæ et Psychologicæ Consideratis seu Disquisitiones Psychologicæ-Theologicæ de Voluntate in Ordine ad Mores (V. Frius, S.J.).....	222	Prælectiones Dogmaticæ quas in Collegio Ditton-Hall habebat Christianus (Pesch, S.J.).....	884
De Prohibitione et Censura Librorum Constit. "Officiorum et Manerum Leonis, PP. XIII. et Dissertatio Canonico-Moralis (Arthur Vermeersch, S.J.).....	893	Prælectiones Dogmaticæ. Vol. V. Tract. I. de Gratia, II. de Lege Divina Positiva (Chr. Pesch, S.J.).....	220
De Religione Revelata libri quinque (G. Wilmer, S.J.).....	220	Reminiscences of William Wetmore Story, the American Sculptor and Author (Mary E. Phillips).....	440
Die Heiligen Sacramente der Katholischen Kirche. Fuer die Seelsorger dogmatisch dargestellt von Dr. Nikolaus Gühr, Subregens an derbischoeflichen Priesterseminar zu St. Peter. Erster Band.....	668	Sermons and Moral Discourses for all the Sundays of the year, for Holy Days and Feasts, and for Particular Devotions. Edited and in part written by Rev. Francis X. McGowan, O.S.A.	671
Exposition of Christian Doctrine. By a Seminary Professor. Authorized English Version (John J. MeVey).....	443	Studies in Church History. Vol. IV. (Rev. Reuben Parsons, D.D.).....	894
Geachichte der Weltliteratur (Von Alexander Baumgartner, S.J.).....	444	The English Black Monks of St. Benedict. A Sketch of Their History from the Coming of St. Augustine to the Present Day (Rev. Ethelred L. Taunton).	442
Girlhood's Handbook of Woman.....	893	The Formation of Christendom. Vol. IV. (T. N. Allies, R.C.S.G.).....	670
History of the Roman Breviary (Pierre Batiffol, Litt.D.).....	890	The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents. Vol. IX. Edited by Reuben Gold Thwaites.....	223
Institutiones Psychologicae. Vol. II.....	437	The Life of St. Augustine, Bishop and Doctor. A Historical Study (Philip Burton).....	663
Institutiones Theologiæ Dogmaticæ: Tractatus de Deo Creante et de Deo Consummatore (Petro Elnig, D.D.)...	667	Theologiæ Moralis Institutiones quas in Collegio Lovaniensi Societatis Jesu tradebat Eduardus Génicot ex eadem societate (Lovanii).....	219
Institutiones Theologiæ de Sacraments (J. B. Sasse, S.J.).....	220	The Sacred Books of the East. Vol. I.—The Upanishads. Vol. II.—The Sacred Laws of the Aryas.....	877
Katholisches Eherecht (Dr. Joseph Schnitzer).....	895	The History of the Popes, from the close of the Middle Ages, drawn from the secret archives of the Vatican and other original sources.....	886
Les Origines de la Psychologie Contemporaine (D. Mercier).....	882	The Church and the Law, with special reference to Ecclesiastical Law in the United States (Humphrey J. Desmond).....	891

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XXIII.—JANUARY, 1898.—No. 89.

ALFRED LORD TENNYSON :

THE MECHANICS OF TENNYSON'S POETRY.

ALFRED LORD TENNYSON. A Memoir by His Son. Two Volumes.
New York : The Macmillan Company. 1897.

THIS biography has received the highest praise from all classes of critical journals. We have found the volumes as interesting as a novel—more interesting, indeed, than most novels. For the hero in this case was possessed of a personality that attracted and held attention by its own merits, and needed not the assistance of romance to lift it above “the petty smokes and stirs of men.” The portrait drawn by the word-painter is striking and vivid—the realism of the story, however, not running into even the borderland of that vulgar fulness which characterized Froude’s “Carlyle,” and on which the modern romancer has, alas! built only too securely his hopes of financial, and perhaps of literary, success.

The biographer has had a vast mass of detail from which to choose—some 40,000 letters, published and unpublished manuscripts, diaries, literary fragments of Tennyson’s friends, notes on his own life and work which the poet left for publication after his death, his unpublished poems, and the “Journal” of the family’s home life. This embarrassment of wealth will explain two things noticeable in the volumes : first, an occasional fragmentariness in the narrative ; and, second, an apparent inconsistency in the portraiture, arising, however, less from lack of synthetic skill in the writer of the Life than from the many-sidedness of the poet himself, who “may be like the magnetic needle, which, though it can be moved from without, yet in itself remains true to the magnetic pole.” But while this wealth of material will explain these seeming defects, it will also call attention to the wise reticence of the

biographer, who has not permitted anything to appear in the two large volumes that could cause even a passing cloud of misapprehension to rest on any one of the numerous figures that people his pages—friends of the poet, correspondents, publishers, casual acquaintances, critics both kindly and harsh, the public whom the poet in his earlier years considered wholly unsympathetic, and from whose enthusiastic sympathy he turned with unconquerable shyness and timidity in his after life. There is absolutely no trace of innuendo, *suppressio veri*, suspicion of scandal, ungenerous criticism, pandering to the appetite of “an eavesdropping and newspaper-ridden age.” There is simply the portrait of a man of sensitive, simple nature; of unflagging energy in perfecting the details of his art; a man whose life was nearly that of the century itself, and some parts of whose work may prove the undying heirloom of all the coming centuries; and, finally, a man whose instincts—much misapprehended by many, if we may trust the testimonies of his friends as quoted in the “Memoir,” and if we may argue from their life-long friendship—were kindly, however much his concrete judgments may have been occasionally at fault. In these he certainly erred at times; he was very far from being a statesman, or perhaps even a broad-minded man. His best apology is that of ignorance (*e.g.*, in the scandal of the “Jamaica Riot,” vol. ii., p. 40), and his attitude found palliation in that of men who knew better only to argue more obstinately for a policy as un-Christian as it was inhuman. Those who have formed an ideal portrait of the poet from that better life expressed in his works need fear no sad disillusioning—as, unfortunately, some recent biographies of great men might with too much reason lead them to fear.

Delightful as this Life is from the standpoint of frank simplicity, cleanness, sympathy, it is no less charming (in its appropriate reticence and in its absence of the “personal note”) as a biography of a man who permitted his son to write it only that no intrusive outsider might find opportunity for an unauthentic travesty. The poet would have preferred leaving to the world, as the sole record of his life, his poems—that is, his life-work; believing that

None can truly write his single day,
And none can write it for him upon earth.

He himself wrote what he considered a sufficient literary biography, in his poem *Merlin and the Gleam*. His son attempts to solve the riddle of this poem—for riddle it certainly seems—according to the authentic interpretation of the poet. The solution only shows more clearly how little the world could spare the

two volumes of the "Memoir." If the authentic reading of the riddle had not been given, we should scarce feel inclined to share Mr. Van Dyke's "wonder that few of the critics seem to have recognized it for what it really is—the poet's own description of his life-work and his clear confession of faith as an idealist." ("The Poetry of Tennyson," by Henry Van Dyke. Scribner's, 1897.) We are rather inclined to think with Mr. Luce, who, by the way, has given an admirable summary of the riddle in his "Handbook to Tennyson's Works" (George Bell & Sons, 1895), that "it is not easy to piece out the allegory of *Merlin and the Gleam*. The poet traverses life from the 'morning hills' down by cataract and wilderness over the level to the ocean shores. Those he leaves behind are young mariners charged to launch their vessel upon the ocean which is about to withdraw his being to its own." Nevertheless the poem does, when interpreted aright, give the salient characteristics of the poet and of his work in a few broad strokes of the pen, and, as an introduction to the following pages of the biography, is like a crystallized text for a long elaboration. Hallam Tennyson's reading of the riddle is more minute than that of Mr. Luce; but, as a slight preface to our own fragmentary criticism in this article, we beg the reader to take down his volume of "Demeter and Other Poems," and read once more the quaint rhythms of *Merlin and the Gleam*, with the comment of Mr. Luce: "In this, though the metre is almost archaic, we have a beautiful and touching description of the life of the great artist. . . . First the gleam flickered above the springs of fancy; then for ten years, repelled by the croak of critics, it retreated; but the poet followed still, and it glanced on lyric and monologue and idyl, it illumined the legend of Arthur the King, threw a divine light on the lament for Arthur Hallam, mingled a ray of immortality with the melodies that sang through the world in later years; and now, having led the poet to the land's last limit, it stood hovering 'on the border of boundless Ocean, and all but in Heaven.'"

We do not intend to discuss in this paper the poet's philosophical or theological or political views—matters on which much stress is laid in the "Memoir." To us he is, first and last, a POET; and even here his melody attracts us so much more than his matter that we shall discuss merely the mechanics of his poetry.

I. POETA NASCITUR.

The poetic instinct was clearly an heirloom to the young Alfred. His father was a poet; his brothers seven and his sisters

four were, most of them, poets. As children they gave early evidence of their heirloom of poetic creation. "Their imaginative natures gave them many sources of amusement. One of these lasted a long time: the writing of tales in letter form, to be put under the vegetable dishes at dinner, and read aloud when it was over." Young Alfred was the prince of the juvenile story-tellers. The cynosure of kindling eyes, he would discourse at any desired length on themes of savage and romantic interest made out of the whole cloth, or having Wellington and Napoleon as the basis of fact for a great fabric of fancy. The imaginative faculty, thus early developed, found soon its easier expression in verse. He lisped in numbers; for, as it seems, the numbers came. In 1890 the old poet jotted down some of his recollections of this early seed-time. Before he was able to read he was in the habit, on a stormy day, of spreading his arms to the wind and crying out, "I hear a voice that's speaking in the wind"; and the words "far, far away" had always a strange charm for him. "According to the best of my recollection, when I was about eight years old I covered two sides of a slate with Thomsonian blank verse in praise of flowers for my brother Charles, who was a year older than I was, Thomson then being the only poet I knew. . . . About ten or eleven, Pope's Homer's 'Iliad' became a favorite of mine, and I wrote hundreds and hundreds of lines in the regular Popeian metre, nay, even could improvise them." At the age of twelve he appears as a critic of Milton, writing to his Aunt Marianne quite an elaborate review of the *Samson Agonistes*. The passage

Restless thoughts that like a deadly swarm
Of hornets armed, no sooner found alone,
But rush upon me thronging, and present
Times past, what once I was, and what am now,

he quotes with the remark that it puts him "in mind of that in Dante which Lord Byron has prefixed to his *Corsair*, 'Nessun maggior dolore, Chè ricordarsi del tempo felice, Nella miseria.'" He admires particularly the line

O dark, dark, dark, amid the blaze of noon.

He comments on the word "diffused" in the line

See how he lies at random, carelessly *diffused*,

as follows: "If you look into Bishop Newton's notes you will find that he informs you that 'This beautiful application of the word "diffused" is borrowed from the Latin.' It has the same

meaning as 'temere' in one of the 'Odes of Horace,' Book the second,

Sic temere, et rosa
Cano odorati capillos,

of which this is a free translation: 'Why lie we not at random, under the shade of the plantain (sub platano), having our hoary head perfumed with rose-water?' " He ventures to differ with Newton, nevertheless, in explaining why Milton wrote "the Gates of Azzar"—"this, probably, as Bishop Newton observes, was to avoid too great an alliteration, which the 'Gates of Gaza' would have caused, though (in my opinion) it would have rendered it more beautiful; and (though I do not affirm it as a fact) perhaps Milton gave it that name for the sake of novelty, as all the world knows he was a great pedant." At about this time the young poet and critic "wrote an epic of twelve thousand lines à la Walter Scott,—full of battles, dealing, too, with sea and mountain scenery,—with Scott's regularity of octo-syllables and his occasional varieties. Though the performance was very likely worth nothing, I never felt myself more truly inspired. I wrote as much as seventy lines at one time, and used to go shouting them about the fields in the dark. . . . Somewhat later (at fourteen) I wrote a drama in blank verse, which I have still, and other things. It seems to me I wrote them all in perfect metre."

That was assuredly a queer prophecy which his grandfather uttered as he gave the lad half a guinea in recognition of a poem on his grandmother's death: "Here is half a guinea for you, the first you have ever earned by poetry, and take my word for it, the last!"

The boy was a fond observer of Nature in all her moods. As a boy, says the biographer, he would "reel off hundreds of lines such as these:

When winds are east and violets blow,
And slowly stalks the parson crow.

And

The quick-winged gnat doth make a boat
Of his old husk wherewith to float
To a new life! all low things range
To higher! but I cannot change."

Although of a shy and reserved nature throughout his life, and in his earlier years rendered very melancholy by the sternness and despondency of his father, Alfred had a great fund of humor in his nature such as, with but few exceptions, his poems do not clearly hint at. The "Memoir," however, has many instances of his sense of humor; and a careful reading of his poems will prove

unfounded the charge that he was destitute of this sense. It shows itself very early in his life, and must be considered an integral part of the demonstration that *poeta nascitur*. As an illustration of his sense of humor—a sustaining and important quality in his character as well as in his poetry—we must make room for the following anecdote. “He liked to tell of an owl and a monkey of famous memory. Sitting at night by the open window in his own particular little attic (now used as a store-room for apples and lumber), he heard the cry of a young owl and answered it. The owl came nestling up to him, fed out of his hand, and finally took up its permanent abode with the family. Sometimes it would perch on my grandmother’s head, and was so constantly with her that her pet monkey was made jealous. The monkey was a droll fellow; he would imitate the housemaid scrubbing the floor, and his prime luxury was to singe the hair of his back at a candle. One luckless day he was sitting in a corner of the sill outside the attic window, the owl in the opposite corner. The monkey glared at the owl; the owl watched the monkey with solemn round eyes,—the monkey advancing and retiring, and gibbering like a little Frenchman all the while. The little Frenchman at last plucked up courage, rushed at his solemn opponent, took him by the leg, and hurled him to the ground. ‘One of the most comical scenes,’ my father said, ‘that I have ever witnessed.’ The owl was eventually drowned in the well; dying, it is supposed, a Narcissus death of vanity.”

As an illustration of the dramatic instinct which, many long years afterwards, astonished the world and delighted his friends with *Becket*, *Queen Mary*, *Harold*, and his other plays, we quote from a fragment written at the age of fourteen. Carlos (a spirited stripling with a spice of suspicion and a preponderance of pride) is addressing Michael (his old attendant):

How beautifully looks the moonbeam through
 The knotted boughs of this long avenue
 Of thick dark oaks, that arch their arms above,
 Coeval with the battlemented towers
 Of my old ancestors!
 I never look upon them but I glow
 With an enthusiastic love of them.
 Methinks an oak-tree never should be planted
 But near the dwelling of some noble race;
 For it were almost mockery to hang it
 O'er the thatched cottage, or the snug brick box
 Of some sleek citizen.
 Ye proud aristocrats whose lordly shadows,
 Chequer'd with moonlight's variation,
 Richly and darkly girdle these gray walls—

I and my son's sons and our offspring, all
 Shall perish, and their monuments, with forms
 Of the unfading marble carved upon them,
 Which speak to us of other centuries,
 Shall perish also, but ye still shall flourish
 In your high pomp of shade, and make beneath
 Ambrosial gloom.

The sentiment suggests our own Bryant's early and imperishable triumph of *Thanatopsis*; and although so vastly inferior, still is noteworthy as illustrating a precocious mastery of rhythms and imaginative language. Truly, *Poeta nascitur*. While we marvel at these buddings of the Tennysonian genius, we cannot fail to recall to mind the more striking achievement of Pope's poetic precocity—the exquisite *Ode on Solitude*, which is no unworthy rival of Horace's *Beatus ille qui procul negotiis*. Both poets lisped in numbers, and gave the clearest possible evidence that *Poeta nascitur*.

II. ET FIT.

There be poets who sing no songs. When the poet, however, attempts to sing, he ventures into the temple of Art, and must be initiated into the mysteries if he will exercise worthily the priesthood of poesy. Tennyson had the advantage of training in his art from his earliest years. "My father once said to me," he wrote in 1890, "'Don't write so rhythmically; break your lines occasionally for the sake of variety.'" And he continues to insist that the poet precedes the artist: "'Artist first, then Poet,' some writer said of me. I should answer, 'Poeta nascitur non fit'; indeed, 'Poeta nascitur et fit.' I suppose I was nearer thirty than twenty before I was anything of an artist."

Hallam Tennyson has noted in many places through the two volumes of the "Memoir" the constant study expended by his father on the slightest details of the moods of Nature, on birds and flowers and skies and clouds, and especially on sea-phenomena. When a child he came across the verse in the Apocalypse, "There was no more sea," and could not reconcile himself to a "future where there should be no sea!" "Like Wordsworth on the mountains," said Fitzgerald, "Alfred, too, when a lad abroad on the wold, sometimes of a night with the shepherd, watched not only the flock on the greensward, but also

The fleecy star that bears
 Andromeda far off Atlantic seas."

And Hallam notes that "from his boyhood my father had a passion for the sea, and especially for the North Sea in wild weather—

The hollow ocean-ridges roaring into cataracts;

and for the glorious sunsets over the flats—

The wide-wing'd sunset of the misty marsh."

He gathered his inspiration sometimes in the humblest fields. "When I went by the first train from Liverpool to Manchester (1830), I thought that the wheels ran in a groove. It was a black night, and there was such a vast crowd round the train at the station that we could not see the wheels." Then it was that he made the line in *Locksley Hall*: "Let the great world spin forever down the ringing grooves of change." A prosaic buoy bobbing in the dark sea at Torquay became to his poetic eye a "star of phosphorescence," and suggested these lines in *Audley Court* (published in 1843):

The bay was oily calm; the harbor-buoy,
Sole star of phosphorescence in the calm,
With one green sparkle ever and anon
Dipt by itself, and we were glad at heart.

He noted with scrupulous nicety the humors of the sea at different times and places. One sea is "not a grand sea, only an angry curt sea"; another had "interminable waves rolling along interminable shores of sand"; at Valencia, "the sea was grand, without any wind blowing and seemingly without a wave; but with the momentum of the Atlantic behind, it dashes up into foam, blue diamonds it looks like, all along the rocks, like ghosts playing at hide-and-seek." When on a visit to Ireland in 1843 he wrote these lines (in *Merlin and Vivien*) in one of the caves of Ballybunion:

So dark a forethought rolled about his brain,
As on a dull day in an ocean cave
The blind wave feeling round his long sea-hall
In silence.

Looking at the sea one night at Torquay, when the moon was "muffled" by a thin vapor that covered the sky, he catches the suggestion of the line:

A full sea glazed with muffled moonlight.

A storm in the middle of the North Sea gives him the line in the *Idylls of the King*:

With all
Its stormy crests that smote against the skies.

Tours in Cornwall, Isle of Wight and Ireland in 1860 furnished him the following sea-memoranda, which he jotted down in his note-book:

- (*Babbicombe.*)— Like serpent-coils upon the deep.
- (*Torquay.*)— As the little thrift
Trembles in perilous places o'er the deep.
- (*The open sea.*)— Two great ships
That draw together in a calm.
- (*I. of Wight.*)— As those that lie on happy shores and see
Thro' the near blossom slip the distant sail.
- (*Valencia.*)— Claps of thunder on the cliffs
Amid the solid roar.
- (*Bray Head.*)— O friend, the great deeps of Eternity
Roar only round the wasting cliffs of Time.
- (*The river Shannon, on the rapids.*)—Ledges of battling water.

Tyndall, a quick observer and elegant expositor as he was of nature, wrote to Hallam Tennyson, describing a visit to the poet at Freshwater. *Inter alia* he says: "I occasionally sat near the shore observing the advance of the waves and listening to their thunder. The pebbles and shingles on the beach are mostly of flint, and emit a sharp sound on collision with each other. As the billows break and roll up the beach they carry the shingle along with them, and on their retreat they carry it downwards. Here the collisions of the flint pebbles are innumerable. They blend together in a continuous sound, which could not be better described than by the line in 'Maud':

Now to the scream of a maddened beach dragged down by the wave";

and this line of the poet, quoted by a scientist as the best possible description of the scene, was actually written anent that very beach! The poet gloried in having written the line

Roared as when the roaring breakers boom and blanch on the precipices.

This love and accurate description of sea-moods is found in many of the poet's works, and recalls a sympathetic treatment of the same theme—and perhaps quite as felicitous a treatment—by our own Lowell, who, in many places, but notably in *Pictures from Appledore*, has painted "marines" which are masterpieces of accuracy and vividness.

In his observation of nature Tennyson must have made impossible forevermore the mere "closet" poet. His inspiration came not from books or from brother poets, or from the classical worthies, but from his own close study of the scenes he himself witnessed. He is in Wales, and hears the roar of a cataract above the roar of a torrent, and he writes:

For as one
That listens near a torrent mountain-brook,
All thro' the crash of the near cataract hears
The drumming thunder of the huger fall
At distance, were the soldiers wont to hear
His voice in battle.

He sees a cow "drinking from a trough on the hill-side," and he jots down in his note-book: "The netted beams of light played on the wrinkles of her throat." He notes, with respect to the Cornwall wildflower called "lady's finger," that when opened it is of a golden yellow, but "of a rich orange red" when unopened. He condescends to notice at Bonchurch "a little salt pool fluttering round a stone upon the shore." The torrent of the Gave de Pau enchanted him—as whom has it not?—and he "sat by it and watched it, and seemed to be possessed by the spirit of delight." The romantic beauty of this region gave him more than one inspiration. A cataract falling over a cliff suggests that loveliest figure in the "Lotos-Eaters," "slow-dropping veils of thinnest lawn." He borrows the simile of "the stately pine" in *The Princess* from a pine "on an island in mid-stream between two cataracts":

And standing like a stately Pine
Set in a cataract on an island crag,
When storm is on the heights, and right and left
Suck'd from the dark heart of the long hills roll
The torrents, dash'd to the vale: and yet her will
Bred will in me to overcome it or fall.

In *Enoch Arden* he constructs a fine figure out of a familiar term used in the western parts of England, the "calling of the sea" for the "ground-swell":

There came so loud a calling of the sea.

"When this occurs on a windless night, the echo of it rings thro' the timbers of the old houses in the haven," he remarks. He sees an old oak that strikes his fancy, and forthwith writes these lines of *The Last Tournament*:

A stump of oak half-dead,
From roots like some black coil of carven snakes,
Clutched at the crag, and started thro' mid-air
Bearing an eagle's nest.

At Farringford, his wife notes in her journal that "there has been a great deal of smoke"—that is, the pollen of the yew blown and

scattered by the wind—"in the yew-trees this year. One day there was such a cloud that it seemed to be a fire in the shrubbery." Then it was that Tennyson wrote the lines in *The Holy Grail*:

O brother, I have seen this yew-tree smoke,
Spring after spring, for half a hundred years.

At Farringford, again, "after the Down had been wrapt in mist through one night, the next morning it looked as if covered with flashing jewels—all the colors of the rainbow," and he finds how best to picture the richness of the dress offered to Enid by the Earl of Doorm:

And thicker down the front
With jewels than the sward with drops of dew,
When all night long a cloud clings to the hill,
And with the dawn ascending lets the day
Strike where it clung; so thickly shone the gems.

Here, again, the hyacinth wood suggested the figure:

Sheets of hyacinth
That seemed the heavens upbreking through the earth.

Poeta fit. Tennyson spared no trouble to learn the alphabet of his art, to understand the *materies poescos*. In 1853 he began a flower dictionary, took up the study of geology; made long expeditions under the tutorage of a local geologist, bought spy-glasses "through which he might watch the ways and movements of the birds in the ilexes, cedar and fir-trees." In 1856 he finds his daily quantum of exercise in planting trees and shrubs, "taking all the while a loving note of Nature. Thus as he was digging one day a well-known line formed itself:

As careful robins eye the delver's toil."

Tyndall visited the poet in 1858, and thus refers to the desire of the poet for the greatest possible accuracy in matters relating to Nature: "The noble Atlas of Keith Johnson lay upon his table. In regard to metaphors drawn from science, your father, like Carlyle, made sure of their truth. To secure accuracy he spared no pains. I found in his room charts of isothermals and isobars intended to ensure the exactitude of certain allusions of his to physical science. In illustration of this, the late Lord Houghton, while still Mr. Moncton Milnes, once told me that, having composed an exquisite poem upon a flower, Tennyson discarded it because of some botanical flaw."

His study becomes at length an instinctive matter with him, so

that, as a friend wrote of him in 1864, "However absorbed Tennyson might be in earnest talk, his eye and ear were always alive to the natural objects around him. I have often known him stop short in a sentence to listen to a blackbird's song, to watch the sunlight glint on a butterfly's wing, or to examine a field-flower at his feet. The lines on 'The Flower' were the result of an investigation of the 'love-in-idleness' growing at Farringford—he made them nearly all on the spot and said them to me (as they are) next day. Trees and plants had a special attraction for him, and he longed to the last to see the vegetation of the Tropics."

The poet himself assigned as his reason for selecting English themes and scenes for his poems that he could not truly portray the atmosphere of foreign lands. His sureness and accuracy of observation make it dangerous to challenge any of his descriptions of nature. Even Ruskin erred in criticizing as a "pathetic fallacy" the line in *Maud*:

And left the daisies rosy.

"Why," said Tennyson, with some resentment, "the very day I wrote it I saw the daisies rosy in Maiden's Croft, and thought of enclosing one to Ruskin labelled 'A pathetic fallacy!'" In a letter written by the poet in 1847 he refers to another critic as follows: "When I was about twenty or twenty-one I went on a tour of the Pyrenees. Lying among these mountains before a waterfall that comes down one thousand or twelve hundred feet I sketched it (according to my custom then) in these words:

Slow-dropping veils of thinnest lawn.

When I printed this, a critic informed me that 'lawn' was the material used in theatres to imitate a waterfall, and graciously added, 'Mr. T. should not go to the boards of a theatre but to Nature herself for his suggestions.' And I had gone to Nature herself."

III. RHYTHMIC AND METRIC.

While Tennyson was careful to draw his inspiration from Nature, he made a very special study of Rhythms. An elaborate doctrine of Tennysonian metres based on his actual use of them in his poems and on the occasional glimpses the "Memoir" gives us of his theoretic views would prove a highly important as well as, we think, a highly interesting addition to the science of English verse. Our literature does not, indeed, lack some few significant treatises on the general subject; while it has been treated in par-

tial, special and fragmentary ways by many writers. But a special study of such masters of metre and rhythm as Tennyson and Swinburne would go far to establish a desirable standard—objective and intelligible—of correct taste.

Unfortunately, there is given in the "Memoir" no hint of any consecutive or rationally ordered study, on the part of the poet, of a subject to which he gave unquestionably much thought; and we think it dangerous to relegate to a critic who is not a poet, or at least an elegant versifier, the treatment of a subject in which the cultivated poetic ear must be the court of last appeal. Sidney Lanier was equipped properly for his work on the "Science of English Verse"; but we hesitate to accept the doctrines of a profound mathematician like Sylvester, because the abstract reasoning of the mathematical faculty seems forbidding when it concerns itself with such an eminently concrete thing as the melody of language.

In the artistic sense, *Poeta fit*. And the question forces itself on the admirer of any "Mighty-mouthed inventor of harmonies," whether his success was wholly due to the instinctive guidance of a highly cultivated and sensitively musical "ear," or whether it was due in part to a regular study of what Mr. Sylvester has termed "The Laws of Verse." By a "musical ear" we do not mean that sense appreciative of "music" in its common acceptation, which in Mozart manifested itself in the precocious composition of a melody when he was but four years old, and which in a lesser way is so common as to have merited for music the title of the Universal Language; we mean simply a sense which recognizes the melodious sounds, whether single or successive, of language.

It is an old theory that the poet must have an "ear for music" in the musician's parlance. The poet of the early Greek art was not a "maker" but a "singer," and he was not called ποιητής, but ἀοιδός. The Romans, too, sometimes confounded poets with musicians.

The identity of the two "ears" is a theory of dazzling attractiveness for the unpoetic critic of poetry. A certain professor of English in one of our universities informed his class, with dogmatic conviction, that it was wholly impossible for a person without an ear for music to write musical verse. But this delightful theory will not stand the test of actual fact. The most musical fashioner of words into rhythm that we have known personally was unable to appreciate the difference between high and low sounds; could recognize only two tunes, and these only by their

different rhythms. In this ability he very much resembled General Grant, who used to say that he could distinguish but two tunes, one of which was Yankee Doodle and the other of which was *not* Yankee Doodle. Old Dr. Johnson, again, who had some little claim to the title of "poet," considered music as "the least disagreeable of noises." Charles Lamb, similarly, found himself able to write pleasing verse, although the only pretence he could offer in the way of a musical ear was that, while organically unable to utter a musical sound, constitutionally he was *not averse* to melody. Shelley, who was little else if not melodious in his verse, had, very probably, no real passion for music. Rossetti, it is said, disliked music. How was it with Tennyson—that master of melodiousness in verse?

We can understand how Carlyle, who gave utterance to the profoundly beautiful thought, "See deeply enough and you will see musically," could have said of the poet Tennyson: "The man must have music dormant in him, revealing itself in verse," and should have characterized the poet's rich diapason voice as "like the sound of a pine-wood." Edward Fitzgerald, nevertheless, speaking of his college days, remarked that the poet "was not thought to have an ear for music; I remember little of his execution in the line except humming over 'the weary pund o' tow,' which was more because of the weary moral, I think, than for any music's sake." He was, however, fond of Beethoven—especially of some of his settings of German lyrics. Perhaps in this case it was the words rather than the music that affected him. His appreciation of music probably had some element in it of the ideal developed so systematically by Wagner; for on hearing Haydn's music descriptive of Chaos, he remarked that "the violins *spoke of light*." Of the scientific aspect of music he seems to have had scarcely any knowledge, although lamenting the lack of it. "I can feel the glory," he said, "though I cannot follow the music. I know that I miss a great deal by not understanding it. It often seems to me that music must take up expression at the point where poetry leaves off, and expresses what cannot be expressed in words." When nearly threescore and ten he hears Joachim playing the "Trillo del Diavolo," and feels less the magic of melody than the "soft eye-music" of Wordsworthian enjoyment: "I can feel the magic and poetry of the *Bowing*," he said.

It seems pretty clear, therefore, that his marvellous sensitiveness to the melody of language was not built on any sympathetic love for music, whether melody or harmony. His triumphs illustrate the futility of attempting to identify the two "ears," or even

to associate them by any essential connection; for with no decided musical ear he certainly had a wondrously acute development both of the physical and of the poetic ear.

Nevertheless, it was said with truth of him that no one has written finer things about music:

Music that gentlier on the spirit lies
Than tir'd eyelids upon tir'd eyes.

The tides of music's golden sea
Setting toward Eternity.

The glory of the sum of things
Will flash along the chords and go.

Love took up the harp of life and smote on all the chords with might,
Smote the chord of self that trembling past in music out of sight.

Like Collins, he could hear "the short, shrill shriek" of a bat, and this he considered the test of a fine ear. In some notes which he left on *Maud* we find the interesting fact stated that he designed the words "Maud, Maud, Maud," to imitate the rook's caw; and the words "Maud is here, here, here," the call of the little birds. He was at times laboriously minute in his avoidance of ill-sounding phrases. Having written the line in "Enid" originally:

Had wedded Enid, Yniol's only child,

he discovers that "Enid" is pronounced with the "e" short (as though spelt "Ennid"), and he therefore changes "wedded" into "married" to avoid the concurrence of the two short sounds. He thought that "as the English language is much finer than the Italian for variety of sound, so Milton for sound is often finer than Dante," and illustrated by the monotony of the "a's" in the opening lines of the "Inferno":

Nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita
Mi ritrovai per una selva oscura,
Che la diritta via era smarrita, etc.

"He felt what Cowper calls the 'musical finesse' of Pope, and admired single lines and couplets very much; but he found the 'regular da, da, da, da' of his heroic metre monotonous. He quoted

'What dire offence from amorous causes springs.'

'Amrus causiz springs,' horrible! I would sooner die than write such a line! Archbishop Trench (not then archbishop) was the only critic who said of my first volume, 'What a singular absence of the "s"!'

Reading aloud his *Ode on the Duke of Wellington*, he "dwelt long on the final words, letting them ring, so to speak, especially 'toll'd, Boom.' At the end he said, 'It is a great roll of words, the music of words. For a hundred people who can sing a song there are not ten who can read a poem. People do not understand the music of words.'"

Who will not immediately detect the rushing of rivulets, the moaning of doves, the murmuring of bees in the lines

Myriads of rivulets hurrying thro' the lawn,
The moan of doves in immemorial elms,
And murmuring of innumerable bees,

and who will not echo the criticism that they are as felicitous as Theocritus?

He writes thirty-four lines of a poem on *Reticence*, and leaves it unfinished because his eye—or rather ear—notices two "her's" coming together; he is vexed, throws the fragment aside, and finally forgets entirely its existence. Of Goethe he said that he "could not quite overcome the harshnesses of the German language. 'Kennst du das Land' is a perfect poem, but 'Beschuetzer ziehn' is a hideous sound in the middle." He thought Gray had a "wonderful ear," and held these to be "among the most liquid lines in any language":

Though he inherit
Nor the pride, nor ample pinion
That the Theban eagle bear,
Sailing with supreme dominion
Through the azure deep of air.

With these he coupled:

And drowsy tinklings lull the distant folds.

For the same reason he criticized the line in Collins' poem on the death of Thomson:

The year's best sweets shall duteous rise.

Tennyson asserted that he never made one sibilant sound immediately precede another. The assertion displays his estimate of the unmusicalness of such a juxtaposition, but is nevertheless incorrect as a matter of fact; for he does so more than once, as, for example:

A grief, then changed to something else
Sung by a long-forgotten mind.

Also:

May breathe with many roses sweet.

He comments on the "liquid lines" of Milton :

and Groves whose rich trees wept odorous gums and balm,
and And sweet reluctant amorous delay,
And in the ascending scale
Of Heaven, the stars that usher evening rose—

remarking of the last line that it "is lovely because it is full of vowels, which are all different. It is even a more beautiful line than those where the repetition of the same vowels or of the same consonants sometimes are (is) so melodious."

His carefulness was minute and exacting. "The Foresters" was put on the stage by Daly in 1892. "'Robin and Richard!' Did you notice that I would not say 'Richard and Robin?' It does not sound well," Tennyson said to a friend.

So much for the poet's doctrine and practice with respect to the melodious sounds of language. Closely connected with this is the subject of alliteration—such a prominent feature of his verse that it almost obtrudes itself even on the notice of dull ears. It is therefore interesting to find Tennyson remarking, in 1864, that he is not, as most readers are inclined to think, "studiedly alliterative." "Why," he said, "when I spout my lines first, they come out so alliteratively that I have sometimes no end of trouble to get rid of the alliteration." In "The Battle of Brunanburh" he uses it of set purpose, however, to give a flavor of the old Beowulfian song—"My father himself liked the rush of the alliterative verse, as giving something of the old English war-song.

The struggle of standards,
The rush of the javelins,
The crash of the charges,
The wielding of weapons—
The play that they play'd with,
The children of Edward.'

Lowell had pushed the alliterative suggestion farther with more correctness of imitation, and with better effect, in "The Voyage to Vinland" :

Looms there the New Land :
Locked in the shadow
Long the gods shut it,
Niggards of newness
They, the o'er-old.

Little it looks there,
Slim as a cloud-streak ;
It shall fold peoples
Even as a shepherd
Foldeth his flock.

Scattered through the "Memoir" we find some very interesting views of the poet respecting metres, as well classical as English. His metrical ear was, as has been already stated, well developed in his early boyhood. When about eight years old he writes Thomsonian blank verse by the square foot; and when a couple of years older, wrote the regular Popeian metre of Homer's "Iliad" by the square yard, attaining such facility in this line that he could even improvise. He received most of his training in the best possible palæstra—the works of his favorite poets; but this was supplemented by probably more than one hint from his father, who "was a poet and could write regular metre very skilfully." One instance of the parental help is recorded by the poet: "My father once said to me, 'Don't write so rhythmically; break your lines occasionally for the sake of variety.'"

When his first volume, "Poems, Chiefly Lyrical," appeared in 1830, his friend Arthur Hallam noted "the variety of his lyrical measures and the exquisite modulation of harmonious words and cadences to the swell and fall of the feelings expressed." It is a curious fact that the eminent metrist as well as poet, Coleridge, to whose poetry Tennyson was then devoted, should have misunderstood Tennyson's metrical forms. He "was more reserved" than Hallam in his praise about the first two ventures. "I have not read through all Mr. Tennyson's poems which have been sent to me, but I think there are some things of a good deal of beauty in what I have seen. The misfortune is that he has begun to write verses without very well understanding what metre is"! Commenting on this criticism some sixty years after, Tennyson said: "Coleridge did not know much about my poems, for he confounded Charles and me. From what I have heard he may have read *Glen-river* in 'above the loud Glen-river,' and *tendriltwine* in the line 'mantled with flowering tendriltwine' dactylically, because I had an absurd antipathy to hyphens, and put two words together as one word. If that was the case, he might well have wished that I had more sense of metre."

Perhaps rendered sensitive by this criticism of Coleridge, and fearful that his readers would wholly misconstrue the rhythms of his poem, "The Hesperides," the poet suppressed it after its publication (in 1833), contributing some of its beauty to a revised draft of "The Lotos-Eaters." Mr. Luce thinks "The Hesperides" "was rejected possibly on account of a few slight weaknesses, but more probably because its resemblances marred the single beauty of 'The Lotos-Eaters.'" The "Memoir" informs us, however, that the poet regretted, in after years, having excised

the poem from his "Juvenilia," but does not give the reason for its suppression. From the fact that the poem is republished in the "Memoir" with metrical accents written by the poet himself, we may fairly conclude that the reason for the suppression must have been, as we have just suggested, the extreme danger of mistaking its metrical character, rather than either of the reasons suggested by Mr. Luce.

In the 1842 volume appeared *Break, break, break*, that lyric of marvellous metrical appropriateness. The only comment made in the "Memoir" on this poem is that "it was made in a Lincolnshire lane at 5 o'clock in the morning between blossoming hedges." And in Mr. Luce's excellent "Handbook," while much space is given to an analysis of the poem, not a word is said on its metrical aspect. And yet by many an ear this beauty of its music is undoubtedly not recognized. We once heard a quondam professor of English literature, who was also a fine wielder of the Queen's English, read the first line without any pauses between the words. Plainly, the line should be read with a clear indication of the time-elements in it.

The time-measure of the poem is four feet to the line. In the first line, however, there are but three syllables. These, therefore, are to occupy the space assigned to a line of four feet. The meaning of the first line becomes at once apparent, the figure conjured up in the imagination by the lapse in metre being that of waves gathering strength for the supreme attack, the repulse indicated by the "k" of "break," and then, in the metrical silence following this word, the noiseless relapse of the broken wave. It is a perfect picture, painted vividly by the help of the time-element in metre.

In "Locksley Hall" the poet condescended to the popular taste that expresses a preference for trochaics: "Mr. Hallam said to me that the English people liked verse in trochaics, so I wrote the poem in this metre."

He thought he had originated the metre of "In Memoriam," and "had no notion till 1880 that Lord Herbert of Cherbury had written his occasional verses in the same metre." He believed himself the originator till some one told him, after the publication of the poem, that Ben Jonson and Sir Philip Sidney had used it. Brother Azarias well notes, in his essay on "The Spiritual Sense of 'In Memoriam,'" that "the poet made a happy selection. This form gives him great freedom. He is not tied down to any set number of stanzas. He can always stop when the inspiration ceases. It has become in his hands a most pliant instrument for the expression of many and various notes."

“He was proud of the metre of ‘The Daisy,’ which he called a far-off echo of the Horatian Alcaic.” To illustrate this we quote here the stanzas xix., xx.,—stanza xix. because it contains a reference to the Virgilian metre he loved—likening it to the rhythmic lapse of the stream—and stanza xx. because it gives the reason for this predilection :

From Como, when the light was gray,
And in my head, for half the day,
The rich Virgilian rustic measure
Of Lari Maxume, all the way,

Like ballad-burthen music, kept,
As on the Lariano crept
To that fair port below the castle
Of Queen Theodolind, where we slept, etc.

The reference to Virgil is the “Georgics,” ii., 159. The echo of the Alcaic measure is found, doubtless, in the last two lines of the stanza, or, more precisely, in the last foot (trochaic) of the third line, and in the dactyl introduced into the middle of the last line, imitating somewhat the swing of the last two lines of an Alcaic stanza, *e.g.*,

Spargent olivetis odorem
Fertilibus domino priori.

He seems to have been attracted by the Alcaic stanza of Horace—the favorite of the Roman lyrist, in which he wrote most of his odes—and has enshrined in a poem of four stanzas composed in that form a splendid portrait of Milton :

Oh, mighty-mouth'd inventor of harmonies,
Oh, skilled to sing of time and eternity,
God-gifted organ-voice of England—
Milton, a name to resound for ages.

In this poem he has surely achieved a masterpiece of metrical adaptation, our mother tongue being very loath to sing in such a cramping cage. German yields itself more readily to such treatment, or at least the German poets have been the most successful in the attempt to copy classical metres. In “An Gott,” Klopstock has written thirty-four stanzas of Alcaics, apparently with the greatest ease. His “Hermann und Thusnelda” is an instance of another felicitous use of a refractory classical metre. Tennyson, however, disliked German hexameters—no doubt with reason—and considered them even less felicitous than English accentual hexameters. He thought the attempt to render Homer into English accentual hexameters a great mistake, and that even quantitative

English hexameters would serve, as a rule, only comic themes, "tho' of course you might go on with perfect hexameters of the following kind, but they would grow monotonous :

High woods roaring above me, dark leaves falling about me."

"Englishmen will spoil English verses by scanning when they are reading, and they confound accent and quantity"; "and," continues his son, "as an illustration of a quantitative line regardless of accent he suggested the following pentameter :

All men alike hate slops, particularly gruel."

He found Coleridge's imitative description of an elegiac couplet faulty :

In the hexameter rises the fountain's silvery column—
In the pentameter aye falling in melody back ;

and altered it, so as to bring it into quantitative form, thus :

Up springs hexameter with might, as a fountain arising,
Lightly the fountain falls, lightly the pentameter.

The "Memoir" does not give the poet's reasons for objecting to the Coleridgian couplet, and we, therefore, make room here for the analysis made by Tom Hood, son of the singer of "The Bridge of Sighs," in his "Rhymester": "The first feet of both lines are less dactyls than anapæsts. The cæsure of the first line is not the 'worthier' cæsure. In the second line the monosyllable is inadmissible in the last place. Here I may as well point out what seems to me to be a difficulty of English versification which has given much trouble. The substitution of accent for quantity is not all that is required to make the best verse. Quantity enters into the consideration, too. A combination of consonants, giving an almost imperceptible weight to the vowel preceding them, goes far to disqualify it for a place as an unaccented syllable. To my thinking 'rises a' would be a better English dactyl than 'rises the,' and 'falls it in' than 'falling in.' But no agglomeration of consonants can make such a syllable accented. Two lines from Coleridge's 'Mahomet' will evidence this :

'Huge wasteful empires founded and hallowed slow persecution,
Soul-withering but crush'd the blasphemous rites of the pagan.'

'Huge wasteful' is not a dactyl, and 'ing but' is certainly not a spondee—nor is 'crushed the.' 'Hallowed,' by force of the broad 'o,' is almost perfect as a spondee, on the other hand; as is

'empires' also. Longfellow, in his 'Evangeline,' has, perhaps, done the best that can be done to give an exact rendering of the Latin hexameter; but Tennyson, in portions of 'Maud,' has caught its spirit, and transferred it into an English form. No poet, indeed, has done so much as the Laureate to introduce new or revive old forms of versification, and enrich the language with musical measure." This passage is rather long for a single quotation, but our apology must be, first, the evidence it furnishes that other students of metre than the Laureate felt keenly the limitations of our mother tongue, and the almost impossibility of bending its structure into a fit vehicle for carrying well the cumbrous classical metres; and secondly, the tribute it pays to the genius of Longfellow in this matter, as well as to Tennyson for the elegant standards he has set up in English metres.

Several examples are given, in the "Memoir," of Virgilian and Homeric hexameters which especially pleased the poet; "Virgil's finest hexameters, he thought, occurred in the 'Georgics,' and in that noble sixth book of the 'Æneid.'" We fail, however, to thoroughly understand the poet's assertion that "twice in the first two lines of the first 'Æneid,' and elsewhere perpetually, quantity is contradicted by accent." This criticism might have force if we but knew exactly how the ancients read their majestic rhythms. That accent "contradicted" quantity seems to us a bold view to put forth with respect to an accomplished versifier as well as poet, like Virgil; and to say that this is done by him "perpetually" is to reverse the prime rule of deduction and criticism, which should first study the model and draw thence the rules that govern its beauty, rather than measure its metrical worth by any preconceived—and probably erroneous, and at best tentative—standards of our own. If the old *arsis* meant *accent* in our English sense, and *thesis* meant the *absence* of accent, the criticism might be a just one; but if *arsis* meant *length*, or perhaps *acuteness*, and *thesis* meant *shortness*, or perhaps *lowness*, of sound—or if, as many have contended, an accented syllable in Greek (for instance) neither necessarily nor even frequently received the stress of the voice which we in English call accent—the criticism labors under an ambiguity of terms that must render it futile. Instead, then, of saying that a short quantity is contradicted by an accent falling upon it, we should perhaps rather say that Virgil has, in some way not perfectly clear to us, harmonized the two.

For the same reason, we fail to understand the poet's comparative estimate of the Greek and the Horatian Alcaics and Sapphics. He published his experiments in classical quantity in the

"Cornhill Magazine" (December, 1863), annotating his "Ode to Milton," as follows: "My Alcaics are not intended for Horatian Alcaics, nor are Horace's Alcaics the Greek Alcaics, nor are his Sapphics, which are vastly inferior to Sappho's, the Greek Sapphics. The Horatian Alcaic is perhaps the stateliest metre in the world except the Virgilian hexameter at its best; but the Greek Alcaic, if we may judge from the two or three specimens left, had a much freer and lighter movement; and I have no doubt that an old Greek, if he knew our language, would admit my Alcaics as legitimate, only Milton must not be pronounced *Milton*." How may we venture to estimate the metrical effect of the Alcaic or the Sapphic verse as it sounded to the Greek ear? or on the Greek tongue? It is surely a fair inference, from Horace's familiarity with it, that his adaptation of it to Latin was—must have been—a more correct, as well as a more felicitous one, than any modern poet's adaptation—which at best must be in the nature of a groping interpretation—to his own vernacular. Latin has been so long a dead tongue that we are floundering amidst a dozen waves of diverse pronunciation.

Devine si tu peux, et choisis si tu l'oses.

And the old Greek—who shall tell us how it was pronounced? By accents, as we find it written, or according to the quantitative scheme of Latin prosody? Or who may assure us that the modern Greek values of the alphabet do not constitute a ludicrous parody of the speech of Alcæus or Sappho? The quantitative values of English—a living tongue—have changed so much even since the days and in despite of the master work of Shakspeare, that if he had constructed his metres out of quantitative rather than accentual elements of rhythm we should find it extremely difficult to catch his music.

Let us dismiss the subject of Alcaics with Tennyson's whimsical imitation of the last two lines of an Alcaic stanza:

Thine early rising well repaid thee,
Munificently rewarded artist.

Another bit of comicality *in re* classical metres is found in the letter written by the poet from Llanberis, during a trip to North Wales in 1879, conveying details of the trip, in English parodies of what in Latin he styled, in his "Ode to Virgil," "the stateliest measure ever moulded by the lips of man." We can sympathize with the nerves of the poet while in the room above his quarters at the hotel a jovial party prepared to usher in the morn:

Dancing above was heard, heavy feet to the sound of a light air,
Likewise the feet no doubt but floors were misrepresenting.

He describes the walk in the morning—assimilating easily the crude masses of Welsh topographical nomenclature :

Walked to the Vale Gwynant, Llan Gwynant shone very distant
Touched by the morning sun, great mountains glorying o'er it,
Moel Hebog loomed out, and Siabod tower'd up in aether :
Liked Beddgelert much, flat green with murmur of waters,
Bathed in a deep still pool not far from Pont Aberglaslyn—
(Ravens croaked, and took white, human skin for a lambkin.)
Then we returned. What a day! Many more if fate will allow it.

After such an illustration, we feel that if there was any vanity in the poet on the subject of metres, it was almost justifiable.

The indebtedness of Tennyson to classical metres for many of his happiest inspirations in rhythm goes far to demonstrate the plea of Mr. J. Churton Collins that no amount of philological training can supersede the necessity of a large familiarity with the ancient classics in the study of English literature. He bases his plea more on the culturing ideas than on the mere forms, indeed; but if it were a question simply of the forms of verse, his contention would be justified by the example of Tennyson. Sappho, Theocritus, Catullus, not to speak of Homer, Virgil, Horace, and other masters of ancient rhythm, ministered to his muse. The metre of *Boädicea* (written in 1859) was "an echo of the metre in the 'Atys' of Catullus" as he himself noted.

While about the shore of Mona those Neronian legionaries
Burnt and broke the grove and altar of the Druid and Druidess, etc.

While he gloried in his new English metre, he "feared that no one could read it except himself, and wanted someone to annotate it musically so that people could understand the rhythm." "If they would only read it straight like prose, just as it is written, it would come all right," he said. He seems to have been sensitive on this subject; for in a letter written to the Duke of Argyll in 1861, he says: "'Boädicea,' no, I cannot publish her yet, perhaps never, for who can read her except myself?" Three years after, Robert Browning writes to him that he considers the new metre admirable, "a paladin's achievement in its way." Mr. Luce thinks that in *Boädicea* "the poet has written what are, perhaps, the most sonorous lines in our language. . . . As in some of the verses in 'Maud' and 'The May Queen,' the accents, eight in each line, become the basis of the measure, more or less irrespective of the number of syllables."

To Catullus he is indebted again for his otherwise uninteresting *Hendecasyllabics* :

O you chorus of indolent reviewers,
Irresponsible, indolent reviewers.
Look, I come to the test, a tiny poem
All composed in a metre of Catullus,
All in quantity, careful of my motion, etc.

He was attracted by the metres of Catullus, but not by his doctrine : " Catullus says that a poet's lines may be impure provided his life is pure. I don't agree with him : his verses fly much further than he does. There is hardly any crime greater than for a man with genius to propagate vice by his written words. I have always admired him : ' Acme and Septimius ' is lovely. Then he has very pretty metres. ' Collis O Heliconii ' is in a beautiful metre. I wrote a great part of my ' Jubilee Ode ' in it. People didn't understand. They don't understand these things. They don't understand English scansion. In the line ' Dream not of where some sunny rose may linger ' they said the first syllable of ' sunny ' was long, whereas it evidently is short. Doubling the *n* in English makes the vowel before short."

Asked to construct a Sapphic stanza in quantity with the Greek cadence, he gave this :

Faded ev'ry violet, all the roses ;
Gone the glorious promise ; and the victim,
Broken in this anger of Aphrodite,
Yields to the victor.

Here it will be noticed that he discards the cæsure of Horace's unvarying practice, and follows strictly the type set by Sappho.

Tennyson " confessed that he believed he knew the quantity of every word in the English language except, perhaps, ' scissors. ' "

While disliking the Horatian type of the Sapphic stanza, whose Adonic he would " audaciously define," writes Mr. Palgrave, as " like a pig with its tail tightly curled," he was " deeply moved by the Roman dignity which Horace had imparted to the Sapphic in the ' Non enim gazeæ. ' . . . "

We have perhaps dwelt at too great length on his fondness for the old classics and their metres, but the moral to be drawn was too attractive to be passed over without large illustration—the moral, namely, of the necessity of a familiarity on the part of an ambitious versifier with the old classics, which are such excellent instructors in matters of quantity and rhythm.

A few words on his preferences in English metres, and we shall

have finished our discussion of the "mechanics" of Tennysonian verse.

"Among the many metres he invented," writes Hallam Tennyson, "that of 'The Daisy' he ranked among his best, together with some of the anapæstic movements in 'Maud,' and the long-rolling rhythm in his 'Ode to Virgil.'"

With respect to his blank verse, Professor Jebb writes in his "Preface" ("The English Poets," edited by T. H. Ward): "As a metrist he is the creator of a new blank verse, different both from the Elizabethan and from the Miltonic. He has known how to modulate it to every theme and to elicit a music appropriate to each, attuning it in turn to a tender and homely grace, as in 'The Gardener's Daughter'; to the severe and ideal majesty of the antique, as in 'Tithonus'; to meditative thought, as in the 'Ancient Sage,' or 'Akbar's Dream'; to pathetic or tragic tales of contemporary life, as in 'Aylmer's Field,' or 'Enoch Arden'; or to sustained romantic narrative, as in the 'Idylls.' No English poet has used blank verse with such flexible variety, or drawn from it so large a compass of tones, nor has any maintained it so equably on a high level of excellence."

Tennyson said "something like this" to his son: "The English public think that blank verse is the easiest thing in the world to write, mere prose cut up into five-foot lines, whereas it is one of the most difficult. In a blank verse you can have from three up to eight beats; but, if you vary the beats unusually, your ordinary newspaper critic sets up a howl. The varying of the beats, of the construction of the feet, of the emphasis, of the extra-metrical syllables and of the pauses helps to make the greatness of blank verse. There are many other things besides, for instance, a fine ear for vowel-sounds, and the kicking of the geese out of the boat (*i.e.*, doing away with sibilations); but few educated men really understand the structure of blank verse. I never put two 's's' together in any verse of mine. My line is not, as often quoted,

And freedom broadens slowly down—

but

And freedom slowly broadens down."

As has been pointed out, the poet erred in saying this, for he has put two "s's" together more than once, but the remark is interesting as displaying his temper of mind. He considered the blank verse the only fit medium for a translation of the "Iliad." After reading Sir John Herschel's "Book I. of the Iliad Translated in the Hexameter Metre" ("Cornhill Magazine," May, 1862), he wrote

the note prefixed to his own experiment: "Some, and among these at least one of our best and greatest, have endeavored to give us the 'Iliad' in English hexameters, and by what appears to me their failures have gone far to prove the impossibility of the task. I have long held by our blank verse in this matter" *A propos*, we find him on his eighty-third birthday still harping on blank verse—this time in connection with Virgil. He quotes Milton, and remarks: "This is very like Virgil in its movements. If Virgil is to be translated it ought to be in this elaborate kind of blank verse." Among his last "talks" is this other bit of criticism: "I have been reading in the 'Spectator' that Wordsworth and Keats are great masters of blank verse, who are also great in rhyme. Keats was not a master of blank verse. It might be true of Wordsworth at his best. Blank verse can be the finest mode of expression in our language." Possibly his last utterance on the subject of metre was: "I never could care about French Alexandrines. They are so artificial. The French language lends itself much better to slighter things."

A reading of his poems, together with the valuable sidelights thrown on his estimate of the importance of a scrupulous attention to metre and rhythm, will surely justify Mr. W. E. H. Lecky in his estimate: "His ear for all the delicacies of rhythm has, I suppose, very seldom been equalled."

We have finished our study of the Mechanics of Tennysonian Poetry, as illustrated in the scattering remarks on metre found in the "Memoir." These we have tried to digest and comment upon in our own fashion. We should like to give some notice here of the inspiration of many of his finest poems as indicated in the "Memoir"; but however interesting—and it is only second in interest to the mechanics—this theme would prove, we are compelled to close, at this point, a paper already grown overbulky. We can merely suggest, in conclusion, that the value of any future edition of his works would, in our opinion, be much enhanced by annotating the poems in some such fashion as the lately-published volume of Lowell's poems has been annotated, for lovers of a poet are always interested—and not seldom enlightened—by timely hints of the poet's source of inspiration, motive of composition, literary models consciously followed, friendly suggestions adopted, the rhythmical and metrical purposes of the various poems, etc. Of such helps to poetic interpretation the "Memoir" is a well-filled storehouse.

H. T. HENRY.

WHAT MAKES A SPECIES?

THIS is a question to which many of our readers would probably be disposed to give a theological answer. But an answer of that kind is one which, for reasons, we above all things wish to avoid. It appears to us, as a result of much intercourse for many years with men of science and with persons of both sexes who really love science for its own sake, that very many of them are beset with an abiding fear of being caught hold of by theology, as by the arms of an octopus, and dragged into a sea of dogma from which they can find no escape. To them (*mirabile dictu*) it seems clear that dogmatic authoritative Christianity is a great evil, if not *the* great evil, and they deem it to be a power which can close men's eyes to the evidence of fact, and which can pervert the volition of men into devious paths, to practice superstitious ceremonies in order to obtain what they desire in another world, to the great detriment of the progress of the human race in the present one.

Therefore they become, as it were, "color blind" and "tone-deaf" by an unconscious process of averting their mental gaze from facts and deductions which seem to them necessarily to conflict with the theology they favor. Such facts and deductions, therefore, run off from their intelligence, as water from a duck's back. Nothing will induce persons so prejudiced to consider them fairly, unless they can first be convinced that the results they so greatly dread would not necessarily follow did they accept the scientific facts and admit the deductions offered to them.

Similarly no positive Christian writer, above all, no man of science who is a Catholic apologist, can hope to obtain a fair hearing. He must not hope it, because those whom he addresses not only dread and detest his creed, but can never persuade themselves that he is even honest; that he really cares for the science he teaches for its own sake; or that his one only object is not to make "Romanists," or at least "Christians," of them, willy nilly. The specious arguments of such a man, they think, are not to be listened to, or, if listened to, then listened to with a mind firmly closed against conviction, and only keenly alive to detect the sophistries and fallacies which *must* be latent in his teaching, because his teaching, if accepted, would bring them under a bondage from which their whole being recoils.

It seems to us that the only way of dealing with such people is to say: "Well, let us assume that no supernatural revelation has been made, that no Church legitimately claiming authority exists, and that no anthropomorphic deity once created and now sustains the universe." Let us, then, for argument's sake, make abstraction of all such doctrines, and take for granted that the abandonment of a mechanical explanation of nature need not carry with it, as a consequence, the Divinity of Christ, the Doctrine of the Trinity, Transubstantiation and Papal Infallibility.

Let us say further to the inquirer: "Admit, if your intelligence is convinced that such is the case, that the universe manifests a reason, latent within it, which is not the reason of man; that there is something which, for want of a better term, we may call with Oersted, 'a soul in nature.' All that does not force you to be a Christian.

"As to the nature of this 'latent reason' you are quite free to remain an 'agnostic,' for, in some respects, we all are and want to be 'agnostics' with respect to it. Adore, if you wish to, the great god Pan, or rehabilitate, if it helps you, the whole heathen Pantheon. Do not, however, shut your eyes, blunt your senses, or paralyze your reason when you look out upon nature, but study and try to apprehend its deeper, if not its deepest, lessons.

"Shake off the paralyzing fears which beset you, be honest, be earnest, and try to view nature with an unprejudiced mind. We, on our part, promise you, in turn, to be absolutely sincere and honest while advocating the truths which we believe nature teaches. We will keep back not only all roundabout attempts to influence your religious belief, but (for the time) all mental reference thereto in our own minds, studiously avoiding anything of the kind, lest we should thereby unconsciously become theological proselytizers, when our one only aim is to be sincere students of nature, willing to follow wherever natural truth leads us."

Only by such a course of conduct can we, we think, induce these mistaken but morally well-meaning persons to put aside their prejudices and consider our arguments dispassionately. Moreover, it must be admitted that some distrust on their part is not altogether unreasonable or unwarranted; for, obviously, the scientific writings and arguments of many among us are evidently undertaken for the sake of edification, and are much more directed (as is, of course, very laudable from the supernatural standpoint) to secure converts to the Church than to advance science purely for its own sake.

Thus it is we have instituted "Catholic Scientific Congresses"

which cannot but give offence as well as edification, since they imply that there is such a thing as "Catholic Science," apart from all theology.

Yet it is impossible to deny that there really is a neutral region of scientific truths which may be apprehended alike by believers and unbelievers, by Christians, pagans, agnostics and dogmatic antitheists.

In such a region lies the multiplication table, the whole of algebra and Euclid, the facts of the world's past history as revealed by geology, and of the annals of mankind as made known by the most recent advances in historical research.

No true man of science, and no true lover of science, Catholic any more than non-Catholic, can avoid a feeling of distrust with respect to the scientific teaching of anyone whose direct and main aim is not the utilization of science for its own sake, but for some ulterior purpose.

Having, then, done my best to make clear that here and now I write purely and simply as a man of science and from the scientific standpoint only, I invite the attention of readers, from whatever bench of the "Parliament of Religions," to the consideration of certain biological facts bearing upon our initial question, "What Makes a Species?"

The disciples of Mr. Darwin and that eminent naturalist, Dr. Alfred R. Wallace (who propounded the theory of "Natural Selection," in the rooms of the Linnæan Society, on the same evening¹ as his *confrere* of wider repute), do not for a moment hesitate to answer my initial question very positively.

The joint enunciation of the Darwin-Wallace theory took place nearly forty years ago, and we have lamented the loss of Charles Darwin now for fifteen years; but at the last meeting of the Linnæan Society's last summer session the survivor of the great biological twins read a highly interesting paper which clearly and unmistakably expressed his answer to the question. The maker of a species—of all species of all and every kind—is and must always be, he said, "utility" and nothing but "utility." The title of his paper was: "The Problem of Utility—Are Specific Characters Always or Generally Useful?"

One most remarkable feature of this paper was its extreme dogmatism! Dr. Wallace affirmed that, *even in the absence of all evidence* of the utility of specific characters, we MUST none the less affirm their necessary utility, and that it is only through such utility that they *could* have ever come into existence!

¹ On the 30th of June, 1858.

It was very interesting to listen to the venerable zoologist who, after the lapse of more than a generation, was thus able to return to the scene of the promulgation of his theory, amidst wonder and opposition, in order to reassert it to an audience almost entirely acquiescent. And it was a "reassertion," because a declaration that all specific characters have been produced by "utility" is simply the reassertion of his original theory. For, if any specific characters are not useful ones, either for saving life or gaining a mate, then the species constituted by such characters can never have been produced by "Natural Selection." But the author, in treating the question, took for granted, as he might naturally be expected to do, the truth of the doctrine common to him and the late Mr. Darwin. So the question was implicitly answered at once; since, if species arise by "Natural Selection," then those characters which serve to characterize any kind of animal *as* a species must be due to the same cause, *i.e.*, to utility.

Thus the question which was really raised by Dr. Wallace in asking, "Are specific characters always or generally useful?" was really but a repetition of the old one, of thirty-nine years ago, "Do species arise through 'Natural Selection'?"

To do our best to answer this question from the pure standpoint of physical science, we have the advantage of citing some novel and interesting facts, though we must not on this account lose sight of important arguments which we have before brought forward—arguments which have never been replied to or duly noticed, owing, probably, to that very prejudice to which we referred in the opening passage of this article.

That there really is such a thing as "Natural Selection" (*i.e.*, that the destructive forces of nature eliminate individuals least able to endure them), and that it acts to a certain extent, is, for us, an obvious fact, and it was evident long ago to the Greek predecessors of Aristotle. Nevertheless, there are a number of biological facts, too often and generally ignored, which demonstrate that many specific characters are due not to "Natural Selection," *i.e.*, to "Utility," but to what for us is evident, an innate tendency towards variation in a definite direction. If, however, amongst our readers are any minds prejudiced against the very idea of anything "innate," it will suffice to affirm that such specific characters are due not to the "utility" of them, but to an X power.

In that great and wonderful island, New Guinea, and in a few adjacent to it, there are to be found a number of kinds of very remarkable birds, not to be found anywhere else in the world. In

fact, the 100-fathom line round New Guinea accurately marks out the range of the birds we refer to. One curious fact is that the birds in question are near allies, zoologically speaking, of a group with which we are not accustomed to associate ideas of "beauty" any more than of melody, in spite of the fact that their throats contain apparently as perfect an apparatus of song as is to be found in that of the Nightingale or the Mocking-bird. They are, in fact, close allies of the Rooks and Crows, Jackdaws and Ravens; and yet, after those unrivalled living gems, the Humming-birds, I know none more beautiful than these transfigured Rooks and Crows, the Birds of Paradise. New species of them have been found quite lately—new forms which even exceed in the singularity of their beauty.

The Great Bird of Paradise (the species longest known) possesses a dense tuft of delicate plumes, sometimes two feet long, which come forth on each side of the body from beneath the wings. These tufts have for a very long time been made use of as an ornament for ladies' head-dresses. It is an inhabitant of the Aru Islands. A similar but smaller species is found in New Guinea, Mysol, and Salwatty.

The Red Bird of Paradise has its two middle tail-feathers charged with two stiff black riband-like structures a quarter of an inch wide. It is found nowhere but in Waigiou, a small island off the northwest end of New Guinea.

The King Bird of Paradise has an altogether differently developed plumage to that of the three foregoing birds. Its tail is short, save two feathers, while on each side of the breast are some short, broad, brightly-tipped feathers which can be spread out like a fan over either shoulder. The two middle tail-feathers are nearly six inches long and like delicate wires, save toward their ends, where they have on the inner side a most singular web in the form of a spiral disc. This species is widely distributed over New Guinea and the adjacent islands.

Quite different again is the form of the plumage of the other small bird known as the Magnificent Bird of Paradise.

Another bird, the Republican Bird of Paradise, a skin of which is in the Museum of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, has the top of its head bald and (when fresh) of a rich blue color.

One of the rarer Birds of Paradise is called "the Superb." It has over its breast a sort of shield formed of narrow and rather stiff feathers, and another much more extraordinary one, which springs from the back of the neck, the outer sides of which shield are actually larger than the wing.

Another anomaly is presented us by the Six-shafted Bird of Paradise, which has six wonderful feathers, six inches long, which spring from the sides of the head and are like delicate wires with a small oval disc at the extremity of each. It has also a great tuft of soft feathers on either side of the breast.

Yet another kind named after Dr. Wallace, who discovered it in the island of Batchian, has a quite unique structure in the form of a pair of long narrow white feathers which spring from the bend of each wing—a structure unlike any other known to us in the whole class of birds. The Twelve-wired Bird of Paradise is so called because on either side of the body it has six feathers, each like a slender black wire, bent almost at right angles about its middle and ending in a point without any web—a most extraordinary and fantastic ornament amongst those of this singularly polymorphic group of birds.

Lastly it will suffice for the present purpose to refer to the Long-tailed Bird of Paradise which by the structure of its tail, even more by its upstanding lateral plumes, exhibits a special structure of its own.

In this remarkable group of birds we find their exceptional abnormalities of plumage so different in different species that they could never have sprung from a common origin—from one parent abnormality—but they must have arisen independently in different modes in different species. Evidently in the whole of the individual organisms which together compose the group of Birds of Paradise there must have been an innate, latent tendency to develop a special abundance of plumage, different in both form and locality in different species.

Dr. Wallace said: "Accessory plumes and other ornaments originate at points of great nervous and muscular excitation." But the points of origin of abnormalities of plumage in these birds are so numerous and diverse that such local excitations seem a very inadequate cause to account for them. Yet even if they were adequate, what would account for such varied localities of excitation in this particular group of birds alone?

But Dr. Wallace affirmed that such characters were utilized "for purposes of recognition, . . . each ornament being really a 'recognition mark,' and therefore essential to both the first production and subsequent well-being of every species."

Let us suppose that a certain group of birds (A) have begun to vary in such a way that the males have acquired incipient secondary sexual markings or growths in their plumage, and that another group of birds (B) have begun to vary so that new tints, or

plumage growths, appear equally in both sexes. The change must be small at first, and, indeed, Dr. Wallace said "the transition" is an "almost imperceptible process." But that influence can, at the same time, induce the males of the group (A) to seek for females, freshly modified but different from themselves, and the males of the group (B) to seek for females freshly modified but like themselves.

And why should individuals with only incipient modifications object to mate with individuals of the hardly different parent stock? Yet if they did not so object in a majority of cases the new variety would soon disappear. Dr. Wallace declared that such marks must have been specially needed during the earlier stages of differentiation. Yet at such "earlier stages" the much-needed (according to Dr. Wallace) "recognition marks" must have been at their minimum. An innate spontaneous impulse of this kind—an impulse on the part of individuals *incipiently* varying to breed together *exclusively*, is surely a very mysterious impulse. The causation of such a mysterious *quasi* voluntary mode of action must be a *sine qua non* for the origin of species. But the origin of this impulse is as mysterious as the origin of species itself! To explain a mystery by another mystery not less mysterious than the first is a proceeding as unscientific as it is unsatisfactory.

Dr. Wallace stoutly maintains that the action of no other agency than "Natural Selection" is credible, because it is imaginable that specific characters which are now useless may have once been useful in unknown ways to unknown ancestors of existing species.

It is difficult to tackle such an assumption, and yet we are sure it can be tackled, and successfully tackled, could we only obtain an unprejudiced hearing for facts we have to bring forward and will bring forward very shortly.

Dr. Wallace, in his paper here referred to, affirmed that "no other agency" than "Natural Selection" has been brought distinctly forward and shown to be a probable cause of specific characters—and therefore of species. Possibly not. But if an asserted cause (X) has been shown to be incapable of producing a certain effect, it is no use to say: "It must be (X) because you have not brought forward any definite (not X) as efficient to produce that effect." Surely it amply suffices to reply: "The cause you assert is insufficient; we must therefore still remain in an attitude of doubt and expectancy with respect to the phenomena in question."

There is, however, another group of birds besides the Birds of

Paradise to which attention has recently been called.¹ This is a considerable group of small-sized Fruit-Pigeons, which range from the Malay Peninsula, through the Malay Archipelago, to Australia and Polynesia. The group is so large that it is subdivided, and one of these (named *Ptilopus*, in the most restricted sense of that term, which in a wide sense is also applied to the whole group) contains twenty-two species, of which no less than thirteen are found isolated from other species each on its own island or small groups of islands.

Thus the species *P. pelewensis* is found only in the Pelew Islands. *P. roseicapillus* is confined to the Ladrões. *P. ponapensis* and *P. herusheimi* are both found in the Caroline Islands, and yet only in different ones; the former only in Rock Island and the latter in Kushai. *P. purpuratus* and *P. chrysogaites* both belong to the Society Islands, but to different ones; while other species belong respectively to the Solomon Islands, New Caledonia, the New Hebrides, the Marquesas, and so on.

Now, as Captain Hutton says (p. 333), it is highly improbable that all these thirteen species were first developed on other islands where now they are not to be found. It is no less improbable that other species of this section of the Fruit-Pigeons formerly lived on each of these thirteen islands, and have become extinct on all of them. If it had been a single case only, we might have had some doubt; but when it comes to having to apply the same explanation to more than half of the whole number of species, the process surely becomes absurd. Consequently, it appears almost certain that most of these species were developed each on its own island; and, this being allowed, we have the problem of the origin of their specific characters reduced to its simplest form.

If these species originated in the islands in which they are found, the colors which distinguish them cannot be recognition marks, because there is no other species in each island with which they could be confounded. The colors cannot be due to correlation, because they are the only characters which have changed. They cannot have been useful to ancestors, because they have only lately been developed. And we cannot suppose that they give any special advantage in each island, because all the islands have, for practical purposes, the same flora and fauna. This exhausts the resources of the principle of utility, and we are driven to the conclusion that these specific characters have a non-utilitarian origin; and yet they are found "in every individual constituting the

¹ By Captain F. W. Hutton, F.R.S. See the *Journal of the Linnean Society* (Zoology), vol. xxvi., No. 168 (November I, 1897), p. 330.

species, neither more nor less." In these opinions we are entirely at one with Captain Hutton; and we further agree with him in affirming that whether we can discover the cause of these developments or not, there is an overwhelming probability in favor of the statement that these truly specific characters have had a non-utilitarian origin.

But the colors and markings which constitute the specific characters of these Fruit-Pigeons have not had a utilitarian origin; surely it is quite probable that the specific characters of many, most or all other species have not had a utilitarian origin either!

It therefore follows, as an absolute certainty, that recognition marks and specific characters are not necessarily developed through utility; therefore, that utility does not make a species, or, in other words, that the origin of species is not and cannot be due to "Natural Selection," however much the destructive agencies of nature may facilitate or hasten that origin.

There is yet a third group of birds to which I will here refer, and to which I would specially invite the reader's attention, because it is a group of beautiful species of which I myself have made a very special study.¹

The group in question is made up of the Parrots which compose the family *Loriidæ* (seventy-five species), which have mostly brilliant plumage, and which vary in size from about that of a Turtle Dove down to about that of a Sparrow. They form rather less than one-sixth of the whole order of Parrots. They are very choice feeders, living on the nectar and pollen of flowers, and very largely on the blossoms of *Eucalypti* and coral trees.

When such trees are in flower, Lorics may be seen in large flocks clinging to the smaller branches in every attitude possible to them, and when they have exhausted the supply to be obtained at one spot they will fly off rapidly with shrill screams to other trees as yet unrifled of their nectar. So intent are they, while feeding, on their occupation that they may then be closely approached, and even the firing of a gun from beneath, though fatal to individuals, has been known not to disturb their uninjured neighbors.

Their plumage is almost always a mixture of green, purple (or

¹ See my work, *A Monograph of the Lorics or Brush-tongued Parrots Composing the Family Loriidæ*, London, R. H. Porter, 7 Princes Street, Cavendish Square, W., 1896. With LXI. plates, drawn and colored from nature, representing 22 typical specimens, and 16 species, represented for the first time, an anatomical introduction with 19 figures, and 4 plates of geographical distribution.

blue) and red, often of all three, while yellow is frequently also present. Sometimes the whole body is green of one or more shades, while the plumage may be all red, or, in two instances only, blue and white. The tail is generally short, and may be nearly square, but in rare instances the two middle tail-feathers may be very prolonged.

The tongue is very remarkable, the papillæ on its upper surface laterally and towards the apex being much elongated and bent more or less backwards, so as to form a kind of brush, which must be useful in extracting the nectar and pollen of flowers. Such is the structure of the tongue in all these species the tongue of which has been examined.

It is the geographical distribution of certain species, however, which is of special interest to us. The Lories do not extend beyond 10° N. and 45° S. latitude or west of 115° E. longitude or east of 145° W. longitude (English reckoning). Their extreme northern habitats consist of the Caroline, Washington and Fanning Islands; their furthest extension south is to Tasmania; their most western dwelling-place is the island of Sumbawa; while their extreme limit eastward is formed by the Marquesas Islands.

New Guinea, with the islands of Geelvink Bay, is the region richest in Lories, having no less than thirty-one species.

Of a small section of the group—the Black-billed Lories (*Chalcospittacus*)—one species, almost entirely black, is found in New Guinea, but a closely-allied form, known as Berstem's Lory, which (so far as yet known) is confined to the island of Mysol, has there acquired a red edge to its otherwise black forehead. The utility of this specific character may indeed be deemed problematical. Certainly it can be no recognition mark, since the general blackness of the body alone constitutes a complete and ample distinction from the three other Lories which alone inhabit Mysol. Another species, however—the "Red-quilled Lory"—which has so far only been found in the small island Amberpon, has the under surface of the wings and tail with bright red or red and yellow tints. This is the more remarkable because we have up to this time no evidence that any other Lory is an inhabitant of Amberpon Island.

The islands in Geelvink Bay seem to be the only home of the Black-winged Lory, a very distinctly-marked species with its black shoulders and bright blue spot at the side of the head. Similarly the Blue-streaked Lory hails from the Tenunber Islands and Timor Laut, while in the former no other Lory is to be found save the one (termed "plain"), the simple green plumage of which

renders the elaborate markings of the Blue-streaked Lory quite needless as recognition signs.

Very much more striking, however, is the fact that the very exceptional species, named "the Cherry-red Lory," is confined to the small island Puyuepet, one of the Caroline Islands. Its remarkable coloration cannot be needed to enable the sexes to recognize each other, for no other species of Lory exists (so far as yet known) in this group of islands.

Similarly the two species of Notched-winged Lories each dwells in a habitat which no other kind of Lory shares. One of these, the "Fringilline Lory," is found in Samoa and the Friendly Islands, and the other, "Kuhl's Lory," as exclusively in the Washington and Fanning Islands.

Most remarkable of all, however, is the extremely exceptional distribution of the most exceptionally colored of all Lories, namely, the "Blue Lories."

The first of these, of a beautiful azure tint, which was known and described by Buffon in 1779, is called the "Tahiti Lory." As its name implies, it is found in the Society Islands, and is the only Lory there found. The other species, the "Ultramarine Lory," is the only one inhabiting the Marquesas Islands, which is also the only portion of the globe where it is to be found.

The blue coloration of both, the white throat of the Tahiti Lory and the white spots of the other, cannot be "recognition marks." Neither is it conceivable that the surrounding conditions of environment in either the Society or Marquesas can have educed the blue color of these species, or that those of the Caroline Islands can have elicited the uniform tint of the cherry-red Lory.

As Captain Hutton well observes in the paper hereinbefore referred to, recognition marks can be useful only among those animals which are capable of recognizing them by their senses. But in some blind animals color constitutes a specific character, as in bivalve shell-fish (*Lamellibranchus*). Even with animals possessing eyes there are some specific characters which cannot be regarded as recognition marks, for they cannot be seen, as the teeth of the so-called "tongue" of snail-like creatures (*Gasteropods*). The venation, *i.e.*, the arrangement of the so-called "veins," of the wings of Butterflies and Moths is hidden by the scales which clothe them, and yet it often furnishes good generic and sometimes specific characters; occasionally even the venation differs in the two sexes. Some crabs are always covered with sea-weeds, and the species cannot be ascertained till these sea-weeds have been removed.

Many species of orthopterous insects (such as cockroaches, grasshoppers and locusts) differ from each other in the number or position of the spines on the legs, and no one will suppose that the male of one of these insects stops to count the number of spines on the legs of a female before making love to her, or that the female does so as to his spines before accepting him.

Can we suppose that the colors which distinguish the shells of the different species of *Tellina*, which live in sand, have been developed by "utility"? Can we suppose that a spine more or less, or a different arrangement of the tubercles, on the carapace of a crab has been so formed either? Can it matter in the struggle for life whether a vein in the wing of an insect branches once or twice; or can slight differences in the number or position of the spines on the legs give an individual insect an advantage over another? Can we, again, suppose that the slight differences in the number and shape of the teeth of snail-like animals, or whether they have ten or twenty ribs to the tenth of an inch on their shells, are important for life? Yet they are often good and constant specific characters. Let us consider the shape of the spicules of sponges, or the skeletons of Rudiolarians, or the small differences in the leaves of ferns and mosses, or the various ornamentations on the frontales of Diatoms. Can all or any of these characters—which are certainly as stable as specific characters which are acknowledged to be useful—can any of them be explained by the principle of utility? If such is the case, which, among two or more species living together, is best adapted to the conditions, and which the worst? And why has not the worst died out? Take, for example, the different colors and shapes of the shells of Mussels (*Mytilus*), two or more species of which often live together under exactly the same conditions; if one color or shape is more advantageous than the others, why are the others there? We cannot plead want of time, for many of these species date back to the Pliocene period. Suggestions that it might be this or might be that are not worth consideration when we find that effects which, according to them, ought to have been produced have not been produced, and when species are equally abundant which have and which have not some character thus hypothetically deemed useful.

As examples of the gratuitous hypotheses which men like Dr. Wallace are ever ready to suggest, we may take the following. On its being suggested that a rabbit's white tail, instead of a useful appendage, must be a dangerous one as attracting the eyes of an enemy, he replied, "It has been created by utility because, in

cases of danger, it serves to guide the young to their dam and therefore to their burrow." The spots over dogs' eyes are also, according to him, due to utility, because, he tells us, they delude onlookers into the belief that a dog is awake when, in fact, he is fast asleep.

But the fact seems to us to be simply undeniable that different groups of creatures have different innate tendencies to develop in certain definite directions, as we have seen reason to believe that the groups of Birds of Paradise have a tendency to develop redundant plumage now in one region of the body and now in another region.

In the great group of Marsupial or pouched animals, whereof the Virginian Opossum may be taken as a type, we find a series of species in which a certain portion of the bodily frame becomes more and more diminished. These species constitute a section of the Marsupials which inhabit Australia. One of them has a squat body, somewhat like that of a Marmot, and is a burrowing animal. Each hind foot has five toes, whereof the second and third are very slightly shorter than the others and somewhat further bound together by the skin. But this minute difference cannot be supposed to be of very vital importance to the Wombat. In another group of Australian Marsupials, however, the Phalangiers, this difference is a little more marked, and when we examine the structure of the foot in a third group, that of the Bandicoots, it becomes much more so. In the Kangaroos we find this character present in an extremely marked degree. Each hind foot has two large and conspicuous toes of unequal size, the inner one being very large, with a very big and sharp claw. On the inner side of this large toe is what at first sight appears to be a very minute one, furnished with two claws placed side by side. An examination of the bones of the foot, however, shows that this apparently two-clawed toe really consists of two very slender toes bound together in a common fold of skin, and these answer to those two toes which are very slightly shorter than the others in the Wombat.

Thus we have here a characteristic and progressive determination of a part which must have been due to an innate tendency, since its incipient stage, as we find it in the Wombat, could not have been developed through utility and the struggle for life.

There is another interesting group of animals which exhibit an analogous condition with regard to the hand, a condition which culminates in a structure which no one has, or can pretend, to have been due to either natural or sexual selection.



There is a group (*genus*) of animals which inhabit Madagascar which are known as "Lemurs." They are creatures mostly about the size of a cat, with sharp-pointed muzzles and long tails, which, like their bodies, are well clothed with hair. Their legs are not much longer than their arms, while each extremity is modified to serve as a hand, the great toe as well as the thumb being opposite to the other digits. Their hands and feet are thus like those of monkeys, with which they were long associated in zoological classification, though in reality they seem to have no special affinity whatever with the monkey tribe. There are a number of groups (*genera*) of animals which more or less closely resemble these Madagascar Lemurs, and they have, therefore, become known as Lemur-like¹ animals. Some of the genera thus allied to the genus *Lemur* are also found in Madagascar, but a few exist in Africa, and also in Southeastern Asia.

Among the Lemur-like animals there are four genera which we may distinguish from the others as slow-lemuroids, because they are rather sluggish animals and singularly deliberate in their movements. They are all about the size of a squirrel or a little larger, their limbs are of equal length, and their tail is, at most, but a short one. None of them are found in Madagascar, but two are Asiatic and two African. Of the two inhabiting Asia (in the India region) one is known as the Slender Loris, for it is exceedingly slender in build, and has not even a rudiment of a tail. It inhabits Southern India and Ceylon, and is regarded by the natives as a remedy for ophthalmia, on which account it is sold in the bazaars of Madras. The second Indian kind is a stouter animal, and is found in Cochin China, Sumatra and Borneo.

Of the two African kinds one is known as the Angwautibo, and inhabits Old Calabar, and was first described in 1863. The other African kind was discovered by the traveller Bosman during his voyage to Guinea, and was first made known in 1705. After that, it was not again seen by a European for twenty years, nor was it ever fully described till 1830.

Now the special point to which we desire to direct the reader's attention is the structure of the joints, or index finger of the hand.

In the true Lemurs of Madagascar that finger is already slightly shorter than the others, and this is a common feature in Lemur-like animals. When, however, we come to the Slow-lemurs this

¹ The author of the present paper was the first to propose this arrangement in a paper read before the Zoological Society of London on November 22, 1864, pp. 635-637.

shrinking of the index becomes progressively more marked, until, in the Angwautibo, the first finger is reduced to a mere rudiment. In the Potto, however, the reduction is most complete, for it has no index finger at all.

This peculiarity of the Potto appears to us to afford nothing less than an absolute demonstration that it is not "utility" which "makes species." For who can believe that the circumstance of not having an index finger ever saved the life of a single Potto? As to sexual selection, who again can believe that even one male Potto ever gained a mate through such a defect? Is it credible that when a male Potto makes an offer of his hand to the female of his choice, she habitually looks carefully to see if her suitor has a rudiment of an index finger, and would certainly reject him with scorn and disgust, could he not proffer a hand entirely devoid of a feature so offensive to her susceptibilities?

But what other reason can possibly be assigned by the school of Dr. Wallace as a cause for this progressive atrophy of the index amongst Lemuroids, and for the special distinguishing character of the species Potto?

"Oh!" some will reply, "It is not due to natural or sexual selection directly, but only indirectly; it is a character correlated with some other character which *is* due to one or other of these kinds of selection."

But certainly no one can even pretend to be aware of any useful character thus varying concomitantly with the development of the index finger. As for any unknown character, anatomical or physiological, it would surely be nothing less than monstrous to assume that some unascertained anatomical condition of the liver or kidney, or some diminished or increased function, *e.g.*, of secretion—was the real cause of such a specific character, where-with the size of the first finger was correlated in some quite unknown and quite unimaginable manner.

A survey of the organic world cannot be a complete or scientific one, if the characteristics of the highest of animals (man) be left out of the account, nor can man be said to be treated scientifically if his highest characteristics, his mental endowments, are not taken into consideration as well as his mere animal faculties and organization.

Now as to the latter, man's body shows a curious analogy (when taken into consideration together with the structure of apes) with the Potto as becoming the vanishing points of a progressively decreasing structure. In many mammals there is a well-developed penial bone, and such a structure is well developed

in the ordinary Apes. When we come to the man-like or Anthropoid Apes, we find it becomes smaller and smaller, till it was, for a time, believed to be entirely absent in the Chimpanzee. It exists, however, at least in a rudimentary condition, in all the Anthropoids. Yet in man it has, at least normally, entirely disappeared, and yet it is impossible to suppose that its progressive disappearance has been progressively useful as regards any form of "Natural Selection." This absence is, as in the case of the Potto, merely the culmination of a tendency latent in the group which comprises men and apes—in the order Primates.

But it is not the body but the mind of man which constitutes his essentially distinctive character. We have so frequently and fully urged the impossibility of his highest mental faculties having been formed by "Natural Selection" that we forbear to repeat our arguments here, which is the less necessary as they have been never answered, still less refuted.

But we desire in this connection to call attention to one very curious fact. *Mirabile dictu*, Dr. Wallace himself holds that these most important characters of the human species are the results of "Natural Selection," but are due to the intervention of some conscious intelligence or intelligencies (for Dr. Wallace remains a Spiritualist) who, according to him, have acted on man much as the celebrated Sir John Sibright acted on the development of pigeons.

Therefore against Dr. Wallace we have a triumphant *argumentum ad hominem*. But as I have not here entered upon the distinctiveness of the human intellect, I am content to rest my opposition to the doctrine that "utility makes species" on the various facts I have brought forward about birds and beasts, and especially on the specific characters of that small beast, the Potto. Other instances, not here set down, could also be brought forward, but logically one suffices: "*Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus.*"

In one instance (our own) we see that Dr. Wallace gives up the matter. But therein he really concedes the whole question, for if one species is the outcome of such intelligence, why not all? And surely nature abounds, on every side, with phenomena which "Natural Selection" is impotent to account for. The colors and markings of flowers have been attributed to insect agency, yet no such agency will serve to account for the markings on foliage-leaves.

But, however, flower streaks can never be so accounted for. It suffices to contemplate the delicate divergent streaks on the lowest petal of some pansies—so beautifully symmetrical in their

dichotomous divisions—to be sure that the cause thus assigned is ludicrously inadequate. It is as inadequate as such a cause can be for the minute markings on shells and the pustules of Diatoms.

Moreover, can anything be more unreasonable than to judge as to the cause that has produced the various species which constitute the *organic* world without taking account of the various mineral species belonging to the inorganic world? This is the more remarkable since, but for the powers and processes of inorganic substances, no living creature could ever have existed! But what has “Natural Selection” had to do with the symmetry, no less definite than multiform, of crystals? Did “sexual selection” or any kind of “utility” produce the glorious tints (rivaling those of the breasts and heads of humming-birds) which mineralogical galleries have to show? Yet the mystery of these phenomena is essentially the same as those to be found amongst animals and plants. If the former are due to an agency which is unknown and unimaginable, why may not that agency also be the cause of such of the latter as “Natural Selection” has been called in to explain?

But here some of those we are addressing will feel themselves unable to accord an impartial consideration to the arguments here advanced, because they fear that our arguments imply a theological explanation as to “what makes a species.” But if they will with candor examine our words they will see that they accord with any explanation which may commend itself to their minds so long as it is not a mechanical one. If they are really pagans and will have nothing but Pan, or if they can accept nothing more than “a soul in nature,” we have nothing here to say on such a subject. All we say, and say most earnestly, is: “Consider and weigh the *facts*. Do not allow, as many do, your intellect to be fettered by your imagination. Do not, because, if the all-sufficiency of mechanism be denied, anthropomorphic images arise in your mind which your intellect tells you are absurd, do not on that account shrink from decrying the sufficiency of mechanism. Such images are not at all necessarily connected with the intellectual perception of the inadequacy of a mechanical idea of nature. Indeed, with the perceptions and conceptions here advocated, such mental images have really as little to do as have the signs of the zodiac with the origin of the solar system. In studying science be really scientific, and do not allow yourselves to disregard facts, being blinded to their reality by a sort of “anti-theological ophthalmia!”

ST. GEORGE MIVART.

THE RELATIONS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH WITH THE INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA.

FROM the advent of Europeans in North America, and during the formation and extension of their original colonies, their progress was opposed during two centuries or more by the Indian owners of the soil.

The American Indian nations comprised some whose people were not without intelligence ; while in the territory between the Atlantic Ocean and the head waters of Lake Superior there were confederacies of nations of somewhat remote origin, having well devised systems of government and unwritten laws suitable for a nomadic people living in tribal organizations and having no written language.

The Catholic Church sought to convert the indigenous races from Paganism to Christianity as a preliminary work in colonization.

In the American history of the sixteenth century, that portion of the present domain of the United States extending from Florida westward, along the coast of the Gulf of Mexico, and thence to California and the Pacific coast, is made interesting by the narratives of the respective missions undertaken by the Dominican, the Franciscan and the Jesuit orders, for the evangelization of the wild Indian tribes inhabiting the coast regions and the inland plains of this extensive territory. The locals of these missions are well known, while their record is crimsoned with the blood of many martyred priests.

That this blood was not shed in vain, that the seed of Christianity sown in the soil which it sanctified took deep root, is evidenced by the fact that after three centuries the descendants of the original Indian races are still numerous, and they are solidly Catholic.

A majority of the indigenous race in Arizona, in Lower California and in Nevada are Catholic ; while nearly all the inhabitants of New Mexico, whether of Indian or of mixed blood, have clung to the faith to which they were won by Catholic missionaries under Spanish auspices during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹

¹ For the present status of the Catholic religion in the States named and in New Mexico see "Eleventh Census of U. S.," Plate 11, page 41.

But, has this period in the history of North America been treated by the generality of American historians in that impartial manner which would give prominence to the humanitarian work of the Catholic Church?

Her missionaries succeeded in this beneficent work in the southern extremity of the North American Continent, including Mexico and Central America, during the same period. The indigenous races were, to a great extent, converted to Christianity; they were not obliterated, as they have been elsewhere by the Europeans. It is stated that the descendants of these Indian converts in this part of North America, now living within the fold of the Catholic Church, number several million souls.

With many intelligent people American history begins with the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers on "Plymouth Rock." But from this standpoint the genesis of North American civilization is left in the background.

When the Pilgrims landed on "Plymouth Rock" the New England territory was governed by the Sachems of the Pequots, of the Narragansetts, of the Wampanoags, of the Massachusetts, and of the Pawtucket nations, who, by right of conquest, had acquired control over the thirty-two nations inhabiting the soil, whom they had governed for a century or more.

These five sachems were at first inclined to tolerate the presence of the white intruders, for such they were, upon their respective domains; but the aggressive and murderous proceedings of the latter aroused hostility and provoked retribution according to the Indian cult, with fatal consequences to the aggressors. Then ensued the successive Indian wars. The worst instincts of the American savage in the pursuit of revenge having been aroused, the war-club, the tomahawk, the scalping-knife, and the torch in the midnight raid were prolific of barbarous atrocities.

A malignant hatred of the red man became the second nature of the Puritan; the heathen savage, as he was considered, whether friend or foe, fell victim to his wrath.

During intervals of peace John Eliot and his associates sought to convert the Massachusetts Indians to Christianity.

He met with some success, and gathered a little colony of his converts in the vicinity of Boston; but his beneficent work was distasteful to the majority of the Puritans, and neutralized by the fierce hatred of this people for the Indian race.

Many of the converts had been induced to abandon their homes in the forest and to live in community at Natic, where they cultivated the soil, but their situation at times became so hazardous that the colony was eventually broken up.

A war of extermination finally ensued, during which the sachems, one after another, after a valorous resistance, were overcome. The unfortunate people of the tribes did not expatriate themselves; but chiefs, warriors, old men, women and children sought a last refuge in the unexplored forest, where many were either hunted down and killed or met death by starvation. Fragments only of the tribes remained near the settlements after the power of their sachems had been broken.

All the efforts of John Eliot and of his successors to save the New England Indians did not prevent their extinction.

New England's civilization may be charged with the crime of wiping out of existence the people of thirty-two distinct Indian nations, who were inhabitants of its soil when the Pilgrims landed on "Plymouth Rock."¹

The work of destruction was so complete that it is declared by competent authority that not a full-blood New England Indian exists at the present day; nor are there any half-bloods.

The numerous Indian names of cities and towns remind of the sway of sachems and chiefs who in a former century were rulers of all the territory comprising the present New England States.

This, however, if intended as a tribute to valor and true patriotism, is but just; for the sachems and chiefs whose memory is thus commemorated fought heroically, and offered their life's blood in defence of their fatherland.

But before John Eliot had preached to the Massachusetts Indians near Boston, in 1646, Catholic missionaries from France had evangelized the Abnakis in Maine, the Micmacs in New Brunswick and in Nova Scotia, and the Montagnais in Canada.

This was two hundred and fifty years or more ago. While the New England Indians have long since disappeared from the face of the earth, there are four thousand or more Micmacs who are descendants of the original converts living at the present day in the British Provinces named above, in comfortable homes and in thrifty circumstances, who are solidly Catholic, having churches and schools, and whose members are gradually increasing; while there are in the aggregate half this number of Abnakis and Montagnais, whose ancestors were converted at the same early period, living under equally favorable conditions in Canada, who are steadfast and practical Catholics.² It may be claimed that this is a bright chapter in the history of civilization in North America.

¹ See "Indian Bibliographies," *AM. CATH. QUAR. REVIEW*, vol. xx., page 238.

² Report of the Department of Indian Affairs, Dominion of Canada, 1893.

Anterior to the New England missions of John Eliot was the conversion, principally by French Jesuits, of the Indian tribes of Huronia, whose domain extended from the shores of the Georgian Bay inland to its national boundary.

The Hurons were of Iroquoian stock; their language and tribal laws were somewhat similar to those of the people of the Confederacy of the Five Nations, and they were among the *élite* of the North American Indians.

Huronia finally became a Christian country; but while in the enjoyment of her halcyon repose her cantons were invaded by an Iroquoian army, composed principally of Mohawks and Senecas, who overcame her valiant defenders, captured her forts, burnt and desecrated her chapels, and applied the torch to the homes of her people. Many were killed on both sides, for the fighting was desperate.¹

The destruction of Huron autonomy was completed by the dispersion of the tribes, whose people sought a refuge on the adjacent shores of the bays and islands.

In all its details the destruction of Christian Huronia forms one of the most lurid chapters of internecine American-Indian war. It is, moreover, a sad chapter in the history of American civilization.²

The cause of the invasion and destruction of Huronia was the undying hatred of the invaders towards the Hurons, which had existed since the expulsion of the tribes of the Five Nations from the Island of Hochelaga by the Hurons in the fifteenth century, and the hegira of the tribes of the former from their homes on the St. Lawrence, when they built their cantons in the "Country of the Lakes" of New York.

The destruction of Huronia, however, had a providential sequel. Many of the unfortunate Hurons were led captives to the Iroquoian cantons in New York, but more specially to those of the Mohawks and of the Senecas.

The flower of the Iroquoian warriors had been decimated by the casualties of the wars which had existed, and which were continuous. Mothers mourned for husbands and sons who had gone on the war-path and who had never returned to their homes. The widows claimed the unfortunate Huron captives, as was their right; they took them to their cabins, healed their wounds, and clothed and fed them. As these unfortunates spoke the Iroquoian language, social intercourse was easily established. The

¹ Fathers Brebaeuf and Daniel would not desert their neophytes and were burned at the stake.

² See Bressani, *Brève Relations*, etc.

exiles became husbands and fathers, while the new blood introduced in this manner into the Iroquoian families proved to be of great advantage to the standard of the race.

The system of tribal composition and of national law of the Iroquoian Confederacy was probably the most unique ever devised for human government; it had at the time existed unchanged during two centuries. By its provisions aliens were admitted into the tribes, who, when formally naturalized, were vested with tribal and civil rights. Under this system Huron Christians became adopted members of Iroquoian tribes. Most of the exiles had remained Christians; those domiciled in Mohawk families, being the most numerous, were the first to feel the need of pastoral advice and sacramental fortification. They demanded that a missionary from Canada be brought to the Mohawk cantons. This demand was continued until the Mohawk sachems, ceding to their prayer, sent a delegation to Quebec to solicit a missionary. In the meantime the Jesuit Father, Isaac Jogues, had been a captive in the Mohawk cantons, but he had escaped to Albany. The Dutch Governor humanely assisted him to reach New York, whence he was kindly provided with passage to Europe, and he eventually returned to his brethren in Canada. He was at Quebec when the Mohawk delegation arrived. The Governor-General declined to grant the request of the Mohawk sachems, but he referred their delegates to the Father Superior of the Jesuits at Quebec, who decided to send Father Jogues with a lay brother, René Goupil, to the Mohawk cantons. After the delegation had returned and reported the successful termination of their mission, the Huron Christians awaited with joy the arrival of the expected priest; but in the meantime the Mohawk council had declared war against the French, and while Father Jogues and his companion were on their way they were captured by a war party, brought to the Mohawk castle, tortured and put to death. This is a brief outline of the inception of Christianity into the cantons of the Iroquoian League of the "Country of the Lakes" of New York. It was first introduced by Huron Christian captives, who, when they became naturalized Iroquoians, demanded a priest, with the unfortunate results outlined.

The first French mission to the Iroquoians, of which Father Jogues was the apostle who, with his companion, suffered martyrdom, is known in religious annals as the "Mission of the Martyrs." But the Huron Christians, although saddened by their disappointment, did not despair. They renewed their request for a missionary repeatedly, until the sachems of the Mohawk nation finally

yielded. The Iroquoian League, as well as its five nations, had no war on hand. Peace prevailed.

The next delegation sent to Quebec to solicit a missionary succeeded so well that in a few months two priests of the Jesuit order arrived at the chief canton of the Mohawk nation. It was soon after developed that at the time there were more than a thousand naturalized Christians in the Iroquoian cantons from the Mohawk to the shores of Lake Erie. From these and other respective centres came the demands of the expatriated Christians to their sachems for Catholic missionaries. National pride was excited to secure in other nations what had been accorded the Mohawk nation.

Delegations followed in their turn to Quebec, until Catholic missions were finally established in each of the five nations of the Iroquoian League in the "Country of the Lakes" of New York.

The Iroquoian missionaries comprised some of the most distinguished scholars, members of the Society of Jesus, in North America. The missions they established were continuous until 1686, when the astute English Governor Dongan, of New York, who in 1684 had formed an alliance on the part of England with the Iroquoian League, stirred up hostility among the Pagan elements, and with a liberal supply of rum excited through his emissaries acts of violence against the priests and their converts.

The situation was peculiar. The opposition worked up against the missionaries was not in reality grounded on dislike of the Catholic faith, for Governor Dongan was a Catholic; but as an English governor he deemed it impolitic to have the *élite* of the Iroquoian people held under the spiritual direction of twenty or more brilliant French priests in that part of the country lying between the English and the French borders. It was in the political interest of England to control, by means of the treaty of alliance, the rulers of the Confederacy, which control could not be complete while the French missions existed. But the situation in other respects had become alarming to English prestige.

Several of the Iroquoian sachems and some distinguished chiefs had become converts, and were leading Christian lives. Chapels and schools had been erected in most of the cantons between the Mohawk Valley and Lake Erie, while in the chief cantons of the respective nations religious services were held as regularly as in Catholic communities. Sodalties of the Blessed Virgin for men and for women had been established, and the interesting spectacle might be witnessed of the warrior and the squaw on their knees, reciting the devotional prayers with the rosary beads. The

most distinguished of the converts was probably Ga-ra-con-tié, hereditary head sachem and virtually chief civil ruler of the Iroquoian Confederacy. He had asked for baptism, and the ceremony was performed in the Cathedral of Quebec by Bishop Laval with great solemnity and *éclat*, the Governor-General of New France acting as sponsor.

This missionary work had been accomplished during a period of thirty years, but not without violent opposition by the Pagan element, instigated by the sorcerers and medicine-men, which at times endangered the lives of the missionaries, and they were temporarily recalled. War was also the cause of frequent interruptions of missionary work.

In the early days of the Iroquoian missions Christian converts were so cruelly persecuted that a colony was formed at La Prairie, near Montreal, of Christian exiles; to this retreat, all through the missionary period, came many distinguished converts, who, on account of Pagan opposition in their respective communities, could not practise their religion in peace.

Some of the missionaries spent many years in the Iroquoian cantons—Father James Fremin about ten years; Fathers Julian Garnier, Stephen de Carheil and Peter Milet¹ fifteen years, in one or more localities, between the Mohawk and the Seneca nation. The most remarkable, perhaps, was the continuous residence during sixteen years of Father John de Lamberville at Onondaga, the capital of the Iroquoian Confederacy and the residence of the hereditary sachems who were the custodians of the archives of the Confederacy. There can be no question about the warm friendship which had existed between Father de Lamberville and the sachems at Onondaga, and it would seem reasonable that his counsel had been sought on many occasions by the sagacious and conservative rulers of this remarkable Indian Confederacy.²

Such was the Christian fabric which had been reared in the Iroquoian cantons by distinguished scholars and devoted priests. Sobriety had become the chief feature in Christian life; immorality was frowned down; women had been accorded respect, and were

¹ Father Milet, who had lived so long in the Oneida canton, was subsequently captured and brought back to Oneida; he was about to be put to death, with the other French captives, when he was claimed by a venerable Oneida Christian woman, widow of a sachem. For ten years he lived in her cabin, for escape was impossible. He administered the last rites to French captives, and drew up their wills, which are still on file in Canada; he was highly esteemed by the Oneidas, over whom he exercised great influence. His career was very romantic.

² For an account of the circumstances attending the exit of the venerable Father de Lamberville from Onondaga, see Charlevoix.

no longer the slaves of debauched and brutal masters. The Iroquoian people lived in comfortable homes and were comfortably clad.

The ingenious system of tribal laws caused no conflict with religious authority; crimes were rare indeed, while the innate principles of charity, honesty and hospitality inherent in the Iroquoians' nature were brightened by Christian influence.¹

Every indication pointed to the ultimate conversion to Christianity of the people of the tribes of the Iroquoian Confederacy.

The League would have become a neutral Christian power, for the sachems were too wise to have made it otherwise.

All considerations of humanity for the welfare of the people of the Iroquoian Confederacy were ignored by Governor Dongan when he deliberately overturned the edifice of Christianity which had been reared at the cost of so many years of missionary labor.

It was a cold-blooded outrage, perpetrated to advance the political interests of England in America.

The progress of the civilization of the people of this great Indian Confederacy was indefinitely retarded, as its subsequent history proves.

But the Catholic faith among the Iroquoian people had taken deep root.

It was not destroyed by the wreck of the religious fabric which had been reared in the Iroquoian cantons during the seventeenth century. There are at the present day in Canada and across the boundary line of the Dominion, in the State of New York, more than four thousand Iroquoian Catholics. These, like the Micmacs and the Abnakis, are descendants of converts who had been won from Paganism during the seventeenth century.

During this same century, the vast regions extending from Lakes Huron and Michigan to the Pacific were explored by Catholic missionaries who discovered the Mississippi, and who established the Ottawa and the Illinois missions.

The history of these western missions extends through all the seventeenth century, and down to that period of the eighteenth century memorable in American history by the loss to France of her empire in the New World, which unfortunate event was followed soon after by the much deplored disruption of the great missionary and teaching order which had accomplished so

¹ The Jesuit Fathers in the Iroquoian missions during the seventeenth century include Fathers Jogues, Bressani, Poncet, le Moyne, Chaumonot, Dablon, le Mercier, Ménard, Fremin, Ragueneau, Dupéron, Bruyas, Pierron, Garnier, de Carheil, Milet, Bechefer, Nicholas, Rafeix, Boniface, de Gueslis, John and James de Lamberville.

much for religion and science in Europe and for civilization in America.

The Illinois missions were made memorable in the history of American civilization by the martyrdom of the Recollet Fathers, Zenobius Membré and Gabriel de la Ribourde, during the last decades of the seventeenth century, and of the Jesuit, Father James Gravier, who, after more than twenty years of missionary and philological labor in Illinois, died from a wound received at Peoria in 1706. No record of the history of the American Empire in the Western States, of which Chicago has since become the capital and centre, can be written without paying tribute to the memory of Fathers Claude Allonez and James Marquette; the former especially for his missionary work, and the latter for his discovery of the Mississippi, which has connected his name for all time with renowned Jesuit explorers in America.

The history of the Illinois missions extends from 1673 down to 1778; they became extinct by the death of the venerable Jesuit, Father Sebastian L. Meurin, philologist and missionary, who was among the thirteen of his order in North America in 1774 when Bishop Briand, at Quebec, was inhibited by Governor Carlton from promulgating the Papal edict for the suppression of the Society of Jesus.

The Ottawa missions commenced in 1642 with the planting of the cross for the first time, probably, on Michigan soil, by the Jesuit Fathers Isaac Jogues and Charles Raymbaut, at the wild rapids near the foot of Lake Superior where the slight overflow of its mighty waters, rushing in mad disorder over rocks and boulders into a river some feet below its level, creates a cataract surpassed, probably, in wild grandeur, only by Niagara, in whose torrent mingle the waters of Lake Superior. These venerable priests, awe-struck at this grand display of the torrent, gave it the name of the *Sault de Saint Marie*. They had already, in ascending the stream through which the overflow of Lake Superior descends into Lake Huron, named the river in honor of the mother of our Saviour, to whose rude source they gave the name above written, everlastingly memorable in Western history.

Neither the Illinois nor the Ottawa missions were without their attending scenes of martyrdom, as horribly cruel, perhaps, as were those which memorize the tragic events preceding the establishment of the Iroquoian missions. The Ottawas were the *élite* of the Western Indian nations. They were tall, adonic to perfection, with black hair and eyes, and great athletes.

This noble race of Indians had their homes principally on the

littoral of the upper portion of the Lower Peninsula of Michigan, extending to the fair and prolific regions of the Grand River valley and on the islands in the contiguous waters of Lakes Huron and Michigan.

The headquarters of the Ottawa missions had been established at Michilimacinac, the Indian name of the northern headland of the Lower Peninsula ; around this point mingle the waters of Lakes Huron and Michigan, forming what in modern times is geographically known as the Straits of Mackinaw. In the distance may be seen the picturesque islands in both lakes.

This locality, which connects so closely with the missionary history of a former century, is another evidence of the æsthetic quality the French Jesuit missionary fathers displayed when selecting their missionary centres.

It is a charming locality during the summer season, but during the winter season it is ice-bound.

Michilimacinac during nearly all the French *régime* was the northwestern depot of French commerce. Expeditions from Canada by way of the Ottawa river and by portage and water to the Georgian Bay had for their terminus this central locality, from whence trading parties were directed to regions west and northwest.

The missionary period commenced as early as 1642, nominally, but the active work of conversion was begun by Father Ménard in 1660 ; this work was continued until 1762. Thus for a century Michilimacinac was the centre of the Jesuit system of Western Lake Missions.

The roster of celebrated men identified with the system include the names in chronological order from 1660 of Fathers Ménard, Allouez, Marquette, Dablon, André, Druilletes, Nouvel, Albanel, Ballioquet, Pierson, Silvy, Enjalran, Aveneau, de Carheil, Marest, Le Franc, La Morinie and Dujaunay. Some of these names will be recognized as those of Iroquoian missionaries, while those of others were of prominence in the Illinois missions.

But the seventeenth century has other missionary records. Before the Maryland pilgrims had set sail from England Lord Baltimore applied to the Superior of the Jesuit order in London for some fathers of this society to accompany the Catholic planters and settlers to America for their spiritual benefit, and to convert the Indians.

Father Andrew White, a distinguished scholar, whose career had already been marked by continental literary renown and by persecution in England, was selected as the apostle of the first

English missionary work in North America, under the auspices of the Society of Jesus. He was accompanied by Father John Altham, S.J., and lay brothers John Knowles and Thomas Gervase, S.J. The missionary work of this band among the Indians was coeval with the planting by Calvert of the Maryland colony.

The Indian nations of the period comprised the Andastes, the Anacostans, the Conestogues, the Patuxents, the Piscataways, the Susquehannas and the Yacomicos ; these nations were of Iroquoian stock, while their prevailing language was Huron. Besides, there were portions of the Nanticokes, the Ozinies, the Toghwocs, and the Wycomesses, who were of Algonquian lineage and who used the Algic dialect. While most of the nations mentioned were held in suzerainty and paid tribute to the Iroquoian Confederacy, they were dominated by the Susquehannas and Conestogues. The people of the Maryland Indian nations were of a superior class and lived in comfortable homes. The sachems of the dominant nations were intelligent rulers.

Father White studied the prevailing language ; he also acquired a knowledge of the customs and peculiarities of the people, and while absorbed in spiritual work he found time to compile a grammar, dictionary and catechism.

His missionary work among the Indians met with great success. Father John Brock (who became Superior) and Father Philip Fisher came to his assistance from England, and subsequently Father Roger Rigbie and others. Several of the chiefs were converted and baptized, including Chilomacon and Mosorcoques. The Maryland mission, which lasted about ten years, was interrupted by Indian wars and by the death of Fathers Altham, Brock, Copely and Gravener, who succumbed to climatic fever ; the lay-brothers, Gervase and Knowles, were also victims of the same disease. The rebellion of Claiborne in 1644, and the death of Charles I., subsequently, were the political causes which brought this English mission to an end. Its founder, Father White, died in England about ten years later. The history of this decade is so deeply interesting that we beg to suggest to the readers of the REVIEW the study of the basis of Dr. Shea's outline, which we have partially given, and which this distinguished writer describes as the "*Relatio Itineris*, or Journal of Father Andrew White, copied at Rome by Father William McSherry, of Virginia, and published by Force in his 'Historical Collections,' vol. iv. He is our authority, with Oliver's 'Collections,' towards illustrating the biography of the English, Irish and Scotch members of the Society of Jesus, and Tanner's *Gesta præclara*." "White's narrative," continues Dr. Shea,

“is freely used by Campbell, ‘Historical Sketch of the Early Christian Missions Among the Indians of Maryland’; Burnap, ‘Life of Calvert,’ and by McSherry in his ‘History of Maryland.’”

In the meantime, the tribal remnants of the Huron nation, who had fled when Huronia was conquered by the Iroquoians, as has been stated, and had settled in groups on the shores of the adjacent waters, had refrained from war and had increased in number. They were good farmers, famous hunters, they lived in commodious cabins, and were well and comfortably clad.

At the solicitation of De la Mothe Cadillac a large group had come down from their village on the Lake Huron shore and made new homes a few miles below Fort Pontchartrain and the French colony of Detroit. With this group came Sas-ta-ret-sa, the head sachem, by hereditary right, of the existing representatives of what was left of the Huron nation.

This was in 1702. In the hegira which had succeeded the Iroquoian invasion a tribal group had landed on Bois Blanc Island, at the head of Lake Erie, and settled there, while another had gone lower down the lake and settled at Sandusky.

Sas-ta-ret-sa, the sachem, was the acknowledged head of the Huron tribes; he was a devout Catholic, and had made occasional visits to Quebec. So highly was he esteemed that the Governor-General of New France, the Marquis de Vaudreil, directed Cadillac to build him a substantial house on the high bank of the strait, in the vicinity of the Huron village. From father to son, most of these Hurons, although without direct missionary instruction, had retained the Christian religion and observed the traditional morning and evening devotional prayers; but others had lapsed to Paganism. The Recollet Fathers of Ste. Anne, of Detroit, became their spiritual solace.

When Father Charlevoix visited the Northwest in 1721 he remained two weeks at the post of Detroit, the guest of Father Anthony Delino,¹ chaplain of Fort Pontchartrain and pastor of Ste. Anne's. He spent some time at the Huron villages, and as he was familiar with the Huron language his visits were not without spiritual advantage to their people. No Jesuit at the time could mingle with the descendants of the Christians of Huronia without solicitude for the spiritual welfare of a race for the conversion of whose ancestors some of the most eminent of the order in North America had suffered martyrdom. From what he had seen, Father Charlevoix deemed it advisable that a priest should be sent

¹ Father Delino was a Recollet.

to the Hurons of Detroit and vicinity, and on his return to Canada he so advised the Father Superior of the Jesuits at Quebec ; but at the time there was no father speaking the Huron language available for such a mission. A few years later, however, Father Armand de La Richardie, S.J., was sent to Detroit to provide religious instruction for the Hurons. In order to avoid possible interference with the parochial status of Ste. Anne he obtained pastoral jurisdiction on the south shore of the strait, opposite the post of Detroit, and in 1728 he founded "*La Mission des Hurons du Detroit*," on the beautiful Crescent Bay, just above *La Pointe de Montreal*, where he built the mission church of the Assumption and a spacious mission house. The Detroit Hurons, the tribe on Bois Blanc Island and the tribe at Sandusky were included within the missionary jurisdiction of Father de La Richardie.

The locality of the Huron Mission of 1728 is now known as Sandwich, Ontario.

In 1744 Father Pierre Potier, S.J., was sent to Detroit as assistant to Father de La Richardie ; on the retirement of the latter to Quebec in 1755 the former succeeded as Superior.¹

La Mission des Hurons du Detroit was among the last, as it was probably one of the most famous, of the Jesuit missionary establishments during the eighteenth century in North America on the Western lakes. Father de La Richardie provided a mission store, which he placed upon a commercial footing superior to that of any trading establishment at the Post of Detroit.

His object was to provide a market where the Huron hunters could dispose of their furs at the end of the respective hunting seasons, as also their grain, either for money or for barter, at a fair price, without being debauched by *eau de vie* and swindled by the unscrupulous trader, as had been the custom. Twice each year the furs which had accumulated were shipped to the factor of the mission at Montreal and disposed of to the best advantage for account of the mission at Detroit.

The Hurons, realizing the advantages of the mission at the Crescent Bay, abandoned their cantons at Detroit, Bois Blanc and Sandusky, and made new homes in its vicinity.

It fell to the experience of Father Potier to see the standard of France lowered at Fort Pontchartrain and British soldiers assume control.

Soon after, the Ottawa chief Pontiac, whose cantons and castle

¹ See the translation of the "*Livre des comptes de la Mission des Hurons des Detroit*," in the *U. S. Catholic Historical Magazine*, vol. iv., page 141.

were but two miles above the Huron Mission, on the same side of the strait, commenced his intrigue with the Indian nations having autonomy, for supremacy in the West. The Senecas, the Hurons, the Ottawas and the Indian tribes of the country west of Lake Erie were secretly enrolled in the most formidable hostile combination ever known in American history. A general Indian war ensued; Pontiac's final discomfiture followed. Indian demoralization became complete. Then followed the suppression of the Society of Jesus in Europe, the preservation of the autonomy of the order in North America, and the inhibition by the English Government of its reinforcement on American soil.

After the failure of Pontiac's conspiracy, Sir William Johnson, by shrewd management, succeeded in restoring British prestige over the Indian tribes comprised within the Ottawa chief's league.

The majority of these tribes, however, were sullen and demoralized; but the baronet was able to maintain a peaceful status up to the time of his sudden death in 1773.

The American Revolution ensued soon after this event. Some of the tribes remained neutral, others sided with the Americans; but the greater number were enrolled by England as auxiliary combatants, and fought for her according to the mode of Indian warfare.

American victory was the death-knell of the political power of the Iroquoian Confederacy, which was dissolved by the hegira to Canada of some of the nations of the League. This was one of the most important events in American Indian history, affecting, as it did, the six nations, and all the other Indian nations who had been subject to Iroquoian rule.

"When the War of Independence began in the East," writes Clarence M. Burton, "its effects were almost immediately felt in Detroit, and early in 1775 the English made this post the chief military depot of the West and the fitting-out place for the forays to be made upon the settlements in Kentucky, Virginia and Pennsylvania. The evident intent was to keep the colonists in the West so busy defending their homes that they would be unable to help their brethren in the East.

"With this object in view millions of dollars' worth of goods were shipped to Detroit and distributed to the Indians, who came, upon invitation, from the West and South. On their arrival they were feasted and flattered without stint; clothing, trinkets, fire-arms and 'red-handled scalping-knives' were supplied to them in enormous quantities, and on returning from their forays they often brought hundreds of scalps and prisoners.

“The defeat of the English in the West was largely decided by the capture of Governor Henry Hamilton, of Detroit, at Vincennes, by Colonel George Rogers Clark, on March 5, 1779. That victory and American successes in the East brought about the treaties of 1782 and 1783, which provided for the surrender of the western territory by the English. The pretext of unsettled claims and the protests of Montreal fur-traders who derived immense revenues from this region delayed the surrender.

“Meanwhile the Indians continued their depredations; but finally, on August 20, 1794, they and their British allies were effectually defeated by Major General Anthony Wayne, at Fort Miami.

“Jay’s treaty followed, and was made November 19, 1794. It provided for the evacuation of Detroit and other western posts on or before June 1, 1796, but the surrender did not take place until July 11, 1796.

“This surrender,” continues Mr. Burton, “clearly marks the date of the actual ownership by the United States of a territory larger than the original thirteen States, and the final result of such ownership gave us not only the control of the great lakes but the Mississippi as well, and, indeed, of all the territory clear to the Pacific coast.”¹

The spiritual rule which for a century had been directed by the Canadian hierarchy from Quebec was ended when the British flag was lowered at Detroit in 1796.²

American hierachical control over the vast regions outlined by Mr. Burton was assumed by Bishop Carroll of Baltimore, who sent the Sulpitian Father, Michael Levadoux, to relieve the Very Rev. Pierre Frechette, last of the incumbents of the Church of Ste. Anne, whose line of pastorate under the See of Quebec had been continuous during all the eighteenth century.

Father Levadoux deciding to return to France, Bishop Carroll transferred Father Gabriel Richard, who was also a Sulpitian, from Kaskaskia to Detroit; the latter, with Father John Dilhet, a member of the same congregation, arrived in Detroit in 1798.

At the time the British relinquished control over the northwest shore of the strait by the evacuation of the fort at Detroit in 1796 the missionary-work of the Catholic Church among the American

¹ Introduction, *Centennial Celebration of the Evacuation of Detroit, 1796-1896.*

² The channel of the strait from the head of Lake Erie to Lake St. Clair, and, above this lake, the channel of the River St. Clair to the waters of Lake Huron, was the established national boundary-line dividing Canada and the United States. This line extended along the northeast coast to the head of Lake Superior.

Indian nations of the West had been suspended during thirty years.

This beneficent work had been operated principally under the auspices of Catholic France from the earliest settlement on the St. Lawrence, all through the French *régime*, and even after the eclipse of French power in New France; but during the decade preceding this unfortunate event a condition of peace so essential to religious progress in any country had not prevailed.

The English and French were at war, while some prominent Indian nations had their warriors as auxiliaries in the armies of both of these nations. The Revolutionary War ensued, during which the Indians to a great extent, as has been stated, were subsidized, armed and sent to waste the outlying settlements of the thirteen revolting American colonies.

Other events occurring in Europe paralyzed the right arm of missionary-work in North America. In the progress of the French Revolution the Catholic monarchy and the Church were overthrown, and so fell off the subsidies which had been made for religion and education, while the wealthy families of the nobility who had liberally supplemented these subsidies were made bankrupt.¹ But in the meantime the Catholic Church in Canada had been able to provide zealous priests to look after the spiritual interests of the semi-civilized Catholic Indian communities, whose conversion had been effected principally by the Jesuit missionaries; so that probably no important losses of souls had occurred among these Indian communities from events in France and elsewhere in Europe adverse to the Catholic Church.

From what has been stated, it is but too evident that the policy of England during thirty years, in her relations with the American Indian nations west and northwest of Lake Erie to the head waters of Lake Superior, as carried into effect by the British commandants at the post of Detroit, was to arm these nations and to incite them to war against the people of the American States. At the close of the eighteenth century the people of those nations were in a demoralized and impoverished condition. The war-path had been more attractive than the hunting-field, which in reality was the natural source of the Indian's support. But the war-path had not been without its inevitable casualties; many an Indian mother who had been left in her cabin with children to feed by the cultivation of a little patch of ground never greeted the return of her husband or of her sons.

¹ In this connection, see "The Financial Relations of Church and State in France," AM. CATH. QUAR. REVIEW, vol. xvi., page 187.

Filial endearment was among the brightest virtues adorning the nature of the American Indian mother, and great was the social misery entailed by the methods used to maintain English supremacy by the aid of the Indians on the western frontier.

When the religious control of the vast regions we have outlined devolved upon Bishop Carroll, his charitable instincts moved him to ascertain the spiritual as well as the social condition of the people of the Indian tribes, living upon the soil, in localities memorable in the history of the Church in America as the scenes of her missions during the seventeenth century. Among the first duties assigned Father Richard, who was young and zealous, and who had had some experience in missionary life in Illinois, was to visit the lake regions included within the parochial boundaries of Ste. Anne, which in fact included the littoral of the shores and islands of the region between Lake Erie and Lake Superior.

Father Richard first visited that part of his parochial territory extending below Detroit to the head of Lake Erie, in which were remnants of Indian tribes; he then proceeded to the Island of Mackinac, which after the conquest had been fortified by the British and had become the trading centre, which had formerly existed on the main shore opposite this island, known in history as Michilimacinae. He subsequently visited the islands in Lakes Huron and Michigan, Green Bay, and finally Sault Ste. Marie, and then returned to Detroit.

His report to Bishop Carroll as to the condition of the Indian tribes he had visited is on record. Debauchery, immorality and Paganism, with the attending consequences of these demoralizing factors, prevailed. Subsequently he visited the south shores of Lake Michigan. In all the territory he had visited a Catholic priest had not been seen for thirty years; and yet, evidence that the seed of faith was still alive was apparent to the young missionary.

Bishop Carroll, however, had no missionaries to send to these regions; but Father Richard renewed these visits, and after some years he had the happiness to see the missionary work of the Catholic Church resumed among the Ottawas, the Pottawotomies, and other Michigan Indian nations, by Fathers Badin, Dejean, Bellamy, Mazzuchelli and Résé. In the meantime Detroit had been included within the See of Bardstown, and subsequently within the See of Cincinnati. Father Richard's apostolate ended in a heroic manner in 1832.

The following year Detroit became a see, with Dr. Frederic Résé as its first bishop.

Rev. Frederick Baraga, who had served some seven years as a parish priest in his native province in Carniola, Austria, had been inspired with a vocation for missionary work among the Pagan Indian tribes of Northern Michigan. He arrived in Detroit in 1831, and in the summer of that year he went by water to Arbre Croche, one of the principal cantons of the Ottawa Indians of Lakes Huron and Michigan.

Father Baraga took up the work of his predecessors who had labored in the same field under direction of Father Richard, and reaped a rich harvest from the seed they had sown.¹

Compelled by the United States Indian Agent to abandon his missionary labors among the Ottawas in the Grand River Valley, he returned to Detroit, resolved to redeem the Chippewas of Lake Superior from Paganism and degradation. In the meantime the tribes of the Pottawotomie Indians in the St. Joseph Valley, in the vicinity of Lake Michigan, among whom the Catholic faith had been revived by Fathers Richard, the elder Badin, and other priests, were expatriated by chicanery and force to a reservation west of the Mississippi; while the Ottawas, whom Father Baraga had almost completely evangelized, had to submit to a similar expatriation. These events occurred during the "thirties." The beneficent work of the Catholic Church accomplished by her revived missions among these two Indian nations, the people of whose tribes had become sadly demoralized during the quarter of a century the British commandant at Detroit had held them under control, but whose moral and social condition had been greatly improved by missionary toil, was almost completely neutralized by the arbitrary proceedings of the Indian Bureau of the Federal Government.

The second apostolate of Father Frederick Baraga among the Indians of Michigan commenced at La Pointe, an island in the head waters of Lake Superior and in the country of the Chippewas of this lake region, in 1835. It continued without intermission thirty-three years, and was ended in 1868 at Marquette, the titular city of the diocese of which he was bishop.²

In the history of the Catholic Church in North America there is probably no more interesting chapter than the Chippewa missions of Frederick Baraga; and probably, in the history of North

¹ See "Frederick Baraga Among the Ottawas," *AM. CATH. QUAR. REVIEW*, vol. *xxi.*, page 106.

² See "Father Baraga Among the Chippewas," *AM. CATH. QUAR. REVIEW*, vol. *xxi.*, page 596.

America, few examples will be found of such successful evangelical work, of such generous self-devotion, and of such continuous labor, by which was accomplished the philological compilations of the Algonquian languages, which connect the name of their compiler with this language for all time.

About a decade after the advent of Father Baraga at La Pointe, the Jesuit Fathers of the new *régime*, under the auspices of the Church in Canada, crossing from the Ottawa river to Lake Nipissing, opened a mission upon its shores among the Pagan Indians, whose conversion became general.

Extending their work along both branches of French river, they entered the waters of the Georgian Bay, on the islands of which nearly two thousand Chippewas and Ottawas were living in Paganism. The tribes of these nations were evangelized, and, with the exception of about two hundred and fifty souls who are cared for by Protestant associations, and a score of Pagans, the original converts are solidly Catholic.

These same missionaries followed the Pagan Chippewas to their cantons on the northwest shores of the Georgian Bay, up the River St. Mary to the Sault, and along the north coast of Lake Superior to the boundary line at Grand Portage. The official tables of the Dominion Department of Indian Affairs for 1892-93 give the total number of Catholic Indians in the localities described as considerably over six thousand, against five hundred or more Protestants and one thousand one hundred Pagans.

But, while the work of civilization accomplished by the missionary agencies of the Catholic Church among the American Indians during the first half of the expiring nineteenth century, whether under the direction of the Church in Canada or in the United States, has been miraculously great, much of what had been accomplished under the direction of the latter was unfortunately interfered with, and to some extent undone, by the wholesale Government removal of the Indian converts to distant regions beyond missionary control.

This has not been the fate of the Indians converted under the auspices of the Church in Canada, for the reason that the progress of the country has not been so rapid, while the attitude of the Canadian Government towards her Indian nations has been paternal, and governed by humane principles.

But it remains to be stated that the missionary work of the Catholic Church, whether such had been directed by an American or by a Canadian hierarchy during the period mentioned, has been greatly hampered by the limited supply of funds available for un-

avoidable expenses, reduced to the lowest possible limit. Such has not been the experience of non-Catholic agencies operating in similar fields. On the American side ample funds from well-filled treasuries have not only provided family comforts, but also transportation facilities which have made the service of the non-Catholic missionary comparatively agreeable. On the Canadian side the Church of England and wealthy societies in London have supplied all the funds requisite, paid high salaries to missionary bishops, and established a system of colporteur methods and a press for the dissemination of religious light according to the sectarian standard of each.

The Flat Heads, *élite* of the Indian nations of the Rocky Mountain regions, had their cantons in that part of Montana west and at the base of the main range of the "Rockies." The warriors of this nation were brave and good hunters, and they were able to defend their homes against the attacks of the predatory savages by whom they were surrounded. Their chiefs were wise rulers, while morality and sobriety was the rule of life of this finely formed and intelligent Indian race.

In the early decades of this century two Mohawks, father and son, Ignace by name, from the Indian town of Caughnawaga, on the St. Lawrence, were employed by the Northwest Fur Co., of Montreal, to collect furs in this region. They made their homes in the chief canton of the Flat Heads. They were devout Catholics, and in time they explained to the chiefs the Christian doctrine, taught them prayers, and induced the practice of morning and evening devotions. The elder Ignace baptized the sick in cases of emergency, and explained the functions of a priest, and finally induced the chiefs to send a delegation to the Bishop of St. Louis to ask that a "black robe" might be sent to their nation. This involved a journey of about four thousand miles to be made on foot, over mountains, across deserts and streams, through the territory of ferocious enemies, whose vigilance it would be difficult to elude.

Of the four young warriors who volunteered for this perilous journey, one only had seen a white man's face; none of them had ever seen a village of white people. Ignace supplied them with money. In the spring of 1831 they left the Flat Head canton, and after six months of perilous adventure they reached St. Louis. What these brave souls endured is known only by Almighty God.

The fact that these delegates spoke only the Salishan language,¹

¹ The Salishan languages include that of the tribes of the Atna, Belacoola, Chehalis, Cœur d'Alène, Colville, Dwamish, Flat Head, Kalispel, Kaulits, Kawichen, Kila-mook, Klallam, Komuk, Kwantlen, Lilowat, Lummi, Nehelim, Netlakapamuk, Niku-

which was unknown in any friendly tribe they might have met, rendered their journey more difficult. The account of their mission was given by Bishop Rosati, who wrote to the editor of the "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith," December 31, 1831:

"Some three months ago four Indians who live across the Rocky Mountains, near the Columbia river, arrived at St. Louis. After visiting General Clarke, who had, during his celebrated travels, visited their nation and been well treated, they came to see our church, and appeared to be exceedingly well pleased with it.

"Unfortunately, there was not one who understood their language. Some time later two of them became dangerously ill. I was then absent from St. Louis. Our priests visited them, and the Indians seemed to be delighted with their visits. They made signs of the cross and other signs which appeared to have some relation to baptism. The sacrament was administered to them; they gave expressions of satisfaction. A little cross was presented to them; they took it with eagerness, kissed it repeatedly, and it could be taken from them only after death. It was truly distressing they could not be spoken to. Their remains were carried to the church, and their funerals were conducted with all the Catholic ceremonies. The other two attended and acted very becomingly.

"We have since learned from a Canadian, who had crossed the country which they inhabit, that they belong to the Flat Heads, who had received some notions of the Catholic religion from Indians from Canada. We shall obtain further information as to the means of reaching this nation."¹

How pathetic is this statement of the venerable first Bishop of St. Louis of the sad ending of two of the Flat Head delegation. The survivors soon after started on their return journey. For three years the chiefs and people of their nation awaited their return with a "black robe," but they never returned!

The story of the perils of this delegation in the journeys they made, could it be told, but it probably never will be, would probably surpass in heroic incident any published narrative of American Indian adventure.

Ignace, the Mohawk mentor of the Flat Heads, led another delegation to St. Louis five years later, and obtained a promise from Bishop Rosati that a missionary would be sent to the nation. Two years passed in vain expectation, and a third delegation, led by Ignace, started for St. Louis. The story of the massacre of this party was subsequently related to the Flat Heads by a Protestant missionary who witnessed the tragedy. The Flat Heads

tamuk, Nisqualli, Nuksahk, Nukwalimuk, Nusulph, Okinagan, Pend d'Oreille, Pentlash, Piskwau, Puyallup, Salish, Samish, Shiwapmuk, Shuswap, Siatl, Silets, Skagit, Skitsuish, Shokomish, Skoyelpi, Skwaksin, Skwamish, Snanaimuk, Snohomish, Songish, Spokan, Stailakum, Stalo, Tait, Thompson River Indians, Tilamuk, Toanhuch and Twana. There are, besides, forty-eight subdivisions of those named who use a similar language. Many of the distinct nations mentioned have been evangelized. Our authority for these names is James Constantine Pilling's *Bibliography of the Salishan Languages*, Washington, 1893.

¹ Paladino, *Indian and White in the Northwest*, p. 13.

did not despair. Two years later they sent another delegation to St. Louis, which was successful.

Father Peter John de Smet, S.J., was selected to carry the light of Christianity to the Flat Heads. In later years he went to Europe and secured the active co-operation of the Jesuit Fathers of the respective provinces of Belgium and of Turin. The evangelization of the Montana Indian nations followed. The story of these missions has been told by Father de Smet. It has been printed in three languages, and widely circulated in America and in Europe. The Fathers of the Belgian Province were: De Vos, Eberschweiler, Joset, Kermann, Kuhls, Kuppens, Rebmann, Van der Velden, Van Gorp and Vercruysse. With them came five lay-brothers, skilled mechanics and instructors. Fathers Barcélo, of St. Louis, and Point, of Montreal, accomplished much work.

The Italian Fathers were: Acolti, Bandini, Canastrelli, Caruana, Cataldo, D'Aste, Damiani, Diomedì, Falchi, Fensi, Gazzoli, Genna, Giorda, Grassi, Guidi, Imola, Mengarini, Menetry, who was a Swiss; Nobili, Palladino, Parodi, Prando, Rapagliosi, Ravalli, Tosi, Vangina and Zerbinati. Several accomplished lay-brothers accompanied these; and missionary work was ably supplemented by Sisters of Charity, including the Ursulines. Subsequently Father Hoecken, a Swiss by birth, if we are not mistaken, became an active worker in these missions, which continued more or less actively in all the Rocky Mountain regions during forty years. The cradle of this system was in Montana. The Indian nations in whole or in part evangelized were, in their turn, the Flat Heads, the Nez Percés, the Cœur d'Alenes, the Kalispels, the Kootenays, Pend d'Oreiles, Assinniboines, Gros Ventres, Blackfeet, Cheyennes, Crows, Spokanes and Sioux.

The range of these wild Indians extended from the Pacific, including Oregon and Washington, east to the Dakotas, and across the international boundary-line, including both Dakotas and Montana.

The history of these missions, which are still to some extent in process, has, as we have stated, been related by their venerable founder. One of the Italian fathers, Palladino, has quite recently published, "Indian and White in the Northwest, or a History of Catholicity in Montana," Baltimore, 1894. In this exhaustive work may be seen the portraits of the present bishops of this region, of most of the venerable missionaries, of the lay-brothers, and of the Mother Superiors of the religious orders established in Montana. He also enables us to appreciate the results of missionary zeal in behalf of the Indians, and in the work of their

civilization under the auspices of the Catholic Church. Views are given of missionary establishments, of churches, of industrial schools with their inmates; of the Ursuline Sisters' fine edifices for the training of Indian youth; of the establishments erected for other religious orders of women, and of hospitals and asylums made necessary by white civilization. Some of the beneficent institutions designed for the benefit of Indian children were founded by the munificence of Miss Drexel.

But some chapters in Father Palladino's work may not prove agreeable reading to fair-minded Americans. In these chapters are outlined the chicanery of United States Government officials, whose official position enabled them to gratify their bigotry against the Catholic Church in recent years by interfering with and by curtailing the successful work of civilization which had been in progress under Catholic auspices in the Rocky Mountain regions.

At Port Arthur ends the Jesuit system of Indian missions on the British coast of Lake Superior. The ninety-first degree of longitude in the Province of Ontario defines the eastern limits of the Archbishopial Province of St. Boniface, which extends to the western borders of Ontario, thence north from the international boundary-line to Keewatin, and west and northwest to the Pacific Ocean, including in the waters of the latter Vancouver Island and Queen Charlotte Islands, with Alaska and the Arctic Ocean as the extreme boundaries of the Archbishopial domain, in which is included British Columbia, Athabaska, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Assiniboia, Manitoba, and Keewatin. This vast western British empire has in recent years been connected with the Province of Quebec, and the east by the Canadian Pacific Railroad from Vancouver to Montreal. St. Boniface, the titular city of the Archbishop, is in the Province of Manitoba.

The present prelate is Louis Philippe Adélarde Langevin, O.M.I., D.D. His suffragans are the bishops of New Westminster and of St. Albert, of the vicariate apostolic of Athabaska, and of the vicariate apostolic of Saskatchewan respectively in the order named; Duriu and Clut, Grandin, Grouard and Pascal, all of whom are Oblate bishops.

The deceased prelates number six, namely: Faraud, Herboomez, Lorrain, Provencher, Tache and Villimer, all of whom were Oblate bishops.

We have no knowledge of any Indian missionary system in North America during four hundred years, conducted by any one religious order, as extensive as that now directed by Archbishop Langevin and his suffragans in the northwestern regions of the

Dominion of Canada. And yet the total population of this region is only 88,200. There are 36,000 Indians under missionary care, while the 52,200 remaining are whites and half-breeds. The white population of Manitoba is likely to increase, and also in other districts; but during the recent decade there is but little change in the status of the red and yellow elements of population.¹

In the ecclesiastical province of Dr. Langevin there are 287 churches and chapels in which services are held regularly, 28 academies and colleges, 423 schools, 13 orphan asylums, and 11 hospitals. The work of educating the girls, both Indian and white, is performed by the Sisters of Charity, of whom there are 257; including 144 Gray Nuns. The asylums and hospitals are generally conducted by the latter order.

During the past three decades the following named Oblate fathers have labored in these missions: Allard, Ancel, André, Audie, Baudre, Bédard, Bellemere, Benoit, Bigonnesse, Blanchet, Blais, Bonald, Bourguine, Bremont, Breynat, Brochu, Brunet, Buzoz, Caér, Cahil, Campeau, Campere, Carion, Cavanagh, Chapillion, Chiapini, Charlebois, Chaumont, Chireuse, Cocola, Cochin, Colignon, Comeau, Cornellier, Dandurand, Decorby, De Chambréuil, De Kangué, Desmarais, De Vriendt, Dorais, Doucet, Douthenville, Ducot, Dupé, Dupin, Dupire, Dupont, Eynard, Fafard, Falher, Faraud, Favreau, Fayard, Fillion, Fouquet, Fourmond, Fourmont, Fournier, Fox, Gabillon, Gascon, Gasté, Gauthier, Gendre, Gendreau, Gennin, George, Gireau, Giroux, Glèna, Gouy, Gourdon, Grandidier, Gregoire, Guénard, Gueguen, Guertin, Guillet, Hert, Horris, Houssaye, Hugonard, Husson, Jayol, Jouan, Jousard, Joyce, Jubinville, Jutras, Krangué, Lacasse, Lacombe, Ladet, Laferrière, Laflesh, Laity, Lajacq, Lamure, Laniel, Lavoie, Lecocq, Lecorne, Leduc, Ledousal, Lefebvre, Leguard, Legoff, Léguen, Lejeune, Le Moyne, Lesserrec, Levacher, MacCarthy, Madore, MacGukin, Magnan, Maisonneuve, Marceau, Marchal, Martin, Maurice, Merer, Michel, Morgan, Moulin, Mourrier, Nedelec, Oudemard, O'Dwyer, Ouelette, Page, Pandosy, Paquette, Pascal, Pelletier, Pénard, Perreault, Petiot, Peytevin, Pineau, Rapet, Remas, Richard, Richer, Remas, Reynand, Roure, Roy, Sauvé, Scollan, Seguin, Simont, Tessier, Teston, Thérieu, Tissot, Touze, Vales, Vegreville, Walsh, Whelan, J., and Whelan, W.

As auxiliaries to these fathers are 106 lay-brothers of the same order; 257 or more Sisters of Charity, including 144 Gray Nuns. As stated, the lay-brothers teach the boys, the sisters teach the

¹ The "yellow," or half-breed, population slowly increases.

girls, care for and educate the orphans in the asylums, and nurse the sick in the hospitals. Of the 160 fathers whose names are given above, 19 have succumbed to missionary toil, leaving 141 in the field. Besides the Oblates, 47 secular priests are now serving the white population in cities and town in the Province of St. Boniface.

The names of 147 Oblate fathers given above indicate, apparently, that they are indigeous to the soil of the Province of Quebec, on which succeeding generations have lived and died in the Catholic faith during three centuries.

There are, however, 11 of the fathers having Irish names, 1 Italian, and 1 Belgian.

The territory embracing the circuits of the Oblate missions is the most diversified in all North America. It includes the fairest and most prolific of agricultural districts, as well as the most picturesque and wild regions of forest, lake and mountain.

British Columbia in the west is traversed by the Cascade range of mountains and the northwest range of the Rocky Mountains. In this territory at the present day may be found living in his natural method the original type of the northwestern Indian of North America. Within the circuits of these missions are the tribes of the nations of the Assinaboines, the Blackfeet, the Bloods, the Chippewas, the Crees, the Crows, the Esquimault, the Kamloops, the Kootenays, the Nicholas, the Okanagans, the Saltaux, the Saskatchewanes, the Similikanees, the Sushwaps, and others, consisting of three hundred and eighty-eight distinct communities, having an equal number of local tribal centres, within which, according to official authorities, the Oblate fathers have brought the light of Christianity, whose respective populations range from less than 100 to 1200 souls.¹

But there are in British Columbia and in the northwestern regions of the Dominion of Canada estimated to be 21,000 wild Indians who are not yet enrolled or placed under the care of the agents of the Dominion Government. These wild tribes, however, are being evangelized by the Oblate fathers.

From these wild regions let us cross the international boundary-line into Alaska, with whose peculiar formation—frigid temperature and tempting auriferous, undeveloped richness—the American people have recently been made familiar. We venture to say that in Alaska may be found at the present day the perfect type of the North American savage.

But the primitive people of the Alaskan Indian tribes have

¹ *Report of the Department of Indian Affairs of the Dominion of Canada, Ottawa, 1893.*

souls. The fathers of the Society of Jesus are now braving the rigors of the climate and the hardships connected with missionary work among such a people in order to win them to Christianity and to ultimate civilization.

The Alaska Prefecture Apostolic includes the Territory and the Aleutian Islands. Very Rev. Paschal Tosi, S.J., is the first prefect-apostolic. His is not the only Italian name which appears in the roster of missionary fathers. With his are Giardano, Parodi, Ragaru, Treca, and probably some of the four lay-brothers. The others are Barnum, apparently American, and Crimont, Judge, Munroe, Post, René, and Robout, all of whom are fathers of the Society of Jesus.

This prefecture was established in 1894. There are six churches with resident priests, one hospital, three schools, and two orphanages. The auxiliaries are the lay-brothers and the Sisters of Ste. Anne, sixteen in number, who conduct a school and hospital for the whites, a boarding-school and orphanage for the Alaskan Indians, and a boarding-school and orphanage for the Eskimo Indians.

The work of the Catholic Church for the redemption of the Indian possessors of the soil must end here, for the Arctic Ocean interferes.

This work is active to-day in this frigid region, as it was four centuries ago in the more congenial regions of the Pacific coast towards the south. We have attempted to outline this beneficent effort in the American Indian's behalf, first in Central America, in Mexico, in the present domain of the United States, and in the vast possessions controlled by the Dominion of Canada. In all this continent, wherever the American Indian lived in barbarism, the priests of the Catholic Church, when unopposed, during four centuries have, at the risk of their lives, while generally suffering great privations, sought him in his home in the wild forest to teach Christ crucified, to win him from Paganism, and by induction bring himself and his family into the more agreeable condition of a semi-civilized existence.

Great has been their success. That this success has not been more general is because political complications, white men's hatred, white men's greed and religious animosity have interfered to prevent or to undo their charitable work.

No other religious combinations attempting the conversion of the American Indian during the same period can show in part or in the aggregate so many living proofs as can the Roman Catholic Church of the efficacy of her work in the redemption of the Indians of North America.

RICHARD R. ELLIOTT.

THE LATER RELIGIOUS MARTYRDOM OF POLAND.

IN the last number of the REVIEW, when treating of the struggle between Polish Catholicity and Russian "Orthodoxy" during the reigns of the autocrats, Catharine II., Nicholas I., and Alexander II., we alluded to the establishment, in 1801, of a "Catholic College" which, sitting at St. Petersburg, was to be for all the Catholics of the Russian Empire that which the Holy Synod was in regard to the schismatics. From the day when the infamous Siestrzencewicz was appointed by Alexander I. to the first presidency of this misnamed "Catholic" tribunal, it had constantly shown itself a perfidious and powerful engine for the destruction of all ecclesiastical independence. Count Dimitri Tolstoy, in that travesty of a "History of Roman Catholicism in Russia" (1864) of which we have already given some choice morsels to the reader, transcribes the memorial in which Siestrzencewicz explained the principles which were to guide this "Catholic College" in its mediatory relations between the czar and the faithful whom it was designed to betray. According to the traitor of Mohilew,¹ the czar, "as the anointed of the Lord, enjoys the supremacy over all the Churches and over all the bodies of Christian clergy in his empire"; as to the Catholic Church, *the czar grants to it a dependence on the Pope, "as far as dogmas are concerned; but in regard to matters of discipline and internal government, the czar entrusts them to diocesan bishops who are his subjects, and under conditions hereafter specified."* Then the Catholics of Russia were told that in the primitive Church, "before the Popes had usurped jurisdiction over the bishops," the archbishops were wont to convoke, twice a year, "councils or congregations" for the consideration of *dogmatic* or disciplinary questions; and that now "such a congregation was to sit permanently at St. Petersburg, the emperor naming as its members such of the Catholic clergy as it would please him to choose." Furthermore, just as the most mighty and most clement czar was the "supreme judge" over the Holy Synod, so in the new "Catholic College" that gracious autocrat was to have his representative. "A *secular* procurator will preside for the emperor, and will forbid all resolutions and decrees which *he may deem* dangerous; all which may be contrary to the imperial rights or to the laws of the country."²

¹ See the last number of the REVIEW, p. 701.

² Tolstoy, *loc. cit.*, vol. ii., pp. 436 and 439.

Shortly after the presentation of this memorial, His Grace of Mohilew addressed to the czar another, entitled "The Election of Popes," in which he feigned to discern a necessity, on the part of His Majesty, of putting an end to papal usurpation. Tolstoy relies on the ravings of Siestrzencewicz as proofs that "The consent of the Roman court to the consecration of a bishop is merely a sign of ecclesiastical unity ; but the administrative authority in a diocese is that of the local bishop, *so far as the laws of the state permit it.*" And Tolstoy adds that several other memorials of Siestrzencewicz were merely developments of the same convictions, "sustained by most positive proofs" against the claims of the papal nuncio to a jurisdiction over the Russian Catholic clergy. The archbishop of Mohilew insisted, says the apologist of the Holy Synod, not only that all papal Bulls should be submitted to governmental approval, but also that the Pope should not presume to send any decree into the Russian empire, unless said decree had been requested by a metropolitan who had been authorized by the czar to request it. Dimitri Tolstoy, being the imperial procurator of the Holy Synod, *i.e.*, to all intents and purposes the Russian Supreme Pontiff, was presumably an educated man ; and, nevertheless, he attempted to justify the course of Siestrzencewicz by this effusion : "History shows us a much more striking instance of a limitation of the papal authority by Catholic ecclesiastics. There exists to our day in Holland and in the Catholic (*sic*) Church of Utrecht,¹ the bishops of which, although they remain entirely faithful to the dogmas of the Roman Church, and although they acknowledge the Pope as the Head of the Church, do not tolerate, on his part, any direct interference in the discipline and organization of the clergy, and consecrate their own bishops according to the rules of the primitive Church, without any request for his authorization."² It may be possible, on the score of crass ignorance of history, to excuse the procurator of the Holy Synod when he finds in the schismatic conventicle of Utrecht any more Catholicity than he would discern in the English Establishment, or in the Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland ; but charity does not bid us excuse his wilful blindness to the salient fact that the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff is a dogma of Catholic faith, and that the right of "direct interference in the discipline and organization of the clergy" is necessarily included in that supremacy.

The ukase of Alexander I. establishing this "Roman Catholic College" is simply an abridgment of all the tyrannical laws by

¹ See our *Studies in Church History*, vol. iv., ch. 14.

² *Loc. cit.*, p. 120.

which Catharine II. endeavored to reduce the Catholic Church of both the Latin and the Uniate Rite to the level of the State "Orthodox" Establishment.¹ The Roman Pontiff was to be absolutely ignored, not only in the selection of the members of the new tribunal, but also in every decree which it might issue. The archbishop of Mohilew was declared to be, *ex officio*, its president. Each of the Catholic dioceses of Russia were to be represented in it by a prelate or a canon, chosen by the Cathedral Chapter, but confirmed by the czar. In the third Article of the ukase the members were enjoined to proceed according to the ecclesiastical canons, "but to observe strictly all the imperial prohibitions concerning every foreign ecclesiastical jurisdiction and communication, preserving, in accordance with their sworn allegiance, all the rights of the autocracy and the imperial statutes." The fourth Article assigned to the College the right and obligation of deciding, *in last appeal*, all applications for divorce. And lest there might be some doubt as to the determination of the czarate to assimilate the condition of the Russian and Polish Catholics to that of the schismatics, the eighth Article prescribed that the Catholic College should be unable to decide definitely in any matter without the consent of the "directing Senate" of St. Petersburg; that the College should always "observe the rules prescribed by the General Regulation."² We have seen, when treating of the course of Nicholas I. toward his Catholic subjects, how that monarch, after his interview with Pope Gregory XVI., showed some little velleity to grant an almost indiscernible modicum of satisfaction to the pontifical claims; but even in that petty instalment of justice, which was quickly neutralized by new enactments of his persecuting spirit, no change was effected in the attributions of the "Catholic College" of St. Petersburg. After the rupture of diplomatic relations between

¹ The entire ukase is given by Szantyr, in his *Collection of Information Concerning the Catholic Religion in the Russian Empire, and Especially in the Annexed Polish Provinces*. Paris, 1847. See also Theiner's *Vicissitudes of the Catholic Church of Both Rites*, vol. ii. Paris, 1843.

² This "General Regulation" had been devised by that Peter who is termed "the Great." Peter had abolished all the "chancelleries of state," bodies equivalent to the "ministries of state" in other countries, and he had replaced their titulars by so many "Colleges" or Councils. Each one of these "Colleges" was ordered to follow the prescriptions of a General Regulation; and when Peter abolished the patriarchate of Moscow in all but in name, he established an ecclesiastical "College" which he afterward designated as the "Holy Synod," subjecting it to the same Regulation. It is evident that Peter saw no difference between the administration of ecclesiastical affairs and that of war, secular justice, or finance; and to the same level Siestrzencewicz endeavored to reduce the Church whose rights he had sworn to defend. See Tondini's *The Ecclesiastical Regulation by Peter the Great*, p. 3.

the Holy See and Alexander II., which, as we have seen, was entailed by an insult offered by a Russian ambassador to Pius IX. in his own palace of the Vatican, there appeared an imperial ukase (May 22, 1867), in which the jurisdiction of the "Catholic College" was minutely explained, and which terminated in these words: "All persons guilty of holding with the Pope of Rome and his government any relations other than those hereby allowed (that is, under a special and apposite imperial permission), and all persons who illegally receive from the Pope, or from his government, or from any foreign ecclesiastic, any Bulls, Briefs, or other instructions or decisions, without having sent them to the local government or to the Minister of the Interior, shall suffer the punishments prescribed by the special law on this matter."¹

The Holy See was informed of this ukase, not by the Russian government, but by Staniewski, the administrator of the diocese of Mohilew; and this unworthy ecclesiastic, following in the traces of Siestrzencewicz, dared to tell the Pontiff that the Catholic bishops of the Russian empire had received the document with gratitude and reverence; that the "Catholic College" was revered by all honest Russian and Polish Catholics. His Holiness immediately issued an Encyclical, in which he drew the attention of all the bishops of the world to a decree which "trampled on the natural rights of man by its violation of the rights of conscience"; and on Jan. 3, 1868, Cardinal Antonelli called on Staniewski to repair the scandal which he had given, and to seek for absolution from the censures which he had incurred. His Eminence declared that were the Pontiff to recognize in the "Catholic College" a right to determine what affairs should be referred to the Holy See, he would confer his own primacy on that tribunal; that, furthermore, no lay authority, and especially no schismatical or heretical authority, could decree anything concerning purely ecclesiastical matters. The cardinal-secretary expressed his astonishment on learning that "a Catholic bishop could so far debase himself before a schismatical government as to accept voluntarily so pernicious a law; that a Catholic bishop could join other Catholics in forming a tribunal which had been designed for the ruin of religion; that a Catholic bishop could even preside over that tribunal, and thus become the enforcer of such a law." When Staniewski, on the part of the Russian government, ordered the Polish bishops to send delegates to the "Catholic College," some of them—the Papal condemnation of the tribunal not having

¹ *Journal of St. Petersburg*, cited by *Le Monde*, August 11, 1867.

yet reached them—thought that the gravity of the circumstances might justify them in relying on the ulterior ratification of their submission by the Holy See. Among these compromisers were Lubienski, bishop of Augustovo, and Sosnowski, administrator of Lublin. Others, however, like Vincent Popiel, bishop of Plock, whom the reader must not confound with Marcellus Popiel, the wretched apostate bishop of Chelm, whom we shall soon introduce to his notice, replied resolutely that they would not obey the imperial command. Then Count Berg, lieutenant for the czar in Poland, summoned the intrepid Popiel to Warsaw, and bade him remember that although he was a bishop, he owed compliance to every order of the czar. “In affairs ecclesiastical,” returned the prelate, “I owe no obedience to His Majesty. As a Catholic bishop, I owe obedience to only one human being—His Holiness, the Pope. You are a Russian general. What answer would you give to him who would tempt you from your allegiance? You would reply: ‘Never.’ Such is my answer now. They may dispose of my person as they see fit.”¹ The indomitable man was immediately deported to Novgorod.² Lubienski soon repented of his deference to the Muscovite demands, and in a long and eloquent letter to Count Berg³ he described the perplexities of his conscience during the short period when he had endeavored to reconcile his episcopal duty with his devotion to the czar.⁴ He concluded with these words: “When I look back on all the circumstances which should have enlightened me much sooner, I recognize perforce an exceptional grace of God in the opportunity to confess my error, and to repair it as far as possible, which He has accorded to me. . . . I declare by these presents that, considering the imperial decree which endowed the Roman Catholic College of St. Petersburg with the right to inspect letters directed to the Holy Father by the bishops, and to decide as to whether those letters should be transmitted; and considering that the said College has for its president a bishop who has incurred canonical censures; therefore I can

¹ *Gazette of Augsburg*, October, 1868.

² Alexander III. allowed him to return to Poland. In 1875 he was transferred to Wladislaw, and in 1883 he was promoted to Warsaw, where he still edifies the Poles by an evident readiness to suffer for the faith, if necessary, just as in his younger days.

³ Published in the *Czas* of June 24, 1869, and reproduced by the *Dygodnik Katolicki* of Grodzisk (Posen), July, 1869.

⁴ “Lubienski had rendered himself an object of suspicion to his compatriots because of the extreme zeal with which he sacrificed, ostensibly at least, the most legitimate demands of Polish patriotism, in order to exhibit the fidelity of a Russian subject—as though he wished thereby to purchase the right of remaining an irreproachable bishop.”—Lescour, *The Church in Poland*, bk. iii., ch. i. Paris, 1876.

take no part in the composition or in the acts of the said College. What is more, I declare that by my convocation of the Chapter of Sejn for the purpose of electing a delegate to the said College, and by my order to the Abbé Andrzejewski to proceed to St. Petersburg in order to occupy a position in the said College, I committed a culpable action which has been reprobated by the supreme authority of the Church, and which therefore I also now reprobate. I beg Your Excellency to communicate this my declaration to His Imperial Majesty, to whose profound wisdom and generous justice I have the happiness of committing myself with all submission, in everything which is just that he may deign to command." The deportation of Mgr. Popiel had already indicated how much consideration the "generous justice" of Alexander II. would accord to Mgr. Lubienski. On March 31, 1869, at two o'clock in the morning, he was arrested in his palace, and a few hours afterward a detachment of police escorted him on the road toward Perm, in the depths of Russia. Great was the grief of Lubienski's diocesans; but in a few days their sorrow became horror. Their bishop had died on the road. Had he been murdered by the oppressors? He had been a healthy man, and had lived only forty-three years. Men recalled the similarly suspicious circumstances of the recent death of Mgr. Kalinski, the Uniate bishop of Chelm, and they formed their conclusions. The last days of Lubienski proved the fallaciousness of his theory that by force of sincerity and virtue toleration might be wrung from the schismatic autocracy; that, as he expressed the idea, there is no invincible antagonism between the Pole and the Russian; that "the two peoples were made to understand each other, and that a Pole always agrees with a Russian better than with a German." The holy prelate's philosophy was that of the Polish proverb: "So long as the world is the world, a Pole will not be a brother to a German"; but his Pan-Slavist aspirations will never be satisfied until the standard-bearer of Slavism shall have returned to the fold of religious unity. The noble conduct of Mgr. Lubienski was imitated by Mgr. Sosnowski, the administrator of the diocese of Lublin; but more fortunate, in a worldly sense, than Lubienski, the administrator escaped from Poland.

The children of the Holy Synod are wont to justify their efforts to Russify the Poles by the fact that, many centuries ago, Poland subjugated many Russian provinces, and imposed upon them the Polish religion, language and laws. But the reader must know that this "Polonization," concerning which the Muscovites find it convenient to complain, was neither a violent nor a sudden pro-

cess ; it was the work of four or five centuries, and the sword of persecution never aided it. On the other hand, the Russification of Poland is the very quintessence of violence, and its advocates endeavor to accomplish it without delay. Again, the much decried Polonization of Western Russia was an endowment of barbarians with that civilization which the best minds, even among Russian schismatics, would like to see the portion of millions of Russians to-day ; whereas, the Russification of Poland signifies the degradation of a Catholic civilization by the introduction of a truly oriental autocracy and a servile Byzantine ecclesiasticism. The Russification of the Poles had been prosecuted, of course, with more or less energy ever since the commission of the crime of 1782, but it was reserved for the reign of the emancipator of the serfs to systematize the iniquity. By the advice of Nicholas Milutine, a brother of Dimitri Milutine, the Minister of War, Alexander II. decreed the compulsory use of the Russian language in all the Polish tribunals and schools, in private life, and even in the sanctuary. In order to arrive more easily at this end, the persecutors confiscated the estates of great numbers of Polish nobles and other Polish landowners, and sold them to "Orthodox" Russians or German Protestants.¹ The few Polish landlords who were spared found that by a ukase of December 10, 1865, they were forbidden to sell or lease their lands to other than "Orthodox" Russians ; and lest they might find means of evading this prohibition, no sale or lease was to be held as valid unless it had been sanctioned by the governor-general of the province. The same ukase deprived Catholics of the right of bequeathing landed property to persons not their natural heirs. No Catholic could hold a position under the government ; he could not be even an employee of a railroad. The chief means, however, of this Russification was to be the pretended conversion to "Orthodoxy" of those Uniates who had escaped from the persecution of Siemaszko in 1839 by their passage to the Latin rite. Under the supervision of Kauffmann, that German convert to "Orthodoxy" whom we have met as the successor of the atheistic Mourawieff as governor of Lithuania, the days of Siemaszko seemed to have returned.

One of the most zealous apostles of "Orthodoxy," although he proclaimed openly that money would make of him either a Turk or a Jew, was Prince Chowanski. This officer once reproached an assemblage of peasants with being remiss in their duty to pray for the czar ; and when he was told that they always fulfilled that

¹ Martinow, *De la Langue Russe dans le Culte Catholique*. Lyons, 1874.

duty, both in church and at home, he asked for a demonstration of their veracity on the spot. The unsuspecting rustics dropped on their knees; and Chowanski, as though to increase the solemnity of the occasion, caused a lighted candle to be placed in the hands of each one. When the prayer had been recited, the military missionary congratulated his astounded hearers on their voluntary conversion to the religion of Holy Russia. In vain the peasants cried that they would die sooner than abandon the Catholic faith; they were told that they had become "Orthodox" by the very fact of praying while holding candles which had been blessed by "Orthodox" priests. An adjutant then registered all the names of the "converts," and the poor creatures were ordered to proceed to the schismatic church, there to seal their recantation of the errors of Popery by Holy Communion. With blows of clubs and threats of the bayonet they were driven to the schismatic altar, a "pope" administered the Blessed Sacrament to them; and the unfortunates found themselves and their children enrolled on the official registers of the State Church, and subject, if they dared to protest, to the punishments which "Orthodoxy" visits on apostates. Similar scenes were multiplied throughout Lithuania; and when Alexander II. visited Wilna, he replied to a deputation of his victims who besought him to allow them to follow the dictates of their consciences: "I shall never authorize a return to the Catholic Church on the part of those who have once embraced Orthodoxy." We have alluded to the punishments with which "Orthodoxy" visits what it feigns to regard as "apostasy." Our limits forbid many illustrations of this phase of the policy of Russification; we shall notice only the case of Mary Denisow, which greatly agitated the Poles in 1869. This girl, born of Catholic parents in the department of Grodno, in 1848, and baptized in the Catholic Church, was forcibly "re-baptized" by an "Orthodox" priest when she was six months old, during the absence of her mother, and in spite of the protests of her dying father. According to the Russian law, therefore, the baby Mary had "embraced Orthodoxy," and the Catholic mother was bound by the same law to train her as a schismatic. However, Mme. Denisow succeeded in sending her child to a convent in Nice, where she remained until she reached womanhood. Returning to her native land, Mary married a Catholic named Kleczewski, in June, 1867. A child was born of this marriage in February, 1868, and was duly baptized by a Catholic priest. On the day after this baptism Kleczewski was summoned to the office of the chief of police, and questioned as to how he had dared to espouse an "Orthodox"

woman, and as to how he had dared to have the offspring of that "Orthodox" woman baptized according to the Catholic rite. The trembling man was told to choose between Siberia on the one hand, and on the other a re-marriage to Mary in an "Orthodox" church, accompanied by the obligation to educate his present child and all future offspring in the religion of Holy Russia. If he refused to comply with the law, not only would he be sent to Siberia, but he would also know that his babe had been taken from its mother and was being raised in the asylum for illegitimate children. Kleczewski succeeded in having the case carried to the courts, but the decision was that "the said Mary *Denisow*, *cohabiting with Kleczewski*, should be confined in a Russian convent; the child to be *re-baptized*, with new name and surname, and to be consigned to a House of Refuge." Before the sentence could be executed, the little family had crossed the frontier.¹ It is not surprising that under pressure like this of the Kleczewski family there were many instances of Polish nobles and gentlemen succumbing to Russification during the reign of Alexander II. The most notable of these apostates were Bielnicki, marshal of the nobility of Troki; Prince Bronislas Drucki Lubecki; the two brothers Mirski, and Prince Nicholas Radziwill. In justice to Radziwill, however, we must record that at the time of his defection he was more than half demented. In 1867 he wrote to the czar offering to "embrace Orthodoxy," on condition that he were allowed to repudiate his wife, and to marry, at the same time, two daughters of a certain schismatic priest. Lax as is the practice of the "Orthodox" Church in the matter of divorce, Alexander II. and his Holy Synod found this application rather extravagant; and a government officer was instructed to subject the amorous prince to a medical examination. The physician testified that Radziwill was crazy; but, nevertheless, the representative of the czar pronounced the unfortunate duly enrolled in the State Church of Holy Russia.²

In the estimation of the "Orthodox" clergy, the chief glory of the reign of Alexander II. was not the emancipation of the serfs, but rather the delivery of the Uniate Greeks of Russian Poland from the "thralldom" of Rome, and their subjection to that instrument of czarocracy, the Holy Synod. Although officially destroyed in the ancient Polish provinces since 1839, the United Greek rite still subsisted in 1866 in the "kingdom of Poland," being concentrated in the diocese of Chelm, the sole Uniate diocese which "Orthodox" persecution had spared. This diocese had a popu-

¹ The *Dygodnik Katolicki* of Grodzisk, January 1, 1869.

² See the *Journal of Posen*, May 5, 1871, and August 13, 1872.

lation of about 250,000 Uniate Ruthenians, who lived in such a state of intermixture with the same number of Polish Latin Catholics that in many of the villages the two parochial churches were attended indiscriminately by persons of either rite. In 1865, two years after the insurrection, a deputation from all the communes of Poland having waited on the czar at St. Petersburg to thank him for his release of the peasants from certain burdens, the Ruthenian delegates availed themselves of the occasion to entreat His Majesty to leave them their religion. Alexander replied: "*I give you my imperial word that your religion shall not be touched.*" And, nevertheless, in less than a year from that time, the compulsory transformation of the Uniate diocese of Chelm into a schismatic one had been begun. This "gentle" Alexander II. commenced with the schools. He pretended to regard the kingdom of Poland as divided into four nationalities: Polish, Lithuanian, Ruthenian, and German. In order to prevent the children of the Ruthenians (all Uniates) from frequenting the "Polish" schools, as the Russians termed those in which were any Catholics of the Latin rite, special institutions were established for them; and when the parents asked why their little ones should be forced to learn the Russian language, when their prayer-books were all couched in Polish, the government introduced Russian into the churches, and consequently into the prayer-books. Kalinski, the bishop of Chelm, resisted; but he was arrested, and ostensibly deported to Wiatka. Nothing more was ever heard of this episcopal "rebel"; the Russian authorities said that he had died on the journey, but his children (he was a widower when he became a bishop) could never learn where the death had occurred. After the disappearance of Kalinski, the government gave the administratorship of the diocese to a canon named Wojcicki, who reorganized the consistories, appointing to them a number of schismatics and several apostate priests from Gallicia. Circulars were sent by Wojcicki to all the parish priests, recommending the introduction of many schismatical usages, and the suppression of many Catholic rites which he pronounced redolent of "Latinism." The Ruthenians were told that the matters at issue concerned their nationality, not their religion. The same insidious method was pursued by Kuziemski, a Gallician whom the czar nominated in 1868 to the see of Chelm, and whom the Holy See preconized, since hitherto he had enjoyed an excellent reputation. But the event proved that when the Russian government selected Kuziemski as successor to Kalinski, it had perceived an instrument for its own purposes in his weakness of character.

There was another motive for the Russian selection of Kuzi-
emski. An Austrian subject, and at one time a deputy in the
parliament of Vienna, he was one of the leaders of those Ruthenian
priests of Gallicia who, under the name of "St. Georgians" (so
called from the titular saint of the United Greek cathedral of Lem-
berg), posed as defenders of Ruthenian nationality against the
Poles, and who feigned to be bulwarks of strength whereby the
members of the Oriental rite could resist the alleged attacks on
their customs by the enterprising Latins. This party supported
an organ entitled the "*Slowo*," a journal which was Catholic only
in name, since it openly advocated the establishment of a national
church. The reader must remember that the United Greek clergy
of Gallicia—married, of course, like the schismatic secular priests—
form a hereditary class, and that, therefore, they are completely
absorbed in their family interests. Hence is derived their hatred
of everything Polish, especially of the Polish nobility, for whom
they would substitute themselves; and hence, consequently, comes
their distrust, if not hatred, for everything Latin. And here we
may remark that it is this caste which disposes of the Ruthenian
votes in the Cis-Leithan parliament; and that Russia, interested
in a rivalry which existed long before the partition of Poland, en-
courages that rivalry in a thousand ways, under the very eyes of
Austria, which seems to be blind to the lamentable fact. In the
Paris "*Monde*" of September 2, 1875, we read an illustration of
the strange complicity of the Uniate clergy of Gallicia with the
Russian destroyers of the Uniates of the diocese of Chelm. We
perceive how Russia, ever since 1830, labored for the perversion
of the Catholics of the Greco-Slavonic rite, not only in Gallicia,
but even in Hungary and Illyria. While Marcellus Popiel, the
famous apostate, was a student in the Uniate College at Vienna,
the Russian ambassador, Raiewski, cultivated most intimate rela-
tions with all the inmates of that institution. He visited them for
hours at a time, entertained them frequently in his own mansion,
and never conversed with them on other than political matters.
In 1848 the Austrian government, in order to neutralize the
Polish discontent in Gallicia, excited the Ruthenian population
against the Latin Poles. From that time it was not an extra-
ordinary thing to hear the Ruthenian subjects of His Apostolic
Majesty lauding Holy Russia as the mother of their nationality,
and acclaiming the Holy Synod as the protectress of their Church.
Apostasy was not infrequent on the part of the Austrian Ruthenian
priests. In 1874, when the Austrian government so far imitated
the German as to persecute the Church with those laws which,

after the fashion of *lucus a non lucendo*, were termed "ecclesiastical," the seven Ruthenian priestly deputies (one of them the rector of their seminary) all voted for the enactments. Facts like these cause many acute observers of Polish affairs to believe that most of the Austrian Ruthenian clergy are already Muscovite at heart, and that the people will be drawn quite easily into the schismatic ranks when Russia obtains possession of Eastern Galicia; and the same facts account for the readiness of the Russian government in appointing the Gallician, Kuziemski, to the see of Chelm.

Shortly after his arrival in Chelm, Kuziemski issued a pastoral against what he styled the "Polish propaganda," describing its effects as truly lamentable, since, as he declared, *on a soil essentially Muscovite*, many had ventured to quit the Uniate for the Latin rite; thus denying, moaned the lying sycophant, both their Church and their nationality. The manifesto concluded with the command that *all who had passed to Catholicism*, or who came of parents who had *illegally* changed their *religion*, should return to the *United Greek Church*. Let not the reader fail to note this affectation of a belief that Catholicism and the Latin rite are synonymous—an affectation which is habitual among "Orthodox" Russians, just as among all other Eastern schismatics. When the "Orthodox" Russian uses such language to a United Greek, he (consistently with his system) implies that there is only one true and legitimate Greek rite—namely, that of the Photian or Cerularian schism of which his Church is the daughter. But the utterance of such sentiments by Kuziemski, a bishop who called himself a Catholic, is certainly one of the curiosities of religious literature. No wonder that the Uniates discerned in their bishop a future Siemaszko. Great indeed, however, was their surprise on March 18, 1871, when the official journal announced that the ill-health of Mgr. Kuziemski had led him to ask His Imperial Majesty to relieve him of his functions, and that he was about to return to Lemberg. The hatred of Kuziemski for the Poles had induced him to follow the suggestions of the Czar to the very point of apostasy; but since he refused to plunge into the abyss, he received his passports. His successor, Marcellus Popiel, was more complacent to Holy Russia. Popiel had been the most zealous of all the supporters of Wojcicki; and at the time when the Vatican Council was about to convene, he had publicly declared that if the papal infallibility were pronounced a matter of faith, he would not accept the definition. Such was the new administrator of Chelm, who was summoned by Count Tolstoy, the procurator-

general of the Holy Synod, to a council in St. Petersburg, which the czar had appointed to settle the affairs of the United Greek Church in his dominions. The other members of this council, besides Tolstoy, were Count Schouvaloff and the governors of the departments of Lublin and Siedlcé. The nature of its conclusions is easily perceived in the speech made at a farewell dinner given in Chelm by Kokoszkin, the Russian functionary who had hitherto acted as imperial supervisor over the religious affairs of the Uniates: "The difficult task with which I was entrusted by Count Tolstoy, the Minister of Public Instruction, is ended. . . . The continuation of this mission is confided by the government to the most reverend administrator of the diocese, and to you, honorable gentlemen, who have comprehended the intentions of the government so well. It is true that there are still some fanatical priests in this diocese who do not appreciate the happiness of being definitively united with our holy mother, Russia, and who, therefore, prevent us from uniting ourselves with her; but I trust that they will soon perceive the error into which Polish intrigue has led them. Believe me, gentlemen, for I am an honest man, . . . and I assure you that no religion is better than the Orthodox Greco-Russian, that no civilization is superior to the Russian, and that there is no happiness so great as that of being a subject of the magnanimous emperor, Alexander II. Reflect well, you gentlemen of Gallicia! Do you not know, by your own experience, that I am speaking the truth? I need say nothing concerning the most reverend administrator of the diocese, whose learning and virtues are so well appreciated *by His Excellency the minister* who honors him with his confidence. But you, Father Rector,¹ would you have been made a canon by the Austrian government? Would that government have given you the cross which now rests on your noble breast? And you, Father Cybilin, would you have attained your present dignities under that government? No! It is only under a government like ours, under a monarch like ours, that one can hope to be so honored. . . . Although, Gallicians, you may be true representatives of *that part of Russia which is oppressed by Austria*, I regret that I cannot speak as freely in Lemberg itself, at the side of the worthy Fathers Malinowski, Pawlikow, Pietrusiewicz, and other honorable personages whom I know so well; *but let us hope that our desires will soon be satisfied*. I offer this toast to the health of His Majesty, the President of the Holy Synod of St. Petersburg, *who is the Supreme Head of the Orthodox*

¹ Krynicki, who had been called from Gallicia to be the rector of the seminary of Chelm.

Greco-Russian Church." The priests who applauded this speech termed themselves Catholics; but their effrontery was well matched by that of the Russian government, which, generally so severe in its censorship of the press, allowed the effusion of Kokozskin to be published in "*The Polish Journal*" (December 11, 1872). Here is a high functionary of Russia publicly advancing the pretensions of his autocrat to Austrian Galicia—claims based only on the community of rite followed by the Ruthenians of Russian Poland and by the Ruthenians of Austrian Poland. The czarate must be confident that it has already a number of Austrian Gallicians devoted to itself, a number sufficiently large to encourage it to speedy overt action—a number of unworthy priests like those who have been expelled or are voluntary exiles from Galicia, who have been received into the diocese of Chelm, where, like Popiel and others, they have become or will become canons, pastors, even bishops, replacing the faithful ecclesiastics who are banished from the kingdom when they are not sent to Siberia.¹

In his zeal for the Russification of the Ruthenians, Popiel found that he could not obtain a sufficiency of pliable priests from Galicia, and therefore his agents looked around for a number of wretches who were willing to enter into Holy Orders as his servants. Such were easily found; but how were they to be ordained? He procured the services of the notorious Sokolski, a Bulgarian who had abjured the Greek Schism, had then been consecrated by Pius IX. himself, and had finally apostatized.² Popiel caused Sokolski, then residing in Galicia, to make several visits to Chelm; and each visit was made the occasion of an ordination of

¹ In the Paris *Univers* of April 10, 1875, we read: "If we remember that in Galicia there are 2,300,000 United Greeks, and in Hungary and Transylvania more than 800,000, we may understand the danger which menaces the Austro-Hungarian Empire, not only from a religious, but from a political point of view. The cause of the evil is found in the miserable temporal condition of the United Greek priests, who are very numerous in Galicia and Hungary, and are all married and fathers of families. By paying them, the Russian government makes them its instruments."

² In 1860 many thousands of Bulgarian schismatics, headed by their pastors, declared their subjection to the Holy See, and besought the Pontiff to give them a bishop. The candidate whom they presented was Joseph Sokolski, an archimandrite of one of their Basilian monasteries, and a person of approved morals and of supposed simplicity of character. In order to demonstrate to the neophytes his paternal interest, Pius IX. raised Sokolski to the episcopate in the Sistine chapel; and the new bishop departed for Bulgaria laden with costly presents from His Holiness and the Roman patricians, which were intended to adorn the churches of the converts. Sokolski arrived in due time at Constantinople, but then he suddenly disappeared. Rumors reached Rome that he had been kidnapped by Russian emissaries, but it was finally learned that he had succumbed to the temptations of the Russian ambassador, and had returned to the schism. For interesting details concerning Sokolski and the reunion of the Bulgarians see the Paris *Correspondant*, November 25, 1860.

several prospective apostates. Popiel was unable to seduce the masses of the laity; but he had much success with the children, who were placed under the tuition of either open or secret schismatics, and were taught the Greco-Russian hymns and Catechism, while nothing was allowed to remind them that the Church of their baptism was a part of the Universal Church which is ruled by the Successor of St. Peter. As we have already observed, none of the innovations of the Russifiers were presented to the people as tending to withdraw them from the communion of Rome; everything was designated as a "purification of the United Greek rite" from the deleterious intermixture of Latin observances. But the eyes of the simple-minded were opened when they saw that sixty-three of their priests preferred imprisonment, or even Siberia, to a connivance with the "purification";¹ when they saw these faithful pastors replaced by vagabond foreigners, whose first thoughts were of Russian gold; when they found themselves threatened with fines and the knout if they entered Latin churches; when they saw the new clergy affecting all the externals of the schismatic "popes," and heard them preaching in Russian. At first the resistance was passive; but when Popiel threw off the mask it became active, and was frequently signalized by martyrdom. In the beginning of October, 1873, the Holy Synod told Popiel that he was proceeding too slowly; therefore, on the 31st (O. S., 19th) he sent to each one of his deans a copy of a new ritual which was openly schismatical, and he enjoined on each dean to enforce its adoption in all the churches of his deanery on and after January 1, 1874. In this new manual of liturgy, wherever the name of the Roman Pontiff had occurred, it was replaced by the words "the hierarchy." Since all the deans were creatures of Popiel, and since they had already installed men like themselves in nearly all the parishes, the people were dismayed when, on entering their churches at the time appointed for the change, they found themselves confronted by sanctuaries which displayed all the paraphernalia of the schismatic cult. The horrors which now ensued in every part of the vast diocese of Chelm have no parallels in modern history. The rods of the Cossacks and other more refined tortures knew no distinctions of age, sex, or relative debility, as they were applied for the purpose of extorting signatures to a petition addressed to "The Most Clement Czar, The Father Of All

¹ Popiel took care to publish in the official journals that he "had been obliged to remove from their parishes only a few of the clergy for their refusal to obey the orders of the government"; but the journals of Lemberg submitted a list of sixty-three who had been imprisoned or banished in one year.

The Russians," begging that he would deign to hearken to the "voluntary" prayers of "his loving Ruthenians," as they besought him "to be admitted to the embrace of the Holy Orthodox Church." Those who scorned this embrace of a daughter of foul schism and heresy received, when the regulations were observed (and they were generally exceeded), fifty lashes of the terrible Cossack *Nahajka*, if they were men; if they were women they were supposed to escape with twenty-five, and the children were deemed worthy of only ten. Mr. Jewell, then Minister of these United States to the Russian court, wrote to Secretary Fish on February 23, 1874, that many of "*the most obstinate and audacious women*" received a hundred lashes; and the callous envoy studiously abstained from stating the number of the "obstinate and audacious" Catholics who died from the effects of those lashes. For details of this persecution we refer the reader to the works of Martinov and Lescoeur, which we have already cited, and to the pages of the *Monde* and of the *Univers*, for 1874. We shall mention only a few cases in illustration of the eagerness which, according to the Russian official reports, the Uniates manifested for a separation from the Holy See.

In the village of Uscimow an officer named Tur ordered his squadron to drive the inhabitants to the neighboring lake. The unfortunates were pushed into the icy waters, and there compelled to remain for several hours, with only their heads and shoulders unsubmerged. Only when the demon became convinced that he could not obtain their signatures did he allow them to leave the lake. Colonel Klemenko, governor of the district of Kurnick, and Kalinski, governor of Siedlcé, drove their populations bareheaded into the open fields, when the thermometer indicated a cold of 16 degrees (Reaumur), intending to keep them there until they yielded. The guards were relieved every two hours, while the "voluntary converts" persisted in remaining unconverted. When the persecutors found that their efforts were futile, they pillaged every house in the two districts. At Wlodawa, a captain of Cossacks, one Formin, saw three women die under the lashes of his men. At Pratulin, in the district of Janow, Colonel Stein shot nine of the obstinate to death, and wounded four mortally. Then he drove the inhabitants to witness the effects of disobedience to the orders of the benign czar. The mother of Onufry Wasyluk, one of the victims, was wailing over his body, when his wife cried out, "Mother, do not weep for your son. I do not weep for the death of my husband, for he is a martyr for the faith." Then the president of the district, Kutanin, thought that he might effect by

persuasion what terror could not produce. He tried to bribe a peasant named Pikuta, an old man whose probity and intelligence had made him a power in the district, to persuade the people to become the spiritual subjects of their tender autocrat. Pikuta signified his readiness to address his neighbors, and Kutanin called out to the crowd, "Here is a man whom you love and respect. He will tell you what you ought to do." Pikuta spoke as follows: "You wish me, president, to tell my neighbors how they shall act. I am ready to obey you; but they know already what I would say. There is but one course for all of us—we must remain invincibly attached to our holy faith, come what may." Then the patriarch fell on his knees, and signed to his hearers to imitate him. When all had knelt, he drew from his bosom a crucifix, and pronounced the following oath, the people repeating it after him: "I swear by my grey hairs, by the salvation of my soul, by my hope of seeing God at the moment of my death, that I will never abandon one iota of our faith. The holy martyrs suffered innumerable persecutions for this faith; our brethren have shed their blood for it, and we must imitate them." The soldiers immediately seized the brave old man, and having loaded him with chains, dragged him to prison.¹

Martinov records an instance of a young mother being threatened with Siberia if she would not sign the act of apostasy; and when the officers told her that they would take her babe from her, she blessed the little one and placed it in the arms of one of them, saying, "There it is; God will care for it."² In the face of facts like these the official journal of St. Petersburg dared to say, on January 26, 1875, that "the opposition of the Latin Church and the Encyclicals of the Pope have had only one result—the *voluntary* conversion of 45 parishes, 26 ecclesiastics, and 50,000 parishioners to the Greek (schismatic) rite." And our Mr. Jewell, the sage diplomat already cited, informed his government that the priests of Chelm, as well as those of Siedlcé, had decided "unanimously" to join the Orthodox Church. Mr. Jewell was careful to remark that "probably" this change of religious profession would be attributed to "violence"; and then the oracle emitted this solemn judgment: "It is more likely that an absence of all persecution and the progress of the age have tempered religious *fanaticism*, and prepared the way for more material and more pro-

¹ *The Schism and Its Apostles*, published anonymously at Cracow in 1875, and translated into French for *Le Monde*.

² *The Brigandage of Chelm*, in the *Etudes Religieuses* of June, 1875.

saic interests, in this century of ours *in which Mammon is so powerful.*"¹

The supplication for union with the Church of Holy Russia, which Popiel and his staff of excommunicated and degraded priests addressed to the head of that Church, Alexander II., is an interesting document: "Most August Monarch, Most Merciful Lord! All the ancient Russian provinces which had fallen under the Polish domination, have had the happiness of re-entering the One, Holy, Orthodox Church. . . . The sole diocese of Chelm experienced the misfortune of remaining longer *under a foreign rule, remaining in union with the Popes of Rome, who, as has been well demonstrated by ancient facts and recent experience, govern the Church in a spirit which is not the spirit of kindness and of love which was taught by Jesus Christ, but rather a spirit which regards neither the temporal happiness nor the eternal salvation of the flock.* The powerful words of Your Imperial Majesty have broken the chains of serfdom which fettered the Russian people, and which were especially heavy in this region, under the influence of men of another religion, who sought to make the Russian population, ever animated by an ardent love for their Russian country, a blind and docile instrument of their political intrigues. The series of governmental measures which followed the emancipation of the peasants, the object of which was the well-being of the people and the clergy, *and, above all, the abundant revenues accorded by Your Majesty for the training of all classes in the Russian spirit,* have awakened in the populations the sentiment of national and ecclesiastical unity with the rest of Russia which had been suffocated under the *foreign* domination. . . . Firmly convinced of the purity of the dogmas of the Orthodox Church of all the Russias, from the communion of which *we were so long withheld,* and governed by the interests of the flock confided to our care, *and which thinks as we do,* we have resolved to prostrate ourselves at the feet of Your Imperial Majesty, begging you most humbly to assure the happiness of the Russian Uniates in the diocese of Chelm by allowing them to join the Orthodox Church of their ancestors, so that with one heart and one only tongue we may glorify God, and address to Him our prayers, together with the entire Russian people, for your health and welfare, Most Pious Emperor, and for the happiness and prosperity of Russia, the country which is so dear to us." This masterpiece of hypocrisy was soon followed by a *Capitular Act*, in which the "Chapter of

¹ We quote from the *Monde* of April 29, 1875.

Chelm" announced to the faithful subject to it that they were now children of the State Church of Russia; and which, from beginning to end, was redolent of the ideas of Tolstoy, and was frequently a *verbatim* reproduction of the audacious assertions of that minister. The Chapter, or probably Tolstoy writing in the name of that body, begins by giving the simple-minded Ruthenians a lesson in ecclesiastical history. They are told that "it was from the Orient, from the Greek Church, that their Slavic ancestors derived the faith"; but they are not told that when Sts. Cyril and Methodius evangelized the Slavs, and when "Greek priests first preached to *the Russians*," the Greek Church was subject to the Roman Pontiff, just as it had been from the beginning of Christianity. It is asserted that from that time (where was "Russia" then?) "the Orthodox *Oriental* Faith penetrated to the very foundations of the *national life of Russia*," and thenceforth "*the name of Russia was identified with that of Orthodox*." The conversion of the Ruthenian schismatics in the sixteenth century is ascribed to the "treachery of the bishops, who yielded to Polish pressure, and were *guided by Jesuits who were hardened in intrigue*." Here the hand of a layman, of a politician instead of a theologian, betrays itself; for while blaming the "treacherous bishops" for "interpolating" the *Filioque* in the *Creed*, the instructor says that those churchmen, when thus interfering with the purity of the Faith, "forgot the advice of St Paul, in *II. Tim., ch. i., v. 6, 7*."¹ The Uniates are informed that "although very able measures were taken to entangle the people of Western Russia in the nets of the Roman domination and of Polonization, from the first moment of the proclamation of the Union the people perceived that in that Union with Rome there was involved not only a subordination to the bishop of Rome, but an attack on the purity of the Eastern Faith, and an attack on the foundations of the national life, and on their nationality itself. The people understood that *the object of the Union was the complete absorption of the Russians, and the destruction of their very name*." The writer complains that "nearly all the Western Russian nobles had passed to the Latin rite; and that the Polish government, and the party of the Jesuits and of the Polish gentry, used every effort to efface every difference *between Catholicism and the Union*." And why not? "Uniate" and "Catholic" were synonyms in Poland. However, by "Cath-

¹ Certainly there is no argument against the *Filioque* in these words: "For which cause I admonish thee, that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of my hands. For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of sobriety."

olicism" the writer means "Polonism." Very innocently indeed the "Orthodox" apologist says that "when Poland lost her political existence, the Union immediately weakened in the provinces annexed to Russia. During the reign of Catharine II., two millions of Uniates returned to Orthodoxy; and in 1839, under the Emperor Nicholas I., of blessed memory, the remaining Uniates in the western provinces, *having declared solemnly that they renounced the Union, were received into the fold of the Orthodox Church. Thus it was with extreme facility that destruction fell on a work which had been accomplished by a double use of force, by a violation of the rights of conscience, and by material oppression.*" The sublime impudence of this passage needs no comment. But the diocese of Chelm was yet to be saved from the cruel Union which caused the Uniates "to manifest toward the Russian population religious intolerance and hostility, in all their force"; and the first measure for its redemption was taken when the "tender" Alexander II. opened rural schools for the children, "*wherein they might be trained in an atmosphere not corrupted by political agitators.*" The next measure, says Popiel or his Mentor, was the establishment of higher schools in which "*the young generation might imbibe the Russian spirit.*" Under the benevolent rule of Alexander II., writes the pen of the Holy Synod, "the Uniate clergy felt the need of examining more attentively their position in the land, and to understand better their duties toward their flocks." They resolved to enter the Church of Holy Russia, in spite of the machinations of the Pope, who "legitimated all the alterations and Latino-Polish innovations in the United Greek rite; who showered blessings on the apostates¹ who separated themselves from the Church and the people." And the chief reason why Popiel and his precious "Chapter" could not remain Uniates was found in their unwillingness to place themselves in opposition to the dispositions and measures of the Russian government, "*and even in opposition to that Most August Emperor who had conferred so many favors on them, the humble ministers of the altars.*" Popiel received his thirty pieces of silver in the shape of the "Orthodox" diocese of Lublin, created expressly as a reward for his "apostolic" labors. Thus was consummated the extirpation of the United Greeks in Russian Poland—a work of fraud and violence far more detestable than that of England toward Catholic Ireland; since, before this century, England had never formally promised freedom of conscience to the Irish. In 1773, after the first par-

¹ These "apostates" were those who abandoned the excommunicated Popiel.

tion of Poland, that crowned prostitute whom "Orthodox" Russians style "Catharine the Good" stipulated, in the sixth article of the apposite treaty, that "*the Catholic religion, in both rites, shall be maintained in the ceded provinces, and its rights and property shall be respected.*" In 1793, in the treaty for the second partition, the same German Messalina on a Slavic throne promised "*irrevocably for herself, and for her heirs and successors, to maintain perpetually the Roman Catholics of both rites in the unchangeable possession of their prerogatives, properties, and churches, as well as in the free exercise of their worship and discipline, and in all the rights pertaining to the cult of their religion; declaring that neither she nor any of her successors would ever attempt to exercise any sovereign rights in prejudice of the Roman Catholic religion of the two rites.*" Alexander I. ratified the treaties of 1814-15 which were entailed by the Congress of Vienna, and which guaranteed full liberty of worship to the Poles. In 1832 the Russian ambassador to the Vatican communicated to Pope Gregory XVI., by order of Nicholas I., an imperial Organic Statute which guaranteed that "the government of His Majesty would ever show special respect for the religion which was professed by the greater part of its Polish subjects." In 1847 Nicholas I. entered into a new Concordat, which repeated the assurances of 1832. And finally, only ten years before the catastrophe of Chelm, Alexander II. had said to a Ruthenian deputation, "I give you my imperial word that no one shall touch your religion. I shall not permit it."

Justice to Alexander II. demands that we record that during the last days of his reign he manifested a conciliatory tendency toward the Holy See. When Leo XIII. mounted the papal throne in 1878, the absence of diplomatic relations with Russia did not prevent His Holiness from notifying the czar of his elevation. One of this Pontiff's earliest acts was the issue of a powerful Encyclical against Nihilism; and it so pleased Alexander II. that he caused it to be read in all the churches of his empire, despite the signature of "Supreme Pontiff," with which it terminated. The czar even caused his ambassador at Vienna, Prince Oubril, to enter into a comparatively just arrangement with Mgr. Jacobini, the papal nuncio at that capital, concerning the episcopal nominations and Catholic education in Russia; and as a further proof of his good intentions, he sent his sons to the Vatican in December, 1880. But the too usual fate of a monarch of Holy Russia befel Alexander II. ere he was able to prove that his sense of justice toward his Catholic subjects was conceived in other than a

spirit of velleity. The first acts of Alexander III. in reference to the Holy See indicated a desire to follow in the later rather than in the early footsteps of his father. The audience of Prince Oubril with Leo XIII., on April 20, 1881, was marked by every deference on the part of the envoy, and on the following December 24th a draft for a Concordat was signed at the Vatican by Jacobini (then a cardinal) and M. de Giers, the prime minister of the czar. Then came the Franco-Russian *rapprochement*, and, as a natural consequence (since every Russian coolness toward Berlin means some consideration for the Papacy, and *vice versa*), closer relations were resumed between the autocratic and the papal courts. M. Iswolski arrived in Rome as Russian ambassador at the Vatican in 1888, shortly after the treaty of San Stefano, when Alexander III. withdrew from the Triple Alliance which had bound together the cabinets of Vienna, St. Petersburg and Berlin. But Catholic optimists had forgotten one important personage. Constantine Pobedonostzef, the successor of Tolstoy as procurator of the Holy Synod, was implacably averse to any renunciation of the abuses which are the very life-blood of Russian bureaucrats; and as he had been the chief tutor of Alexander III.—a timid and hesitating man, although physically a giant—his influence over that sovereign was immense. He reminded his former pupil of the principal lesson which he had learned: that official "Orthodoxy" is the symbol and the sole *raison d'être* of Muscovite power and glory; that the entire programme of Russian policy should be based on the principle, "All and everything for *pravoslavié* or Slav "Orthodoxy"; in Russia all interests must yield to those of *pravoslavié*, for there is no *jus contra jus*."¹ Pobedonostzef gained his point, and in certain parts of Poland men soon came to think that Nicholas I. still reigned. The Polish language was absolutely proscribed in all schools; not even among themselves, and during recreation, could students use it. Not only teaching, but also preaching, was to be in Russian, even when the hearers did not understand a word of that language. No Polish Catholic could be employed by the state or by a municipality, even in the most menial capacity; with one stroke of the pen 55,000 Poles, employed on the railroads, were condemned either to apostasy or destitution. In no governmental document, and in no journal or periodical, could the name of Poland occur; the country was to be designated as the "Land of the Vistula." Children were marched by force from the schools to the schis-

¹ Villefranche, *Contemporary Russia*, p. 316. Paris, 1895.

matic churches. Innumerable Catholic churches were closed or destroyed. Entire villages were proclaimed "Orthodox" despite the protests of the inhabitants, and exile was the lot of the Catholic priest who dared to administer the Sacraments to those whose names the Holy Synod had placed on its registers. Where neither force, nor knout, nor money availed to crush "Polish obstinacy," Siberia was made the missionary of the State Establishment. In the governments of Vilna and Grodno, where in the olden time all the churches had been Catholic, and in 1863 one-half had become schismatic, in 1893 there were only 292 Catholic churches to 983 schismatic ones. The massacre of Krozé, in the province of Grodno, will serve as an illustration of the methods adopted by the apostles of "Orthodoxy," and of the culpability of the imperial government in the premises. The authorities having closed a parish church as a preliminary measure to its transfer to the state clergy, about a hundred peasants entered the edifice. They were immediately attacked by some Cossacks, and eight were killed, while forty-two were grievously wounded. Fifteen of the women were outraged, and their companions were knouted nearly unto death. When Pope Leo XIII. heard of the matter from unexceptional sources he protested to the czar, and that potentate ordered Prince Cantacuzene to make an investigation. The result was a report to the effect that the Catholics of Krozé, "justly suspected of Polonism, had attacked the imperial soldiers, and had met a deserved punishment." Then the Pontiff sent to Alexander III., by a sure hand, the evidence which had prompted his complaint, remarking, in an autograph letter, "It is evident, Sire, that one of us has been egregiously deceived. Since you are nearer to Krozé than I am, deign to discover, for yourself, which one of us receives misleading reports." The czar made a personal inquiry, and having found that Cantacuzene had hidden the guilt of the authorities of Krozé, he sent for the prince, and it is said that in the height of his indignation he gave the culprit a blow in the face. Be this as it may, Cantacuzene felt that he was disgraced, and on the following day he poisoned himself. Meanwhile the survivors of the massacre were languishing in prison, and it became necessary to try them. Some generous Russian lawyers, who had been edified by their behavior in the jails, volunteered to defend them. Evidence of their innocence was abundant; but, nevertheless, four of the accused were condemned to ten years of hard labor, three to Siberia, and twenty to some months of further imprisonment. The greater and most influential part of the European press, and all of the American

secular and Protestant religious journals, entirely ignored this and similar episodes of the reign of Alexander III.; for the victims were Catholics. The editors, or at least the masters, of the principal continental journals of Europe are nearly all Jews, and when the "Orthodox" Russians direct their engines of persecution against the usurers of the Hebrew race we are overwhelmed with columns of pathos. The time was when the Jews of Poland and of Russia sympathized with the Catholic victims of the Photian schismatics; and this sympathy was natural, the Jews having suffered nearly as much as the Catholics after the partition of Poland, whereas in the ancient Catholic kingdom they had enjoyed extraordinary privileges; for instance, in the eleventh century they enjoyed the right of imprisoning Christians for debt—a right which, among the Polish Christians, was exercised only by the nobles. In 1334 Casimir the Great pronounced the Jews *idonei et fideles*, and subjected them, just as the nobles were, to the common or territorial law, whereas the Christian burghers were subject to the more irksome Germanic municipal law. This Polish monarch even decreed that the testimony of a Christian should avail nothing against a Jew, unless it were corroborated by that of another Jew; whereas the oath of a Jew sufficed to convict a Christian of debt, and he could levy on the property of that Christian, if such a course was necessary in order to obtain his money. Even after 1406, when public indignation against Jewish extortions excited a bloody persecution against them, and when many privileges were taken from them, the Jews retained their civil equality with the Christians, and were even allowed to teach in the Polish universities. When the Polish Jews passed under the Russian domination, among other new burdens they incurred that of subjection to military service. It is true that Alexander I. remitted this obligation in the case of all Jews who could pay a fine; but Nicholas, from a population of two millions of Polish Jews, took twenty thousand for his army and many thousands of boys for his navy. This czar tried to subject the Polish Jews to the religious laws of his empire; and he designed to transfer them all in a body, when Russian conquests would have permitted, to some region beyond the Taurus.

When Alexander III. succumbed, in 1894, to the disease which had been the consequence of his attempted assassination in 1888, he was succeeded by his son, Nicholas II. Like those of his father, the first public acts of the young monarch promised a small but still acceptable measure of justice to his Catholic subjects. The victims of Krozé were allowed to return to their

homes. General Orowski, the governor of Vilna, was summoned to St. Petersburg, to answer for his course in the fearful episode; but, like Cantacuzene, he cared not to survive his fall, and he blew out his brains in the railway carriage which was bearing him away from the capital. Gourko, the terrible executor of the mandates of Pobiedonostzef in the "Land of the Vistula," was placed on the retired list. Mgr. Vincent Popiel, archbishop of Warsaw, was allowed, together with two other Catholic bishops, to visit Rome—an authorization which had not been accorded during the previous fifty years. But a few days after the removal of Gourko, when the Poles had begun to realize the sweetness of easy breath, it transpired that Nicholas II. had written to him a letter of most affectionate praise—a letter in which the hand of Pobiedonostzef was plainly discerned. The czar lauded the "admirable" conduct of his governor-general; his "conscientious and energetic" method of welding the Polish provinces to the vast empire, "of which they are an integral part"; especially his zeal for the cause of official *pravoslavié*, as manifested by his erection of an "Orthodox" cathedral in the very centre of Warsaw. "By such efficacious means," concluded Nicholas II., "the influence of the Russian Church will be considerably augmented at the western confines of the empire." After the contents of this letter became public property, no surprise was expressed because the new sovereign deferred until after his marriage (November 16, 1894) any judgment in the case of the seminary of Kielcé, which had been closed because some Polish books had been found in it. For this "crime" all of the professors had been arrested, and some of them had been deported to Siberia. We do not know, as we write these pages, whether any of these "conspirators" were included in the amnesty which, as usual on such occasions, followed the marriage of Nicholas II.; but we do know that since that amnesty very many priests have been exiled for just such "treasons" as they committed. Thus, some months afterward, twenty-four priests were deported; all being condemned to three or five years of exile, and all who were teachers being deprived forever of the right of teaching. In justification of this proceeding there was adduced a note found in a memorandum-book belonging to one of them, showing that they had entered into an agreement to aid each other in the difficulties which the incessant Russian persecutions of the Church would probably entail upon them. At this same time the Paris *Monde*, one of the few (even among Catholic) French journals whose anxiety for the Russian alliance permits them to speak candidly on these matters, narrated how

the bishop of Sandomir, returning from a visit to Warsaw, whither he had been summoned to "welcome" the new governor, found a squad of police dragging one of his most worthy associates from the episcopal residence; and how, when the bishop attempted to embrace the unfortunate, he was thrust aside, an order having been issued by the government prohibiting all communication with the arrested. At that time, also, some humble peasants were dragged from the village of Minoga and deported to the depths of Muscovy, their offence having been a propagation of the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus—a devotion which the Russian State Establishment affects to regard as heretical. We hesitate, therefore, to yield credence to the recent reports concerning an intention on the part of Nicholas II. to grant some small measure of justice to his Catholic subjects.

REUBEN PARSONS, D.D.

IRISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

UNIVERSITY education could not have been thought of by Irish Catholics as a right to which they were entitled until this century was well advanced. Emancipation was granted in 1829, and under conditions that showed it was a concession to fear and not to justice. If a demand were then put forward for exclusive Catholic education the stock arguments of foreign allegiance, mental reservations and equivocations would be again furnished up for duty. Protestant friends of Emancipation would charge Catholics with breach of faith because their support had been won as much by the submissive attitude of Catholics as by the justice of the cause. These Protestants, with all their liberality, played the part of patrons, and wished the Catholics to think and act in political and social matters under their guidance. They were the security to the State for Catholic loyalty, and their *protégés* should be content with statutory but not practical citizenship.

Since 1794 Catholics could obtain degrees in Trinity College,¹ and some availed themselves of the privilege with loss of faith now and then in those pre-emancipation days, with loss of faith even since emancipation; but we think it will be admitted that since the early fifties there has been no Protestant place of education in the world so liberal to Catholics as Trinity. Still the social atmosphere of Trinity was charged from top to toe with the spirit of the Ascendency. It required exceptional independence on the part of a Catholic to resist its influence. We have seen the result in those Catholic members of Parliament who seemed to be forever apologizing for their position in the House. Their personal courage could not be questioned, but they did not possess one scintilla of social courage.

In connection with the national system of education, and in pursuance of its non-sectarian policy, three State colleges were established and endowed in Ireland, viz. : at Belfast, Cork, and Galway. These are the Queen's colleges. A little later the Queen's University was established, embracing these institutions and coincident with them. The avowed object was to afford an

¹ It is the only college in the University of Dublin, and so overshadowed it that the degrees were always spoken of as of the college, and not of the university.

university career to young men not rich enough to go to Trinity; the object attributed to them was to withdraw the Catholic middle classes and very promising youths of the lower classes from the influence of the Catholic hierarchy. It is not easy to say to what extent this judgment was well-founded, because there was under the scheme an arrangement for deans of residence who could control the moral conduct of the pupils of their own persuasion. It is said that the philosophy taught in these establishments was of a pernicious character, and the history anti-Catholic and anti-Irish. Be that as it may, Parliament was deaf to the representations of the episcopate. The only course open to the hierarchy and the influential laity was to found the establishment called the Catholic University, of which Dr. (afterwards Cardinal) Newman was the first Rector. For this a poor country subscribed, between the years 1852 and 1872, the sum of £200,000; but as it had no charter, no State recognition, it could confer no degrees. Generations of graduates passed through it to the learned professions with the disability that marks a man in such professions who has no degree in arts. From the first the Queen's colleges were a failure. Stricken with sterility by the condemnation of Catholic opinion, their immense resources were expended in conferring easy degrees on Presbyterians, who had come to regard them as their own; on Episcopal Protestants, who had not means sufficient for Trinity, or to whom uncompleted-for prizes and scholarships were a temptation. This is the way higher education for Catholics stood when Mr. Gladstone pronounced it "scandalously bad"; this is the way it stands to-day. The Royal University, created in 1879, was an attempt at solving the question; but this issue may be put aside for the present. The measure of the Tory ministry in 1879 substantially left Catholic university education where it stood before, where it stood in substance and in fact in 1829, where it stood in 1794, the year after a measure was passed which repealed some of the penal laws and gave Catholics some citizenship in their own country. It is true that though any foreign Protestant could without any formality obtain all the rights of a subject in Ireland in the beginning of 1793, though he could become a barrister, a judge, a governor of a county, a member of Parliament, anything, yet a Catholic whose fathers had lived in it for centuries was nothing, and could be nothing. At the close of that year the Catholic was enabled to become a voter but not to be a member of Parliament, a barrister but not a judge. He could practise before some French Huguenot or German Lutheran, if either of these became a judge; he was entitled to vote

for either of such adventurers if he stood for a county or some other constituency not kept in the pocket of a private owner. As one of the freeholders of the county he might serve in a corps of yeomanry at the command of the German or Frenchman, if either were the governor of his county.¹

Objections to the Catholic demand, on the ground that the existing provisions for education are ample, are answered by the admissions of both parties in the State. If men conscientiously object to avail themselves of the Queen's colleges and Trinity, it is useless saying that these institutions are a provision for them. It used to be said that it was not the penal laws that disqualified Catholics for office, but the Catholics themselves. They refused to take oaths and observe certain religious practices which were conditions to entering upon and retaining those offices. The laws did not deprive a Catholic of his estate, but to enjoy an estate of inheritance it was necessary for a man to be a Protestant. If a youth can be educated only according to a system which his father believes is dangerous to his faith and morals, he cannot be educated at all.

Now the position Catholics are placed in is this: they must be satisfied with a less effective education than Protestants; they must pay more for what they get, such as it is, and they go into life branded with the stigma of social inferiority. If this be the case (and there can be no question of it), they have a claim to be placed on a footing of equality with Protestants of all kinds. They are not inferior to Protestants in ability; competitive examinations for the civil service prove this. Irishmen, Protestant and Catholic, are more successful than Englishmen or Scotchmen. The Scotch have always had exceptional advantages in education. The son of a peasant or a small tradesman in Scotland had an university career within his reach when in England or Ireland no one except a comparatively rich man's son possessed it. Any one now can obtain an university education in England; but take the countries even as they stand and we find that in the examinations for the Indian civil service, the army medical, the navy and Indian medical services, and for commissions in the army—in proportion to the number of candidates Irish Catholics more than hold their own. Take the House of Commons as it now stands; there is no section in the House that can present such a high average of debating talent as the Home Rule party. In certain circles in Ireland the opinion prevails that the members of this party

¹ This office is now called Lord-Lieutenancy of a county.

as a whole do not equal the class of ability which would be secured if the political circumstances of the country were normal. It is regarded as a war party. Such a party would have been only hampered by the taste, the knowledge of parliamentary law, and the accomplishments that distinguished the Irish representation before Mr. Parnell introduced a new element. Its value would be in the fact that it was not trammelled by social considerations and traditional usages in pursuing what the late Mr. Butt described as "a policy of exasperation." It is not denied that there are some men in the party now, and one or two out of Parliament, who are equal to their predecessors in everything that constitutes the successful parliamentary man; but, taken as a body, they are not supposed to represent the best elements of Irish Catholic public life. Yet they are superior in debating power, in proportion to their number, to the Tories and Liberals. The men who are considered the best debaters in the House are the First Lord of the Treasury and Sir William Harcourt. Mr. Chamberlain, it is understood, speaks well, but he must select his ground. Mr. Balfour would perhaps admit that there are several Irish members who are prompt to speak on an emergency, and to speak well. It is hard to deny education to such a people, one would think; and yet this really is what is being done by the two parties in the State, though both are committed to the acknowledgment of the grievance and its removal.

It cannot be suggested that this acknowledgment is only a politic pretence of official Tories and official Liberals bidding for Irish Catholic support. It must be remembered that Mr. Gladstone went into power with an unprecedented majority in 1868 to cut down "the three branches of the upas tree" that poisoned the life of the country. One branch was this blight of inferior education from which the majority suffered. The land and the wealth of the country are enjoyed by the Protestant minorities in a very large proportion; yet they possess the educational establishments supported by the State and Trinity College, which is one of the principal landowners in Ireland. Among the Catholics there is a sufficient number of families to supply to a Catholic college of like standing and expense as Trinity College as many students as are on the books of Trinity. This is evident from the number of Catholics who hold the commission of the peace, who belong to the two branches of the legal profession, to the medical profession, who are engaged in commerce, and who hold in their hands large pasture lands, the possession of which necessarily means the command of capital. Its promoters were

the episcopate and the leading laity, who must have well considered the feasibility of the undertaking. The Catholic University was started mainly for such a class. The chairs of the infant institution were filled by men whose works have added to the polite literature and philosophy of the United Kingdom, a by no means unimportant contribution. The hopes of the promoters were defeated, because Government refused even a charter. It was not pressed for an endowment, it was only asked for a license to confer degrees. This was refused, and Sir Robert Peel, as if to mark the policy of the Government, applied to the wealthy Catholics for subscriptions to the Queen's University. Not only would Government not endow and charter a Catholic university, but through him, as Chief Secretary for Ireland, it appealed to Catholics of rank and station for contributions to found scholarships and exhibitions in the Queen's colleges, which, like Sir R. Inglis, an English Tory, they regarded as "godless colleges." This phrase did not arise with Irish Catholics. It was one used by an English Protestant to describe those institutions; but when Irish Catholics refused to avail themselves of the very decided advantages that they offered, it must be supposed that their conscientious objections to the system of education pursued in them were well thought of and firmly rooted. The answer to Sir Robert Peel's circular letter to the leading Catholics was an indignant protest from noblemen and gentlemen in such numbers that it was abundantly clear that that class of Catholics could fill the halls of an university of the social standing of Trinity College. The class for which the Queen's colleges were intended still exists. This consists of the middle and lower grades of the middle class, and forms a numerous and respectable body of Catholics, out of whose ranks many distinguished men have issued, among whom may be mentioned the late Lord O'Hagan, the late Lord Chief Justice Monahan, the late Sir Robert Kane, whose scientific attainments were so exceptionally high that the Government selected him to fill the important place of President of the College of Science, St. Stephen's Green, Dublin, at a time that he was President of the Queen's College, Cork, and Sir Dominick Corrigan, whose eminence as a physician had something of the unique character of Scarlet's eminence at the bar of England, and which, perhaps, no one will quite appreciate except an Englishman. Corrigan was not only a leading medical man among others, but he stood aloof from them, on a different plane as it were; and so perfectly was this understood on the Continent of Europe, that to speak of a Dublin medical school in

any French or German university was to elicit an inquiry about Corrigan.

This class is heavily weighted. Four-fifths of the Irish people are Catholics. The Protestant one-fifth may be broadly said to have open to them an university career. They are not only well off themselves as individuals, but they possess all the State endowments for higher education. One-fifth of the population may be loosely said to be Catholics who have means to seek such a career if they had a chartered university, even though not endowed by the State. It would be at a great disadvantage, no doubt, for they would have to pay from their own unaided resources for what Protestants of the wealthiest class obtain in Trinity College partly through a rich endowment and partly through their private means. They would have to pay out of their own pockets for what the Queen's colleges bring within the power of the poorer classes of Protestants. This in the statement of it is a great injustice, but it is not the whole evil. Even with such a Catholic university three-fifths of the population, that is to say the masses of the Catholic people, should be content to remain in a condition of inferiority, every avenue to success in life closed against them.

No one will approve of a view commonly enough put forward that a State endowment putting an university education within the reach of all classes of the people would be fraught with the evil of educating them above their position. It is said that in the National schools the masses of the people receive an education up to their fifteenth year superior in its results to that enjoyed in any country in Europe. If education for the masses is only calculated to make them discontented with their position, why is it carried to that line at which aspirations are created and then doomed to disappointment? Again, why establish a system of intermediate education that covers the period between the fifteenth year and the time for matriculation in an university, and yet keep the university closed to boys who have shown their capacity to reap the best fruits of an university training if they only get the chance? This startling inconsistency can only be explained as an instance of the makeshift character of legislation affecting Ireland. Governments refuse relief as long as they can; then it is found something must be done, and they either give relief of another kind than that sought, or they give so little, and with such a grudging spirit, that the only value is in the admission of a grievance and the title to its relief. This is how the question stands now, seventy years after Emancipation, a hundred and three years after Trinity College was opened to Catholics.

It has been suggested already that the higher education of Catholics is in the same position now as it was in 1794. In a very important respect I submit it is in a worse position. Before 1782 it may be said that the State did not recognize the existence of Catholics. There are some curious judicial dicta to that effect; there are some curious instances of the practical operation of the spirit expressed in those dicta. The Catholic body sent a petition to the Irish House of Commons, praying that their peaceful and law-abiding character would be taken into consideration by the House. They did not ask for the repeal of a single statute of that code which taxed the resources of Edmund Burke's genius to their utmost to describe. This request was characterized as insolent, and members demanded that the document should be flung under the table as waste-paper. On another occasion an address of welcome and congratulation was sent to a new Lord-Lieutenant on entering his office. It raised a storm of indignation in Protestant circles. No reply was sent to the address, though it was signed by Catholic peers and Catholic commoners of great social position.

In the year 1793 the first Catholic Relief Act was passed. It conferred upon the Roman Catholic certain civil rights, together with the political one of voting for the election of a member of Parliament. As a privilege annexed to his status as a partly enfranchised subject, the 13th section enacted that he might take degrees in Trinity College without subscribing any declaration, or taking any oath except the oaths of allegiance and abjuration. In consequence of this, the Crown, in the year 1794, altered the college statutes to enable Catholics to be educated and to receive degrees. It might be contended that from 1794 the Catholics were entitled as of right to larger privileges in this university than the prevailing interpretation of the law allowed them. I do not mean that the exclusively Protestant character given to Trinity College was a violation of the purposes for which it was founded, though this also could be contended; but I mean that it was the intention of the 13th section of the Act of 1793, and the Royal Letter of 1794, to give Catholics a place on the foundation, as foundation scholars, with the privilege, annexed to that rank, of voting for the representatives of the university in Parliament. This right, however, it was decided they had not—that the joint operation of the 13th section of the Act of 1793 and of the Royal Letter of 1794 was to enable them to take degrees, and no more. By Professor Fawcett's Act in 1873, all religious tests and disabilities were abolished, converting Trinity into a secular col-

lege. This was an injury to Episcopal Protestants, but it was an outrage on Irish Catholics; for it went on the assumption that their demand for a denominational university was a pretence; that the agitation was inspired by jealousy at seeing the Protestants in possession of an institution of the kind; and that the hollowness of the movement would be exposed by passing his measure. Of that measure, I may say that I know of none which more effectually proves the inability of Englishmen to understand Irish sentiment, infinite in number and variety as are remedial measures partaking of this character; nay, more, I doubt if there be any Irish measure at all on the imperial statute-book which has not some serious flaw, due to ignorance, prejudice, or contempt, even when Englishmen intended to act fairly.

Mr. Gladstone went into power in 1868 pledged to redress this grievance. He had behind him a phenomenal majority. For years majorities ranged from a half a dozen to twenty-five or thirty. Mr. Gladstone's majority at this time was a hundred and sixteen. He had all Scotland with him; he had an unprecedented majority of the Irish members; and he had the cities and boroughs of England. The English counties stood against the intelligence of England, the resentment of Ireland, the sense of justice of Scotland. Thus, according to the usages of party government, Liberalism is committed to the opinion that the higher education of Irish Catholics is unsatisfactory, or, in the phrase of the great leader of the time, "scandalously bad." He introduced his measure. He was defeated by the Irish members because he persisted in forcing upon them as a settlement of the question a measure which they thought would only aggravate existing evils. The attitude of these men does not change the nature of the grievance. If the opinion of official Liberalism, endorsed by the constituencies, that the condition of higher Catholic education was scandalously bad was correct then, it is not released from the duty of giving effect to it because the representatives of those interested refused a measure which would not have given effect to that opinion. The only way the Liberal party could be released from this duty would be by subsequent legislation that removed the grievance. There has been no such legislation since. No one has ever pretended that Professor Fawcett's Act was a solution. It was an experiment by an amiable and excellent man in embodying his opinion that undenominational education was the only kind the State could recognize. He did this at the expense of the Protestants of Ireland and against the wishes of the Catholics of Ireland.

It might be argued that in converting a Protestant institution into a secular college he more closely carried out the intentions of its founder than the policy which, under the successors of Elizabeth, made Trinity College a bulwark of Protestantism. We doubt, however, that he had any such idea. We doubt that he possessed the knowledge which might have suggested the idea. It is quite true that in all the documents Elizabeth and her advisers spoke of establishing a college for the youth of Ireland, that there was no mention of the Protestant youth, that funds were asked from the Catholics for endowment, that the Catholics subscribed for its endowment with far greater generosity than any other merely private benefactors. A large proportion of those private gifts came from men whose estates, eighteen or twenty years afterwards, were given to Scotch adventurers under the Plantation of Ulster. Among the subscribers we find Ulster names, like O'Neil, Maguire, Maginnis, as we find Catholic names of the Pale, like Plunket, Taafe, Tyrrell, Nugent, as persons to whom the letter of the Lord Deputy and Council calling for grants of land or gifts of money was addressed; and so it might be reasonably contended that the Act in question really, at the close of three centuries, effected what Elizabeth intended. We do not think any Catholic would favor this view. It is immaterial now what Elizabeth intended—whether the Lord Deputy Fitzwilliam's letter just referred to is the *contemporanea exposition* of the words in the Charter—“*colendamque virtutem et religionem adjuventur*”—or not. It is enough that the whole rule of the institution since 1592 until 1794 was an illustration of the propriety and consistency of a policy which refused education to men to whom it denied civil rights. But it is not immaterial that Irish Protestants should think that the character of the great foundation with which so much personal fame and national glory are identified should be degraded from the status of a Christian college, and that Irish Catholics should be thought a party to the dishonor. We think every Irish Catholic regretted that it was de-Christianized, and that so important a part of the youth of Ireland should be so circumstanced as to be led to believe that religion was of less consequence than gold medals in science or classics, English literature or history. Catholics would have no hand in lessening reverence for those precepts and principles in which their Protestant fellow-countrymen found a guide in life and a support in death. They protest against the Act by which an English doctrinaire in politics and secularist in education succeeded in depriving Irish Protestants of the advantages of a religious education, and at the same time

they decline to accept it in discharge of the obligations due by the Liberal party to themselves.

The Tory party is also committed to the settlement of the question. They are bound by their own principles to afford to religion at least a resting-place in the highest schools, as they have secured its due authority in the primary schools. Whatever difficulties there may be in arranging the details by which this shall be secured are due to external and hostile influences, and in no small manner to the officious legislation of which we have just spoken. There is no inherent difficulty in the matter; there is no constitutional principle opposed to it. It has only to contend against the weight of certain theories by which many Nonconformist clergymen and agnostic teachers profess to secure political harmony by banishing religion from the State, and against the force of old local prejudices which did untold evil in the past, which seem to be as strong in Ulster and other backwood parts to-day as when it was made a felony to educate a Catholic, or when a meeting of Catholics for worship on some hillside was broken up with more than the fury which earned for Claverhouse, among Scotch Covenanters, a name with the worst enemies of the human race.

The Tory party is also bound by its admission in introducing the bill to create the Royal University of Ireland. We need not go farther than this. So far as Mr. Balfour can be said to represent the views of official Toryism, that party seems bound to support the idea of a Catholic university. At any rate, the measure introduced by Earl Cairns in 1879, and which became law, expresses the judgment of that party that the Catholics of Ireland had a grievance with regard to higher education. The establishment of a mere examining board, and this is what the Royal University is, is not the creation of an university. The association of students in the enlarged life open to them by a great seat of learning is the main value they receive in an university, but it is an enormous value. For the want of it nothing can compensate. Private study under a tutor in one's home may make some men well-informed and studious, will be certain to make some prigs, will make the majority, unless circumstances are peculiarly favorable, idle or dull, angular-minded or unready. He who is not a learned clown will be a local oracle, from whom conceit radiates as offensively as the stubborn pride which went out from Scotchmen when first they condescended to earn money in England or Ireland; or if he be not spoiled he will be a man with some general but no accurate knowledge of any kind. No doubt men privately trained have become successful lawyers and made their mark in Parliament, but it was when society's conflict, the pounding of

necessity, did for them what an university would have done at first. The way, then, the examining board discharges the functions of an university is this: certain colleges, in reality boarding-schools, like Clongowes and the French college, Blackrock, have classes for matriculation at the Royal University, for sessional examinations and for the degrees. No one would dream of comparing with Trinity College the preparatory schools just mentioned; in the comparatively large life of an university like that of Dublin the pulse of cultured life from all quarters is felt. Parliament is echoed in the Historical Society, that nursery of eloquence which first heard the boyish political philosophy of Burke, where Grattan essayed the epigrammatic sentences which in after years became the mould of a more than mortal energy, where Curran disciplined the wild sadness and as wild laughter of which his eloquence consists, at whose meetings Plunket first marshalled the arguments which served as the method for that inexorable logic which distinguished him in Chancery and in the House of Commons; and so on through a list of names that unite Trinity to Ireland and both to fame. To an university like this, the learned societies of the world, the great schools of science, the universities that combine the most recent investigation in the exact and natural sciences with the most scholarly communication of its results—to such an university all these send messages of encouragement and receive such messages in return, all of them forming golden links of the chain which puts an Ariel's girdle round the earth. The policy of Earl Cairns, which would treat those Catholic boarding-schools and small Protestant schools as parts of an university, serving by means of an examining board the functions which we have feebly endeavored to describe, must have been inspired by that kind of humor which prevails in Ulster and Scotland, and which is hardly distinguishable from practical joking.

His measure has not advanced the question one iota. It was adopted as testimony of the universal assent that a grievance existed, and, in pursuance of speeches of the strongest kind by members of his own party, that the redress and remedy should be searching. It professed to grant educational equality; it only enlarged the already exceptional privileges of Protestants. It is hard to understand how that Ministry and Earl Cairns could have pretended to themselves that they were making even an attempt to adjust the balance between those who think religious education a necessity and those who are content with secular education when they left all the establishments then existing—Trinity College and the Queen's colleges, with their equipments, libraries, staffs of pro-

fessors and immense endowments—to the secularists, and created a board to grant degrees to these same secularists and to those who had sacrificed so much in order to obtain religious instruction.

The demand of the Irish Catholics is still unsatisfied, nay, untouched. Before the measure of Lord Cairns and the Tory Ministry established this board under the title of the Royal University of Ireland, Irish students could have obtained degrees on the same conditions from a similar board called London University. It was not necessary to go to London for the purpose. They could pass their examinations at their own homes, or at least in central places in Ireland, whither the examiners were sent by the university. Consequently, this measure gave nothing; yet abortive as it is, insulting as it is, it is the contribution of a party pledged to religious education, to the satisfying of the demands of men who have proved their fidelity to principle, their obedience to the claims of conscience. By turning away from the great revenues, the splendid prizes of Trinity and the Queen's colleges, they proved that they were faithful to principle, loyal to conscience. The loss to nearly five generations of students since that measure received the royal assent is a shadow upon the life of many who have scrambled through these examinations with the training derived from an incomplete apparatus; it is a deeper shadow still on the many who could not avail themselves even of an incomplete apparatus. From 1829 to 1879 no advance was made. The Catholic sought degrees in an alien atmosphere, and with deadly peril to his faith, unless his religious convictions were exceptionally strong. We do not mean necessarily that he would have become a member of the State religion, though many have given up, under this form of seduction, the creed for which their fathers had suffered every extreme of torture. But he was liable to lose the all-pervading sense of religion as the relation between God and man, and the dogmas of faith as the specific statements of those relations. We see no reason why Catholics in Ireland in constant contact with a philosophy which was calculated to disturb the foundations of belief, with a history which misrepresented Catholic thought expressed in ecclesiastical policy or Catholic sentiment and opinion expressed in great movements of men, whether in one particular country or in a course of action said to be in pursuance of such thought on the part of a Catholic nation toward a nation not Catholic—we see no reason why there should not be ground to fear that any Irish Catholic might become skeptical on topics of this kind like a French one, anti-Catholic like some Irish ones, who have done in Parlia-

ment, on the bench, and at the bar, the service of political janizaries for the enemies of their faith.

The question must be solved. Refusals, evasions, substitutes cannot be the eternal order of the day. The better the question is understood the stronger the claim of Irish Catholics will be. With an insolence one could hardly anticipate, secularists say if they want a Catholic university they must endow it themselves, and at the same time pay taxes for secular education. Yet the same secularists used their influence to prevent a bare license for degrees from being granted to the Catholic University in St. Stephen's Green. The Presbyterians have a practical monopoly of the Queen's colleges, yet with the bitter jealousy of a disappointed faction they oppose the design of granting a similar privilege to Catholics. But what of the opposition from those two sources! Presbyterian bitterness is not a power with a long term. Its genesis is disappointment because the Catholics who have borne the heat and burden of the fight against the Irish Tories demanded a share in the spoils when victory was obtained. At the first opportunity the Presbyterians joined the common enemy, but there are already signs that they are disposed to return to the fold. With the secularists the same weakness of spirit is becoming apparent. There was evidence of it on a branch of this question at the last election and since. The denominationalists obtained support from an unexpected quarter from a class of thinkers and their friends whose purity of motive and range of culture make their alliance, if not strong in numbers, rich in repute. We speak of the Positivists, who, as we understand, have gone the entire length in support of a system of education in the lower grades certainly, in the higher grades probably, beyond which no Irish Catholic need proceed. As for the rest of the secularists—whose politics are Liberal—if they desire to see social reforms upon which they have set their hearts, political measures which will give intelligence a fair field against prestige, or, in other words, secularism give a fair field against the Established Church and the landed influence, they must court the Irish Catholics, without whom there can be no Liberal triumph at the polls.

We are, therefore, of opinion that the measure now contemplated should be a sufficient expression of Catholic needs, that security for the moral and religious training of the youth should be ample, and that the present time will be found a ripe one to remove an injustice which countless centuries can no more repair than they could efface the ills which have made lives miserable ever since men had power over their fellows.

GEO. MCDERMOT.

MUSIC IN THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

A.D. 50-600.

THE epoch of the apostles and their immediate successors is that around which the most vigorous controversies have been waged ever since modern criticism recognized the supreme importance of that epoch in the history of doctrine and ecclesiastical government. Hardly a form of belief or polity but has sought to obtain its sanction from the teaching and usages of those churches that received their systems most directly from the personal disciples of the Founder. A curiosity less productive of contention, but hardly less persistent, attaches to the forms and methods of worship practised by the Christian congregations. The rise of liturgies, rites, and ceremonies, the origin and use of hymns, the foundation of the liturgical chant, the degree of participation enjoyed by the laity in the offices of praise and prayer,—these and many other closely related subjects of inquiry possess far more than an antiquarian interest; they are bound up with the history of that remarkable transition from the homogenous, more democratic system of the apostolic age, to the hierarchical organization which became matured and consolidated under the western popes and eastern patriarchs. Associated with this administrative development and related in its causes, an elaborate system of rites and ceremonies arose, partly an evolution from within, partly an inheritance of ancient habits and predispositions, which at last became formulated into unvarying types of devotional expression. Music participated in this ritualistic movement; it rapidly became liturgical and clerical, the laity ceased to share in the worship of song and resigned this office to a chorus drawn from the minor clergy, and a highly organized body of chants, applied to every moment of the service, became almost the entire substance of worship-music, and remained so for a thousand years.

The music of the Church, however, never became entirely stationary. Slowly, for centuries, almost imperceptibly, it steadily expanded. Doctrines, liturgies and ceremonies could become fixed and stationary, but Christian song never showed a tendency to harden or contract. It contained in itself the promise and potency of life. In the very nature of the case a new energy must enter the art of music when enlisted in the ministry of the religion

of Christ. A new motive, a new spirit, unknown to Greek or Roman, or even to Hebrew, had taken possession of the religious consciousness. To the adoration of the same Supreme Power, before whom the Jew bowed in awe-stricken reverence, was added the recognition of a gift which the Jew still dimly hoped for; and this gift brought with it an assurance, and hence a felicity, which were never granted to the religionist of the old dispensation. The Christian felt himself the chosen joint-heir of a risen and ascended Lord, who by his death and resurrection had brought life and immortality to light. The devotion to a personal, ever-living Saviour transcended and often supplanted all other loyalty whatsoever,—to country, parents, husband, wife or child. This religion was, therefore, emphatically one of joy—a joy so absorbing, so completely satisfying, so founded on the loftiest hopes that the human mind is able to entertain, that even the ecstatic worship of Apollo or Dionysios seems melancholy and hopeless in comparison. Yet it was not a joy that was prone to expend itself in noisy demonstrations. It was mingled with such a profound sense of personal unworthiness and the most solemn responsibilities, tempered with sentiments of awe and wonder in the presence of unfathomable mysteries, that the manifestations of it must be subdued to moderation, expressed in forms that could appropriately typify spiritual and eternal relationships. And so, as sculpture was the art which most adequately embodied the humanistic conception of Greek theology, poetry and music became the arts in which Christianity found a vehicle of expression most suited to her genius. These two arts, therefore, when acted upon by ideas so sublime and penetrating as those of the Gospel, must at last become transformed, and exhibit signs of a renewed and aspiring activity. The very essence of the divine revelation in Jesus Christ must strike a more thrilling note than tone and emotional speech had ever sounded before. The genius of Christianity, opening up new soul-depths, and quickening, as no other religion could, the higher possibilities of holiness in man, was especially adapted to evoke larger manifestations of musical invention. The religion of Jesus revealed God in the universality of His fatherhood, and His omnipresence in nature and in the human conscience. God must be worshipped in spirit and in truth, as one who draws men into communion with Him by His immediate action upon the heart. This religion made an appeal that could only be met by the purification of the heart, and by reconciliation and union with God through the merits of the crucified Son. The believer, therefore, felt the possibility of direct and loving communion with the Infinite Power as the stirring of the

very bases of his being. This new consciousness must declare itself in forms of expression hardly glimpsed by antiquity, and literature and art undergo re-birth. Music particularly, the art which seems peculiarly capable of reflecting the most urgent longings of the spirit, felt the animating force of Christianity as the power which was to emancipate it from its ancient thralldom and lead it forth into a boundless sphere of action.

Not at once, however, could musical art spring up full grown and responsive to these novel demands. An art, to come to perfection, requires more than a motive. The motive, the vision, the emotion yearning to realize itself, may be there, but beyond this is the mastery of material and form, and such mastery is of slow and tedious growth. Especially is this true in respect to the art of music; new musical forms, having no models in nature like painting and sculpture, no associative symbolism like poetry, no guidance from considerations of utility like architecture, must be the result, so far as any human work can be such, of actual free creation. And yet this creation is a progressive creation; its forms evolve from forms pre-existing as demands for expression arise to which the old are inadequate. Models must be found, but in the nature of the case the art can never go outside of itself for its suggestion. And although Christian music must be a development and not the sudden product of an exceptional inspiration, yet we must not suppose that the early church was compelled to work out its melodies from those crude elements in which anthropology discovers the first stage of musical progress in primitive man. The Christian fathers, like the founders of every historic system of religious music, drew their material from both religious and secular sources. The forms on which the music of modern Christendom is based were in their origin and style simply the projection of the antique musical system into the new era. The principle of ancient music was that of the subordination of music—subordination to poetry and the dance-figure. It never broke entirely loose from this subjection. Harmony was virtually unknown in antiquity, and without a knowledge of part-writing no independent art of music is possible. The song of antiquity was the most restricted of all melodic styles, viz., the chant or recitative. The essential feature of both chant and recitative is that the tones are made to conform to the metre and accent of the text, the words of which are never repeated or prosodically modified out of deference to melodic phrases and periods. In true song, on the contrary, the words are subordinated to the exigencies of musical laws of structure, and the phrase, not the word, is the ruling power. The

principle adopted by the Christian fathers was that of the chant, and Christian music could not begin to move in the direction of modern artistic attainment until, in the course of time, a new technical principle, and a new conception of the relation between music and poetry, could be introduced.

In theory, style, usage, and undoubtedly in actual melodies also, the music of the primitive Church forms an unbroken line with the music of pre-Christian antiquity. The relative proportion contributed by Jewish and Greek musical practice cannot be known. There was at the beginning no formal break with the ancient Jewish Church; the disciples assembled regularly in the temple for devotional exercises; worship in their private gatherings was modeled upon that of the synagogue which Christ himself had implicitly sanctioned. The synagogal code was modified by the Christians by the introduction of the eucharistic service, the Lord's Prayer, the baptismal formula, and other institutions occasioned by the new doctrines and the "spiritual gifts." At Christ's last supper with His disciples, when the chief liturgical rite of the Church was instituted, the company sang a hymn which was unquestionably the "great Hallel" of the Jewish Passover celebration.¹ The Jewish Christians clung with an inherited reverence to the venerable forms of their fathers' worship, they observed the Sabbath, the three daily hours of prayer, and much of the Mosaic ritual. In respect to musical usages, the most distinct intimation in early records of the continuation of ancient forms is found in the occasional reference to the habit of antiphonal or responsive chanting of the Psalms. Fixed forms of prayer were also used in the apostolic Church, which were to a considerable extent modeled upon the Psalms and the Benedictions of the synagogue ritual. That the Hebrew melodies were borrowed at the same time cannot be demonstrated, but it may be assumed as a necessary inference.

With the spread of the Gospel among the Gentiles, the increasing hostility between Christians and Jews, the dismemberment of the Jewish nationality, and the overthrow of Jewish institutions to which the Hebrew Christians had maintained a certain degree of attachment, the influence of the Jewish ritual passed away, and the worship of the Church came under the influence of Hellenic systems and traditions. Greek philosophy and Greek art, although both in decadence, were dominant in the intellectual life of the East, and it was impossible that the doctrine, worship, and gov-

¹ Ps., 113-118.

ernment of the Church should not have been gradually leavened by them. St. Paul wrote in the Greek language, the earliest liturgies are in Greek. The sentiment of prayer and praise was, of course, Hebraic; the Psalms formed the basis of all lyric expression, and the hymns and liturgies were to a large extent colored by their phraseology and spirit. The shapeliness and flexibility of Greek art, the inward fervor of Hebrew aspiration, the love of ceremonial and symbolism, which was not confined to any single nation but a universal characteristic of the time, all contributed to build up the composite and imposing structure of the later worship of the Eastern and Western Churches.

The singing of Psalms formed a part of the Christian worship from the beginning, and certain special Psalms were early appointed for particular days and occasions. At what time hymns of contemporary origin were added we have no means of knowing. Evidently during the life of St. Paul, for we find him encouraging the Ephesians and Colossians to the use of "psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs."¹ To be sure he is not specifically alluding to public worship in these exhortations (in the first instance "speaking to yourselves" and "singing and making melody in your hearts," in the second "teaching and admonishing one another"), but it is hardly to be supposed that the spiritual exercise of which he speaks would be excluded from the religious services which at that time were of daily observance. The injunction to teach and admonish by means of songs also agrees with other evidences that a prime motive for hymn-singing in many of the churches was instruction in the doctrines of the faith. It would appear that among the early Christians, as with the Greeks and other ancient nations, moral precepts and instruction in religious mysteries were often thrown into poetic and musical form, as being by this means more impressive and more easily remembered.

It is to be noticed that St. Paul, in both the passages cited above, alludes to religious songs under three distinct terms, viz. : *ψαλμοι*, *ὕμνοι*, and *ᾠδαὶ πνευματικαί*. The usual supposition is that the terms are not synonymous, that they refer to a threefold classification of the songs of the early Church into: 1, the ancient Hebrew Psalms properly so called; 2, hymns taken from the Old Testament and not included in the Psalter and since called Canticles, such as the thanksgiving of Hannah, the songs of Moses, the Psalm of the Three Children from the continuation of the Book of Daniel, the vision of Habakkuk, etc.; and, 3, songs

¹ Eph., v., 19; Col., iii., 16.

composed by the Christians themselves. The last of these three classes points us to the birth-time of Christian hymnody. The lyric inspiration, which has never failed from that day to this, began to move the instant the proselyting work of the Church began. In the freedom and informality of the religious assembly as it existed among the Hellenic Christians, it became the practice for the believers to contribute impassioned outbursts—which might be called songs in a rudimentary state. In moments of highly-charged devotional ecstasy this spontaneous utterance took the form of broken, incoherent, unintelligible ejaculations, probably in cadenced, half-rhythmic tone, expressive of rapture and mystical illumination. This was the “glossolia,” or “gift of tongues” alluded to by St. Paul in the first epistle to the Corinthians as a practice to be approved, under certain limitations, as edifying to the believers.¹

Dr. Schaff defines the gift of tongues as “an utterance proceeding from a state of unconscious ecstasy in the speaker, and unintelligible to the hearer unless interpreted. The speaking with tongues is an involuntary, psalm-like prayer or song uttered from a spiritual trance, in a peculiar language inspired by the Holy Spirit. The soul is almost entirely passive, an instrument on which the Spirit plays his heavenly melodies.” “It is emotional rather than intellectual, the language of excited imagination, not of cool reflection.”² St. Paul was himself an adept in this singular form of worship, as he himself declares in 1 Cor. xiv., 18; but with his habitual coolness of judgment he warns the excitable Corinthian Christians that sober instruction is more profitable, that the proper end of all utterance in common public worship is edification, and enjoins as an effective restraint that “if any man speaketh in a tongue, let one interpret; but if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the Church; and let him speak to himself and to God.”³ With the regulation of the worship in stated liturgic form this extemporaneous ebullition of feeling was done away, but if it was analogous, as it probably was, to the practice so common in Oriental vocal music, both ancient and modern, of delivering long wordless tonal flourishes as an expression of joy, then it has in a certain sense survived in the “jubilations” of the Catholic liturgical chant, which in the early middle ages were more extended than now. Chappell finds traces of a practice somewhat similar to the “jubilations” existing in ancient Egypt.

¹ 1 Cor., xii. and xiv.

² Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, I., p. 234 f; p. 435.

³ 1 Cor., xiv., 27, 28.

“ This practice of carolling or singing without words, like birds, to the gods, was copied by the Greeks, who seemed to have carolled on four vowels. The vowels had probably, in both cases, some recognized meaning attached to them, as substitutes for certain words of praise—as was the case when the custom was transferred to the Western Church.”¹ This may or may not throw light upon the obscure nature of the glossolalia, but it is not to be supposed that the Corinthian Christians invented this custom, since we find traces of it in the worship of the ancient pagan nations, and so far as it was the unrestrained outburst of emotion it must have been to some extent musical, and only needed regulation and the application of a definite key-system to become, like the mediæval sequence under somewhat similar conditions, an established order of sacred song.

Out of a musical impulse, of which the glossolalia was one of many tokens, united with the spirit of prophecy or instruction, grew the hymns of the infant Church, dim outlines of which begin to appear in the twilight of this obscure period. The worshippers of Christ could not remain content with the Hebrew Psalms, for, in spite of their inspiriting and edifying character, they were not concerned with the facts on which the new faith was based, except in prefiguring the later dispensation. Hymns were required in which Christ was directly celebrated, and the apprehension of His infinite gifts embodied in language which would both fortify the believers and act as a converting agency. It would be contrary to all analogy and to the universal facts of human nature if such were not the case, and we may suppose that a Christian folk-song, such as the post-apostolic age reveals to us, must have begun to appear in the first century. Some scholars believe that certain of these primitive hymns, or fragments of them, are embalmed in the Epistles of St. Paul and the Book of the Revelation.² The magnificent description of the worship of God and the Lamb in the Apocalypse has been supposed by some to have been suggested by the manner of worship, already become liturgical, in some of the Eastern churches. Certainly there is a manifest resemblance between the picture of one sitting upon the throne with the twenty-four elders and a multitude of angels surrounding him, as set forth in the Apocalypse, and the account given in the second book of the Constitutions of the Apostles of the throne of the bishop in the middle of the church edifice, with the pres-

¹ Chappell, *History of Music*, p. 54.

² Among such supposed quotations are: Eph. v., 14; 1 Tim. iii., 16; 2 Tim. ii., 11; Rev. iv., 11; v., 9-13; xi., 15-18; xv., 3-4.

byters and deacons on each side and the laity beyond. In this second book of the Constitutions, belonging, of course, to a later date than the apostolic period, there is no mention of hymn-singing. The share of the people is confined to responses at the end of the verses of the Psalms, which are sung by some one appointed to this office.¹ The sacerdotal and liturgical movement had already excluded from the chief acts of worship the independent song of the people. Those who assume that the office of song in the early church was freely committed to the general body of believers have some ground for their assumption, but if we are able to distinguish between the private and public worship, and could know how early it was that set forms and liturgies were adopted, it would appear that at the longest the time was very brief when the laity were allowed a share in any but the subordinate offices. The earliest testimony that can be called definite is contained in the celebrated letter of the younger Pliny from Bithynia to the Emperor Trajan, in the year 112, in which the Christians are described as coming together before daylight and singing hymns alternately (*invicem*) to Christ. This may with some reason be held to refer to responsive or antiphonal singing, similar to that described by Philo in his account of the worship of the Jewish sect of the Therapeutæ in the first century. The tradition was long preserved in the Church that Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch in the second century, introduced antiphonal chanting into the churches of that city, having been moved thereto by a vision of angels singing in that manner. But we have only to go back to the worship of the ancient Hebrews for the suggestion of this practice. This alternate singing appears to have been most prevalent in the Syrian churches, and was carried thence to Milan and Rome, and through the usage in these cities established in the permanent habit of the Western Church.

Although the singing of Psalms and hymns by the body of worshippers was, therefore, undoubtedly the custom of the churches while still in their primitive condition as informal assemblages of believers for mutual counsel and edification, the steady progress of ritualism and the growth of sacerdotal ideas inevitably deprived the people of all initiative in the worship, and concentrated the offices of public devotion, including that of song, exclusively in the hands of the clergy. By the middle of the fourth century, if not earlier, the change was complete. The simple constitution of the apostolic age had developed by logical gradations into a com-

¹ *Constitutions of the Apostles*, book ii., cop. 57.

pact hierarchy of patriarchs, bishops, priests and deacons. The clergy were no longer the servants or representatives of the people, but held a mediatorial position as the channels through which divine grace was transmitted to the faithful. The great Eastern liturgies, such as those which bear the names of St. James and St. Mark, if not yet fully formulated and committed to writing, were in all essentials complete and adopted as the substance of the public worship. The principal service was divided into two parts, from the second of which, the Eucharistic service proper, the catechumens and penitents were excluded. The prayers, readings and chanted sentences, of which the liturgy mainly consisted, were delivered by priests, deacons, and an officially-constituted choir of singers, the congregation uniting only in a few responses and ejaculations. In the liturgy of St. Mark, which was the Alexandrian, used in Egypt and neighboring countries, we find allotted to the people a number of responses: "Amen," "Kyrie eleison," "And to Thy spirit" (in response to the priest's "Peace be to all"); "We lift them up to the Lord" (in response to the priest's "Let us lift up our hearts"); and "In the name of the Lord; Holy God, holy mighty, holy immortal," after the prayer of Trisagion; "And from the Holy Spirit was He made flesh," after the prayer of oblation; "Holy, holy, holy Lord," before the consecration; "Our Father, who art in heaven," etc.; before the communion, "One Father holy, one Son holy, one Spirit holy, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, Amen"; at the dismissal, "Amen, blessed be the name of the Lord."

In the liturgy of St. James, the liturgy of the Jerusalem Church, a very similar share, in many instances with identical words, is assigned to the people; but a far more frequent mention is made of the choir of singers who render the Trisagion hymn, which, in St. Mark's liturgy, is given by the people: the "Allelulia"; the hymn to the Virgin Mother; "O taste and see that the Lord is good; The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee."

A large portion of the service, as indicated by these liturgies, was occupied by prayers, during which the people kept silence. In the matter of responses the congregation had more direct share than in the Catholic Church to-day, for now the chancel-choir acts as their representatives, while the Kyrie eleison has become one of the choral portions of the Mass, and the Thrice Holy has been merged in the choral Sanctus. But in the liturgical worship, whatever may have been the case in non-liturgical observances, the share of the people was confined to these few brief ejaculations and

prescribed sentences, and nothing corresponding to the congregational song of the Protestant Church can be found. Still earlier than this final issue of the ritualistic conception the singing of the people was limited to Psalms and canticles, a restriction justified and perhaps occasioned by the ease with which doctrinal vagaries and mystical extravagances could be instilled into the minds of the converts by means of this very subtle and persuasive agent. The conflict of the orthodox churches with the Gnostics and Arians showed clearly the danger of unlimited license in the production and singing of hymns, for these formidable heretics drew large numbers away from the faith of the apostles by means of the choral songs which they employed everywhere for proselyting purposes. The Council of Laodicea (held between 343 and 381) decreed in its 13th Canon: "Besides the appointed singers, who mount the ambo and sing from the book, others shall not sing in the church."¹ The exact meaning of this prohibition has not been determined, for the participation of the people in the church song did not entirely cease at this time. How generally representative this council was, or how extensive its authority, is not known; but the importance of this decree has been exaggerated by historians of music, for, at most, it serves only as a register of a fact which was an inevitable consequence of the universal hierarchical and ritualistic tendencies of the time.

The history of the music of the Christian Church properly begins with the establishment of the priestly liturgic chant, which had apparently supplanted the popular song in the public worship as early as the fourth century. Of the character of the chant-melodies at this period in the Eastern Church, or of their sources, we have no positive information. Much vain conjecture has been expended on this question. Some are persuaded that the strong infusion of Hebraic feeling and phraseology into the earliest hymns, and the adoption of the Hebrew Psalter into the service, necessarily implies the inheritance of the ancient temple and synagogue melodies also. Others assume that the allusion of St. Augustine to the usage at Alexandria under St. Athanasius, which was "more like speaking than singing,"² was an example of the practice of the Oriental and Roman Churches generally, and that the latter chant developed out of this vague song-speech.³ Others, like Kiesewetter, exaggerating the antipathy of the Christians to

¹ Hefele, *History of the Councils of the Church*, translated by Oxenbam, vol. ii., p. 309.

² St. Augustine, *Confessions*.

³ Rowbotham, *History of Music*, vol. iii., p. 89 *seq.*

everything identified with Judaism and paganism, conceive the primitive Christian melodies as entirely an original invention, a true Christian folk-song.¹ None of these suppositions, however, could have more than a local and temporary application; the Jewish Christian congregations in Jerusalem and neighboring cities doubtless transferred a few of their ancestral melodies to the new worship, a prejudice against highly developed tune suggesting the sensuous cults of paganism may have existed among the more austere; here and there new melodies may have sprung up to clothe the extemporized lyrics that became perpetuated in the Church. But the weight of evidence, inference and analogy inclines to the belief that the liturgic song of the Church, both of the East and West, was drawn partly in form and almost wholly in spirit and complexion from the Greek and Greco-Roman musical practice. Such an origin for the Roman chant has been quite conclusively shown by the investigations of the Belgian savant, Gevaert;² and since the Hellenic influence was so strong in the churches of the West, it must needs have been equally so in the churches of Greece and Asia Minor. And it was the more simple, refined and moderate phases of Greek music, together with the noble traditions of the classic age, that passed into the Christian sanctuary, dying paganism thus contributing of its last breath to swell the life that was to regenerate the world. As Schletterer correctly says: "The music of Christendom borrowed from that of the Hebrews its pious religious content; from that of the Greeks its form, structure and beauty." The Greeks stood far above all other nations of antiquity in their love for music; in their conception of its possibilities as an independent art; in the freedom, grace and expressiveness of their melody; in the taste and appropriateness with which they connected it with their most elevated religious, patriotic and festal observances. The Oriental nations loved best instruments of coarse and clangorous sound, nerve excitants, the clashing cymbal, the braying trumpet and jingling tambourine; the sacred instruments of the Greek, on the contrary, were the lyre of Apollo and the Dorian flute. The Greek's exquisite sense of proportion and symmetry, his abhorrence of violence and excess, his matchless appreciation of reason and order, of the beauty that lies in perfect adjustment of parts and delicacy of finish, his noble reserve and balance of emotion and expression—all this was as manifest in his music as in his

¹ *Geschichte der europaisch-abendlandischen Musik*, p. 2.

² *La Mélodie antique dans le Chant de l'Eglise Latine*.

poetry, his sculpture and his architecture. Music was the handmaid of poetry ; it blended with epic, lyric and dramatic expression into an exquisite and inseparable unity. It was the fair counterpart of that most subtle, flexible, precise and harmonious of all forms of human speech, the Attic Greek, and it shared in all the reverence and study that were bestowed upon that paragon of languages. It doubtless grew out of that language in its early estate, and both together attained their ripeness in the Athenian tragedy of the Periclean age. It shared all the rhythmic variety and suppleness of the Lesbian, Theban and Cean lyric and the Athenian dramatic ode, and found its special means of expression in the mingled intensity and billowy swing of contrasted metres and the finest shades of intonation and tonal color. Harmony the Greeks knew, if at all, only in its simplest relations. Simplicity and clearness marked all their art ; music was designed to heighten the effect of poetic speech ; its metre was controlled by that of the verse ; song was intoned recitation ; the text was paramount, and must not be obscured even for the attainment of melodic beauty. Within this limit the Greek music was the most perfect form of vocal utterance which antiquity ever devised ; and the Christians, who had no thought of a system of independent music with laws of its own, could find no style of music better adapted to their needs than that form derived from old Greek practice which they heard around them. That it was associated with pagan religious systems did not condemn it in their eyes. But scanty knowledge of Christian archæology and liturgics is necessary to show that much of form, ceremony and decoration in the worship of the Church was the adaptation of features anciently existing in the faiths and customs which the new religion supplanted. The practical genius which adopted Greek metres for Christian hymns, and transformed basilikas, scholæ and heathen temples (often with monuments, votive tablets, etc., unmolested) into Christian houses of worship, would not cavil at the melodies and vocal methods which seemed so well suited to be a musical garb for the liturgies. Greek music was, indeed, in some of its phases, in decadence at this period. It had gained nothing in purity by passing into the hands of Roman voluptuaries. The age of the virtuosos, aiming at brilliancy and sensationalism, had succeeded to the classic traditions of austerity and reserve. This change was felt, however, in instrumental music chiefly, and this the Christian churches disdained to touch. It was the residue of what was pure and reverend, drawn from the tradition of Apollo's temple and the Athenian tragic theatre ; it was the form of vocalism which austere

philosophers like Plutarch praised¹ that was drafted into the service of the Gospel. Perhaps even this was reduced to simple terms in the Christian practice; certainly the oldest chants that can be traced are the simplest, and the earliest scale system of the Italian church would appear to allow but a very narrow compass to melody. We can form our most accurate notion of the early Christian music, therefore, by studying the records of Greek practice and Greek views of music's nature and function in the time of the flowering of Greek poetry, for certainly the Christian fathers did not attempt to go beyond that; and perhaps, in their zeal to avoid all that was meretricious in tonal art, they adopted as their standard those phases which could most easily be made to coalesce with the inward and humble type of piety inculcated by the faith of the Gospel. This hypothesis does not imply a note-for-note-borrowing of Greek and Roman melodies, but only their adaptation. As Luther and the other founders of the music of the German Protestant Church borrowed melodies from the Catholic chant and the German and Bohemian religious and secular folk-song, and recast them to fit the metres of their hymns, so the early Christian choristers would naturally be moved to do with the melodies which they desired to transplant. Much modification was necessary; for while the Greek and Roman songs were metrical, the Christian psalms, antiphons, prayers, responses, etc., were unmetrical; and while the pagan melodies were always sung to an instrumental accompaniment, the church chant was exclusively vocal. Through the influence of this double change of technical and æsthetic basis, the liturgic song was at once more free, aspiring and varied than its prototype, taking on that rhythmic flexibility and delicate shading in which also the unique charm of the Catholic chant of the present day so largely consists.

In view of the controversies over the use of instrumental music in worship, which have been so violent in the British and American Protestant churches, it is an interesting question whether or not instruments were employed by the primitive Christians. We know that instruments performed an important function in the Hebrew temple service and in the ceremonies of the Greeks. At this point, however, a break was made with all previous practice, and although the lyre and flute were sometimes employed by the Greek converts, as a general rule the use of instruments in worship was condemned. Many of the fathers, speaking of religious

¹ For the high ideal of Greek music surviving in the decline of Greek practice, see Plutarch's dissertation concerning music in his *Morals*.

song, make no mention of instruments ; others, like Clement of Alexandria and St. Chrysostom, refer to them only to denounce them. Clement says : " Only one instrument do we use, viz., the word of peace wherewith we honor God, no longer the old psaltery, trumpet, drum and flute." Chrysostom exclaims : " David formerly sang in psalms, also we sing to-day with him ; he had a lyre with lifeless strings, the Church has a lyre with living strings. Our tongues are the strings of the lyre, with a different tone, indeed, but with a more accordant piety." St. Ambrose expresses his scorn for those who would play the lyre and psaltery instead of singing hymns and psalms ; and St. Augustine adjures believers not to turn their hearts to theatrical instruments. The religious guides of the early Christians felt that there would be no incongruity, and even profanity, in the use of the sensuous nerve-exciting effects of instrumental sound in their mystical, spiritual worship ; their high religious and moral enthusiasm needed no aid from external stimulus. The pure vocal utterance was the more proper expression of their faith. This prejudice against instrumental music, which was drawn from the very nature of its æsthetic impression, was fortified by the associations of instruments with superstitious pagan rites, and especially with the corrupting scenes habitually represented in the degenerate theatre and circus. " A Christian maiden," says St. Jerome, " ought not even to know what a lyre or a flute is, or what it is used for." No further justification for such prohibitions is needed than the descriptions of the shameless performances common upon the stage in the time of the Roman empire as portrayed in the pages of Apuleius and other delineators of the manners of the time. Those who assumed the guardianship of the morals of the little Christian communities were compelled to employ the strictest measures to prevent their charges from breathing the moral pestilence which circulated without check in the places of public amusement ; most of all must they insist that every reminder of these corruptions, be it an otherwise innocent harp or flute, should be excluded from the common acts of religion.

The transfer of the office of song from the general congregation to an official choir involved no cessation of the production of hymns for popular use, for the distinction must always be kept in mind between liturgical and non-liturgical song, and it was only in the former that the people were commanded to abstain from participation in all but the prescribed responses. On the other hand, as ceremonies multiplied and festivals increased in number, hymnody was stimulated, and lyric songs for private and social edification, for

the hours of prayer, and for use in processions, pilgrimages, dedications and other occasional celebrations, were rapidly produced. As has been shown, the Christians had their hymns from the very beginning, but with the exception of one or two short lyrics, a few fragments, and the great liturgical hymns which were also adopted by the Western Church, they have been lost. Clement of Alexandria, third century, is often spoken of as the first known Christian hymn writer; but the single poem, the song of praise to the Logos, which has gained him this title, is not, strictly speaking, a hymn at all. From the fourth century onward the tide of Oriental hymnody steadily rose, reaching its culmination in the eighth and ninth centuries. The Eastern hymns are divided into two schools—the Syrian and the Greek. Of the group of Syrian poets the most celebrated are Synesius, born about 375, and Ephraem, who died at Edessa in 378. Ephraem was the greatest teacher of his time in the Syrian Church, and her most prolific and able hymnist. He is best remembered as the opponent of the followers of Bardasanes and Harmonius, who had beguiled many into their Gnostic errors by the attractive power of their hymns and melodies. Ephraem met these schismatics on their own ground, and composed a large number of songs in the spirit of orthodoxy, which he gave to choirs of his followers to be sung on Sundays and festal days. The hymns of Ephraem were greatly beloved by the Syrian Church, and are still valued by the Maronite Christians. The Syrian school of hymnody died out in the fifth century, and poetic inspiration in the Eastern Church found its channel in the Greek tongue.

Before the age of the Greek Christian poets, whose names have passed into history, the great anonymous unmetrical hymns appeared which still hold an eminent place in the liturgies of the Catholic and Protestant Churches as well as of the Eastern Church. The best known of these are the two *Glorias*—the *Gloria Patri* and the *Gloria in excelsis*; the *Ter Sanctus* or *Cherubic hymn*, heard by Isaiah in vision; and the *Te Deum*. The *Magnificat* or *thanksgiving of Mary*, and the *Benedicite* or the *Song of the Three Children*, were early adopted by the Eastern Church. The *Kyrie eleison* appears as a response by the people in the liturgies of St. Mark and St. James. It was adopted into the Roman liturgy at a very early date, and the addition, *Christe eleison*, is said to have been added by Gregory the Great. The *Gloria in excelsis*, the “greater doxology,” with the possible exception of the *Te Deum*, the noblest of the early Christian hymns is the angelic song given in Luke ii., 14, with additions which were made not later than the

fourth century. "Begun in heaven, finished on earth." It was first used in the Eastern Church as a morning hymn. The *Te Deum laudamus* has often been given a Western origin, St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, according to a popular legend, having been inspired to improvise it in alternate verses at the baptism of St. Augustine by the bishop of Milan. Another tradition ascribes the authorship to St. Hilary in the fourth century. Its original form is unknown, but it is generally believed to have been formed by accretions upon a Greek original. Certain phrases contained in it are also in the earlier liturgies. The present form of the hymn is probably as old as the fifth century.¹

Of the very few brief anonymous songs and fragments which have come down to us from this dim period the most perfect is a Greek hymn, which was sometimes sung in private worship at the lighting of the lamps. It has been made known to many English readers through Longfellow's beautiful translation in "The Golden Legend."

O gladsome light
Of the Father immortal,
And of the celestial
Sacred and blessed
Jesus, our Saviour!
Now to the sunset
Again hast Thou brought us;
And seeing the evening
Twilight, we bless Thee,
Praise Thee, adore Thee
Father omnipotent!
Son, the Life-giver!
Spirit, the Comforter!
Worthy at all times
Of worship and wonder!

Overlapping the epoch of the great anonymous hymns and continuing beyond it is the era of the Greek hymnists whose names and works are known, and who contributed a vast store of lyrics to the offices of the Eastern Church. Eighteen quarto volumes, says Dr. J. M. Neale, are occupied by this huge store of religious poetry. Dr. Neale, to whom the English-speaking world is chiefly indebted for what slight knowledge it has of these hymns, divides them into three epochs:

I. "That of formation, when this poetry was gradually throwing off the bondage of classical metres, and inventing and perfecting its various styles; this period ends about A.D. 726."

¹ For an exhaustive discussion of the history of the *Te Deum* see Julian's *Dictionary of Hymnology*.

2. "That of perfection, which nearly coincides with the period of the Iconoclastic controversy, 726-820."

3. "That of decadence, when the effeteness of an effeminate court and the dissolution of a decaying empire reduced ecclesiastical poetry, by slow degrees, to a stilted bombast, giving great words to little meaning, heaping up epithet upon epithet, tricking out commonplaces in diction more and more gorgeous, till sense and simplicity are alike sought in vain; 820-1400."¹

The centres of Greek hymnody in its most brilliant period were Sicily, Constantinople, and Jerusalem and its neighborhood, particularly St. Sabba's monastery, where lived St. Cosmas and St. John Damascene, the two greatest of the Greek Christian poets. The hymnists of this epoch preserved much of the alertness and objectivity of the earlier writers, especially in the hymns written to celebrate the Nativity, the Epiphany, and other events in the life of Christ. In others a more reflective and introspective quality is found. The fierce struggles, hatreds and persecutions of the Iconoclastic controversy also left their plain mark upon many of them in a frequent tendency to magnify temptations and perils, in a profound sense of sin, a consciousness of the necessity of penitential discipline for the attainment of salvation, and a certain fearful anticipation of judgment. This attitude, so different from the peace and confidence of the earlier time, attains its most striking manifestation in the sombre and powerful funeral dirge ascribed to St. John Damascene ("Take the last kiss") and the Judgment hymn of St. Theodore of the Studium. In the latter the poet strikes with trembling hand the tone which four hundred years later was sounded with such imposing majesty in the *Dies Iræ* of St. Thomas of Celano.²

The Catholic hymnody, so far at least as concerns the usage of the ritual, belongs properly to a later period. The hymns of St. Hilary, St. Damasus, St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, Prudentius, Fortunatus, and St. Gregory, which afterward so beautified the Divine Office, were originally designed for private devotion and for accessory ceremonies, since it was not until the tenth or eleventh century that hymns were introduced into the office at Rome, following a tendency that was first prominently recognized

¹ *Hymns of the Eastern Church*, translated, with notes and an introduction by J. M. Neale, D.D.

² For criticisms and translations of the Greek hymns the reader is referred to the work of Dr. Neale already mentioned: *Julian's Dictionary of Hymnology*; *Encyclopædia Britannica*, article Hymns; Mrs. Charles' *Voice of Christian Life in Song*; Schaff's *Christ in Song*, and Saunders' *Evenings With the Sacred Poets*.

by the permission of the Council of Toledo in the seventh century.

The history of Christian poetry and music in the East ends with the separation of the Eastern and Western Churches. From that time onward a chilling blight rested upon the soil which the apostles had cultivated with such zeal and for a time with such grand result. The fatal controversy over Icons, the check inflicted by the conquests of the Mohammedan power, the crushing weight of Byzantine luxury and tyranny, and that insidious apathy which seems to dwell in the very atmosphere of the Orient, sooner or later entering into every high endeavor, relaxing and corrupting—all this sapped the spiritual life of the Eastern Church. The pristine enthusiasm was succeeded by fanaticism, and out of fanaticism, in its turn, issued formalism, bigotry, stagnation. It was only among the nations that were to rear a new civilization in Western Europe on the foundations laid by the Roman empire that political and social conditions could be created which would give free scope for the expansion of the divine life of Christianity. It was only in the West, also, that the motives that were adequate to inspire a Christian art, after a long struggle against Byzantine formalism and convention, could issue in sufficient artistic expression. The attempted reconciliation of Christian ideas and traditional pagan method formed the basis of Christian art, but the new insight into spiritual things, and the profounder emotions that resulted, demanded new ideals and principles as well as new subjects. The nature and destiny of the soul, the beauty and significance that lie in secret self-scrutiny and aspiration kindled by a new hope, this rather than the loveliness of outward shape became the object of contemplation and the endless theme of art. Architecture and sculpture became symbolic, painting the representation of the life of the soul, poetry and music the direct witness and the immediate manifestation of the soul itself.

With the edicts of Constantine early in the fourth century, which practically made Christianity the dominant religious system of the empire, the swift dilation of the pent-up energy of the Church inaugurated an era in which ritualistic splendor kept pace with the rapid acquisition of temporal power. The hierarchical developments had already traversed a course parallel to those of the East, and now that the Church was free to work out that genius of organization of which it had already become definitely conscious, it went one step farther than the Oriental system in the establishment of the Papacy as the single head from which the subordinate members derived legality. This was not a time when a

democratic form of church government could endure. There was no place for such in the ideas of that age. And in the furious tempests that overwhelmed the Roman empire, in the readjustment of political and social conditions all over Europe, with the convulsions and frequent triumphs of savagery that inevitably attended them, it was necessary that the Church, as the sole champion and preserver of civilization and righteousness, should concentrate all her forces, and become in doctrine, worship and government a single, compact, unified, spiritual state. The dogmas of the Church must be formulated, preserved, and guarded by an official class, and the ignorant and fickle mass of the common people must be taught to yield a reverent, unquestioning obedience to the rule of their spiritual lords. The exposition of theology, the doctrine of the ever-renewed sacrifice of Christ upon the altar, the theory of the sacraments generally, all involved the conception of a mediatorial priesthood deriving its authority by direct transmission from the apostles. Out of such conditions and tendencies proceeded also the elaborate and awe-inspiring rites, the fixed liturgies embalming the central dogmas of the faith, and the whole machinery of a worship which was itself viewed as of a certain objective efficacy, inspired by the Holy Spirit, and designed both for the edification of the believer and as an offering of the Church to its Redeemer. In the development of the outward observances of worship, with their elaborate symbolic ceremonialism, the student is often struck with surprise to see how lavishly the Church drew its forms and decorations from Paganism and Judaism. But there is nothing in this that need excite wonder, nothing that was not inevitable under the conditions of the times. Says Lanciani: "In accepting rites and customs which were not offensive to her principles and morality, the Church showed equal tact and foresight, and contributed to the peaceful accomplishment of the transformation."¹ The Pagan or Jewish convert was not obliged to part with all his ancestral notions of the nature of worship. He found his love of pomp and splendor gratified by the ceremonies of a religion which knew how to make many of the fair features of earthly life accessory to the inculcation of spiritual truth. And so it was that symbolism and the appeal to the senses aided in commending Christianity to a world which was not yet prepared for a faith which should require only a silent, unobtrusive experience. Instruction must come to the populace in forms which would satisfy their inherited predispositions. The

¹ *Pagan and Christian Rome*, p. 23.

Church, therefore, establishing itself among heathenism assumed a large number of rites and customs from classical antiquity, and in the externals of its worship, as well as of its government, assumed forms which were contributions from without, as well as evolutions from within. These acquisitions, however, did not by any means remain a meaningless or incongruous residuum of dead superstitions. An instructive symbolism was imparted to them; they were moulded with marvelous art into the whole vesture with which the Church clothed herself for the instruction, as well as the admiration, of her votaries, and were made to become conscious witnesses to the truth and beauty of the new faith.

The commemoration of martyrs and confessors passed into invocations for their aid as intercessors with Christ. They became the patron saints of individuals and orders, and honors were paid to them at particular places and on particular days, involving a multitude of special ritual observances. Festivals were multiplied and took the place in popular regard of the old Roman Lupercalia and Saturnalia and the mystic rites of heathenism. As among the cultivated nations of antiquity, so in Christian Rome the festival, calling into requisition every available means of design and decoration, became the basis of a rapid development of art. Under all these conditions the music of the Church in Italy became a liturgic music, and, as in the East, the laity resigned the main offices of song to a choir consisting of subordinate clergy and appointed by clerical authority. The method of singing was undoubtedly not indigenous, but derived, as has already been shown, directly or indirectly from Eastern practice. Milman asserts that the liturgy of the Roman Church for the first three centuries was Greek. However this may have been, we know that both Syrian and Greek influences were strong at that time in the Italian Church. A number of the Popes in the seventh century were Greeks. Until the cleavage of the Church into its final Eastern and Western divisions the interaction was strong between them, and much in the way of custom and art was common to both. The conquests of the Moslem power in the seventh century drove many Syrian monks into Italy, and their liturgic practice, half Greek, half Semitic, could not fail to make itself felt among their adopted brethren.

A notable instance of the transference of Oriental custom into the Italian Church is to be found in the establishment of antiphonal chanting in the Church of Milan, at the instance of St. Ambrose, bishop of that city. St. Augustine, the pupil and friend of St. Ambrose, has given an account of this event, of

which he had personal knowledge. "It was about a year, or not much more," he relates, "since Justina, the mother of the boy-emperor Justinian, persecuted Thy servant Ambrose in the interest of her heresy, to which she had been seduced by the Arians." [This persecution was to induce St. Ambrose to surrender some of the churches of the city to the Arians.] "The pious people kept guard in the church, prepared to die with their bishop, Thy servant. At this time it was instituted that, after the manner of the Eastern Church, hymns and psalms should be sung, lest the people should pine away in the tediousness of sorrow, which custom, retained from then till now, is imitated by many—yea, by almost all of Thy congregations throughout the rest of the world."¹

The conflict of St. Ambrose with the Arians occurred in 386. Before the introduction of the antiphonal chant the Psalms were probably rendered in a semi-musical recitation, similar to the usage mentioned by St. Augustine as prevailing at Alexandria under St. Athanasius, "more speaking than singing." That a more elaborate and emotional style was in use at Milan in St. Augustine's time is proved by the very interesting passage in the tenth book of the "Confessions," in which he analyzes the effect upon himself of the music of the Church, fearing lest its charm had beguiled him from pious absorption in the sacred words into a purely æsthetic gratification. He did not fail, however, to render the just meed of honor to the music that so touched him: "How I wept at Thy hymns and canticles, pierced to the quick by the voices of Thy melodious Church! Those voices flowed into my ears, and the truth distilled into my heart, and thence there streamed forth a devout emotion, and my tears ran down, and happy was I therein."²

Antiphonal psalmody, after the pattern of that employed at Milan, was introduced into the divine office at Rome by Pope Celestine, who reigned 422-432. It is at about this time that we find indications of the more systematic development of the liturgic priestly chant. The history of the papal choir goes back as far as the fifth century. Leo I., who died in 461, gave a durable organization to the divine office by establishing a community of monks to be especially devoted to the service of the canonical hours. In the year 580 the monks of Monte Cassino, founded by St. Benedict, suddenly appeared in Rome and announced the destruction of their monastery by the Lombards. Pope Pelagius received them hospitably, and gave them a dwelling near the

¹ *Confessions*, book ix., chap. 7.

² *Confessions*, book ix., chap. 6.

Lateran basilica. This cloister became a means of providing the papal chapel with singers. In connection with the college of men-singers, who held the clerical title of sub-deacon, stood an establishment for boys, who were to be trained for service in the Pope's choir, and who were also given instruction in other branches. This school received pupils from the wealthiest and most distinguished families, and a number of the early Popes, including Gregory II. and Paul I., received instruction within its walls.

By the middle or latter part of the sixth century, the mediæval epoch of church music had become fairly inaugurated. A large body of liturgic chants had been classified and systematized, and the teaching of their form and the tradition of their rendering given into the hands of members of the clergy especially detailed for their culture. The liturgy, essentially completed during or shortly before the reign of Gregory the Great (590-604), was given a musical setting throughout, and this liturgic chant was made the law of the Church equally with the liturgy itself, and the first steps were taken to impose one uniform ritual and one uniform chant upon all the congregations of the Western Church.

The obscurity of the period of which we have been speaking must not deceive us in respect to its importance in the history of the Catholic Church. Among the priceless blessings which she has conferred upon the world not the least has been those forms of religious music—first the chant, then the *a capella* chorus—truly divinely inspired and nourished, which she developed in the middle ages as the purest expression that the world has known of the sentiment and motive of worship. And it was in the first six centuries, when the Church was organizing and drilling her forces for her victorious conflicts, that the final direction of her music, as of all her art, was consciously taken. In rejecting the support of instruments and developing for the first time an exclusively vocal art, and in breaking loose from the restrictions of antique metre which in Grecian and Greco-Roman music had forced melody to keep step with strict prosodic measure, Christian music parted company with pagan art, threw the burden of expression not, like Greek music, upon rhythm, but upon melody, and found in this absolute vocal melody a new art principle of which all the worship music of modern Christendom is the natural and glorious fruit. More vital still than these special forms and principles, comprehending and necessitating them, was the true ideal of music, proclaimed once for all by the fathers of the liturgy. This ideal is found in the distinction of the church style from the secu-

lar style, the expression of the universal mood of prayer, rather than the expression of individual, fluctuating, passionate emotion with which secular music deals—that rapt, pervasive, exalted tone which makes no attempt at detailed painting of events or superficial mental states, but seems rather to symbolize the fundamental sentiments of humility, awe, hope and love which mingle all particular experiences in the common offering which surges upward from the heart of the Church to the Lord and Master of all. In this avoidance of an impassioned emphasis of details in favor of an expression drawn from the large spirit of worship, church music evades the peril of introducing an alien dramatic element into the holy ceremony, and asserts its nobler power of creating an atmosphere from which all wordly custom and association disappears. This grand conception was early injected into the mind of the Church, and has been the parent of all that has been most noble and edifying in the creations of ecclesiastical music.

Judged from these view-points, there are few epochs in art history that seem to be of greater moment. The serene and touching melodies of the Gregorian chant, which carry us back near to this very era, are witnesses that the first application of these new principles was not in feeble and awkward phrases, but in forms so beautiful and appropriate that they endure while other forms of music arise, flourish and fade away. The revival in recent years of the study of the liturgic chant, and the mediæval *a capella* chorus music which grew out of it, arouses an insatiable curiosity to know the causes which set in motion so great an art movement. These causes cannot all be traced in detail, but with the aid of the scanty records much light can be thrown upon them by a comparative study of the liturgies, hymns, architecture, and the political, hierarchical and doctrinal developments of the time. By this method it may be seen that the music of the early Church was not accidental or decorative, or lacking in vital significance. It was an outgrowth of the conditions of the age, of the necessities of devotional expression, and of that peculiar genius of Catholicism that has made every external phenomenon symbolic of the spiritual life within. The Catholic Church develops, but, in essence, she does not change. The history of her music is likewise typical of her whole history. Manifold in its diversity, it has pursued one definite consistent aim, and that aim was already manifest in the first steps of its career.

EDWARD DICKINSON.

RUSSIAN ORTHODOXY AND THE BULL ON
ANGLICAN ORDERS.

HOLY Russia is proverbially slow, and, like individuals who are tardy of intellect or movement, she is obstinate. That stubbornness of temperament which we find so forcibly illustrated in the retention of the old style after all the rest of the world had accepted the corrected calendar, is denoted also in the continued adhesion to the Greek schism with the acceptance of the Czar as the head of the ecclesiastical system. It would be surprising if a system of this kind could conform itself to the appeal for unity sent out by the Holy Father; for as long as the head of the State—the “divine figure of the North,” as the Czar is styled—retains the absolute power in spirituals and temporals he now wields, all those who have watched the effects of civil supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs can entertain no hope of a Church so subjected being able to consider any vital proposition from an independent standpoint.

We may well doubt that in any ecclesiastical system with a Christian basis could be found a set of conditions more unfavorable for the impartial consideration of any question affecting the whole of Christianity than that of Russia. Its traditions of enmity to Latin Christianity, its inextricable bonds of connection with State policy, its fanatical attachment to ancient symbols and formularies, the low intellectual condition of the great mass of its clergy, the quasi-police methods of its administration, and the general spirit of serfdom which seems to pervade it throughout the whole empire—all these facts have to be taken into account when estimating the chances of a general unification. The Church of Russia, one might well conclude, would need to be born over again before it could be brought once more within the fold of Christ. But we must not take this view. With all its degradation and all its superstition, with the curse of state enslavement clinging around its limbs like the poisoned shirt of the centaur around the limbs of Hercules, the Russian Church has still within it the germ of divine grace. It is not heretical; it is but schismatic. It has the body of divine truth and the grace of the sacraments. Differing little in essentials from the Latin Church, it is yet far less likely to embrace any proposals for unity

than any other offshoot of the Christian tree, because its life is interwoven with that of the State, and because it inherits a tradition of hatred and persecution toward the Church which never bowed to the State such as no other Church has so continuously carried out, and which seems to have source in a consciousness of inferiority.

We find now an expression of opinion emanating from this still mediæval institution on the controversy raised by the Anglican bishops over the Pope's pronouncement; and though it comes somewhat late in the day, it deserves some consideration: first, because it is a well-matured opinion, and, secondly, because it represents the judgment of a body which assumes a power of co-ordinate jurisdiction, centred in the Church, with the tribunal of the Vatican. We may pass by the arrogance of this assumption for the present, and invite the attention of those who have upheld the position of the Anglican bishops as against the Holy Father's decision to the fact that a Church with which some English dignitaries have been coquetting, and into whose communion some members of the English Church have been taken in Australia, now repudiates the claim of the Anglicans to any true sacerdotal possession, and takes up substantially the very same ground as the illustrious author of "*Apostolicæ Curæ*" did. Here is a curious situation for a body of communicants who would fain persuade themselves that they are still portions of the universal Christian brotherhood. They cannot remain where they are, and they cannot get away from their anomalous position. Loss of salvation threatens them on the one hand, political revolution on the other. And there is no golden bridge by which they can escape with safety.

We are not aware of the exact status held in the Russian Church by the writer who signs himself Vladimir Kerensky, but we may take the fact of an article of his, quoted from the "*Orthodox Interlocutor*," appearing in the "*Russian Orthodox American Messenger*," as some evidence of an authoritative position. It is a carefully written communication, and its presentation of both sides of the case, although synoptical, is tolerably correct. But it must be noted, with not a little amusement, that while it deprecates any absolute conclusion on the subject from the Roman Catholic standpoint, it assumes for itself an unqualified right to pronounce between the two sides from the superior vantage-ground of the "*Orthodox Russian*." It is not asserted, or claimed, either by insinuation or direct statement, that there is in the Russian Church any authority competent to render a decision

on such a delicate point. When the writer, then, delivers the opinion that the claim of the Anglicans to a valid sacramental power in their Church is not supported by the facts of the case, yet goes on to argue that the grounds set forth by the Sovereign Pontiff are "inconclusive," and that the question is still open, we are compelled to wonder at the resources of the Russian mind when it comes to a question of getting off the horns of a dilemma.

The "Answer," the article points out, "is almost entirely silent upon one very substantial objection which the Bull raises against the validity of these ordinations. The Bull's position is that the Anglican Church corrupts the very conception of priesthood and destroys the meaning thereof as of a Sacrament, and therefore the rite of ordination as it exists in that Church has no real signification. The Anglican hierarchs do not refute the premises, but merely assert that their rite of ordination is correct, that it contains everything that is essential to it. Evidently such a reply to the objection made in the Bull cannot be considered satisfactory. Admitting the Anglican rite of ordination to be correct, to contain all the essentials, the laying on of hands, the reading of appropriate prayers, etc.,—what of it? The Lutheran community also has the laying on of hands, accompanied by the reading of certain prayers, when a given person is called to the pastoral office. It does not follow, of course, that the grace of priesthood exists in the Lutheran community—because, while preserving this external form, Lutheranism denies the existence of Orders as a Sacrament."

This is a gentle way of saying that these ceremonies are so many mere formalities to make a pretence of the reception or conferring of ministerial or pastoral power. The "laying on of empty hands upon an empty head," as Mr. Spurgeon described the proceeding, can only make a pastor in a human or conventicle sense; the inner and supernal grace that accompanies the rite, when performed by those vested with the power of true apostolic transmission, can hardly be deemed to be present when that very succession is denied, and the attribute that makes the sacred character of priesthood denied not only to the minister but to the Church itself.

To our Lutheran brethren no less than our Anglican, this keen criticism of the Russian writer is respectfully commended. But the real question at issue does not rest, as the writer seems rather inconsistently to assume after laying down this line of exclusion, on the crux, "Does the Anglican Church recognize Orders as a

Sacrament in proper sense, or does she not?" The fact of such an internal recognition, without any force of apostolic succession in the Church itself, as has been shown to be the case by the result of the historical investigation, can hardly be deemed sufficient. When the very essence of a sacrament is rejected by the written doctrine and the prescriptive practice of the institution itself, how can any claim to the external force and effect of such a sacrament be set up by it? An army officer, a ship captain, a civil-service functionary, has as much authority, from a sacerdotal point of view, to minister in the offices of religion as clergymen appointed by those State Churches who are by their own act cut off from apostolic and sacramental fellowship with the body of the Church. These go through their functions entirely in a temporal way, and what are called sacraments by them are only temporal ceremonies, having no intrinsic value as sacraments, since sacramental power, save with regard to two sacraments, is repudiated for the Church to which they adhere, and that Church is resolved, therefore, as regards the rest, into an organization of separate entities, each of which has full authority and freedom to settle matters of dogma and doctrine for itself. Hence it has no cohesive force, by which it may be preserved in any semblance of uniformity, even in externals, from one generation to another, save that of the self-interest resulting from the favor and material support of the State. This is the position into which the question logically resolves itself, if we follow out the argument on which Protestantism generally rests to its right conclusion.

Sharp-sighted as the Russian critic appears to be, he seems to miss the point suggested by the defect he points out. Only two sacraments are relied upon in the Thirty-nine Articles as really instituted by the New Testament and essential to salvation—namely, Baptism and Communion. If the clergy of the Anglican Church possess, as Anglicans assert, no sacramental character from the fact of their ordination, whence comes the power to consecrate bread and wine and administer them as a sacrament? Or is there any such power, or what is there to establish the claim that these elements differ in any degree whatsoever from the bread and wine of ordinary commerce and consumption? Surely, when sacramental qualities are not attributed to the Church or its rites, or to the character of its pastorate, it can hardly be thought that any special grace accompanies the performance of a simple un-kerneled ceremony.

The passage in the Thirty-nine Articles which decides this question for Anglicans is quoted by the writer :

“There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel; that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony and Extreme Unction, are not to be accounted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.”

“It will be easily seen from all this,” remarks the Russian critic, “that the Thirty-nine Articles really and truly strip priesthood of the quality of grace.”

“All the symbolical books of the Anglican Church,” he emphatically superadds, “from the first to the last, deny in substance the grace of priesthood.” Looking at the question from an Anglican point of view, he concludes ordained persons are the same as any other persons, only that they have received external powers to minister in the Church.

Admitting this logic to be true, the term “the Church,” in this connection, goes the same way as the term “clergy.” It is a human institution merely when it possesses no sacrament-creating power or ministry, and has no other foundation than human sanction.

The manifest irreconcilability of the facts and the Thirty-nine Articles with the practices of many of the Anglican clergy is a point which has not escaped the critic's observation. The fact that the practice differs from the law does not alter the case in Russian Orthodox eyes :

“How can we reconcile this doctrine of the Anglican Church on the Sacrament of Orders with her sumptuously developed Sacramentary?” he asks. “Many Anglican theologians, fully realizing the internal contradiction with which their Church has to contend in this particular case, emphasize the fact that neither the Thirty-nine Articles nor their other so-called symbolical books bear a compulsory character in their Church; and that, therefore, the members of their denomination may, and many really do, recognize the grace of priesthood. But where is the foundation of such a belief, and where the expression of it? For those who stand outside the Anglican confession there is no such foundation and no such expression; consequently, neither is there anything to warrant our looking on the Anglican hierarchy from this point of view.”

If this argument were to be taken in all sincerity as an attempt to determine where truth really lies as between two disputants, we might be satisfied with the expressions of opinion above cited as sufficient evidence of a true verdict. But this is far from being the case. The sum—the very inconsequential sum of the writer's propositions *pro* and *contra*—is presented thus :

“While, on one hand, the Papal Bull fails in some points to bring proofs justifying its denial of the validity of Anglican ordinations, the ‘Answer’ of the Anglican hierarchs, on the other, is wanting in force in its defence of these same ordinations.”

The unsophistical reader who has followed the critic's argument, fairly and sufficiently set forth in the excerpts given, must perforce conclude that the writer himself has demolished the pretence of "validity" most effectually. Then what further proofs can be needed? Is it not a case of *cadit quæstio*?

The Bull "Apostolicæ Curæ" the writer had previously described as of immense importance because it rested the grounds for its adverse decision, not on the legend of the Nag's Head ordination, or any doubtful assumptions, but simply on *facts*. These facts are, mainly, the mission of Cardinal Pole and the Gordon ordination. This is the position as to history; the argument from the doctrinal position of the contestants is, in the view of the critic himself, perfectly impregnable. Any ordinary reader endeavoring to follow his tortuous subtleties would early have concluded that he raised no question of the soundness of the Pope's decision on historical grounds. Nor does he, in reality; he merely declares that the Holy Father's method of presenting the historical view of the case is "one-sided." The Anglican bishops did not raise any such ground of challenge, for they knew how futile it would prove to be. All the data are in the hands of the Vatican; and is it to be supposed that the Holy Father, whose yearning for unity is so keen, would not rather have sought to sweep away a barrier where a doubt existed than decided on its continuance? But far more amazing is the demurrer taken to the acceptance of the Anglicans' own doctrine on Sacraments. Here is what the writer says on this point:

"Not less one-sided is that part of the Bull which decides the question dogmatically, by a critical examination of the Anglican Church's doctrine on the Sacrament of Orders. . . . One of the chief grounds adduced by the Papal Bull for denying Anglican ordinations, the quality of grace in a dogmatic sense, is the fact that, in the ritual of these ordinations, there is no mention of the bishop's power and the priest's office to consecrate and offer in sacrifice the Body and Blood of the Lord, without which mention, it is alleged, this rite is utterly worthless. Again, this line of argumentation can of course impress only a truly believing member of the Roman Catholic Church, in whose eyes a deviation from this or that standard established by his Church as absolutely right constitutes a crime."

If it were any but a Russian theologian or polemic who had written the foregoing and afterwards penned the sentences we have previously quoted dismissing the Anglican claims on this very ground, we should be justified in believing him insensible to the absurdity of self-stultification. He proves the non-possession of sacramental grace by both Anglicans and Lutherans—so far as orders are concerned, not by the allegations of those outside these

communions, but out of their own laws and ordinals. His condemnation is more sweeping, because more frequently repeated, than the language of the Bull he challenges. As champion of an "Orthodox" Church he is concerned for the integrity of the sacraments, and he ought to know that the Pope's decision was in no sense a matter of option, but one dependent solely upon absolute recorded facts.

One of the reasons urged by the critic for his objection to this decision is "the narrowly Catholic stand which the Bull takes." Here, perhaps, we may find some clue to a state of mind which regards logical confusion neither as a position demanding explanation nor a cause of embarrassment. There is no power in the Russian Church capable of rendering an authoritative doctrinal decision. The Czar would hardly deem himself competent to pronounce a dogmatic definition. Napoleon, when he sought to make the Church an appanage or department of the State, is said to have seriously reasoned himself into the belief that as head of the State and dictator of the Church he was, although not in holy orders, a bishop, and so entitled to decide on theological questions as well as questions of State. The Czar seems to be less presumptuous. He is president of the Holy Synod, but in how far he pretends to spiritual powers we are not aware. Before the abolition of the Russian Patriarchate there was a semblance of capital authority in the schismatic Church, just as there is in the Greek Church. The Patriarch was the over-bishop and exercised a controlling authority, in so far as the convoking of councils and the nomination to Sees were concerned. The loosening of the principle of cohesion resulting from the abolition of this high office has so weakened the idea of the necessity for unity in the Universal Church that the Russian mind seems now scarcely able to grasp it. The division of the Church into several large branches is now quietly acquiesced in as the natural evolution of Christianity. Hence the complaint about the "narrowly Catholic spirit" of the Pope's decision. Besides being a contradiction in terms, the statement is logically absurd.

In the year 1839 a gentleman named Palmer, a brother of Lord Selborne, and a cherished friend of Dr. Newman, when the Oxford movement was at fever-heat, conceived the singular idea of going to Russia and joining the National Church, as a means of contributing what he could to the unification of what he considered to be three branches of the one mystical body—the Roman, the Greek, and the Anglican. The idea was, if we consider the time, an odd one; but if we try to put ourselves into the shoes of a man

under the influence of a perturbing spiritual impulse, who seeks a haven of rest, we can readily understand how the lights of one haven may be mistaken for those of another. Mr. Palmer went to Russia, and in a most earnest and sincere spirit addressed himself to the task he had set before himself. But he found he had never made a greater mistake than when he imagined that there was any sympathy with Protestantism in the Russian Church. He was received politely; he met huge military personages who represented the Czar in the army and the Church, and who smiled at the idea of a British monarch assuming to be the head of an ecclesiastical establishment representing nothing but a revolt from the old Sacramental Church of Christendom. He applied to the Archbishop of Moscow for the privilege of communion with the Russian Church, but the grounds upon which the claim was based were categorically controverted by the Archbishop, and the request was refused. Afterwards Mr. Palmer admitted the decision was just. He perceived, on analyzing his own logic, that he had no ground for claiming communion with Russia, but that if he desired reconciliation with the mother Church he must go to the centre of unity, which is Rome. Mr. Palmer was made to realize, in short, in a very unmistakable way, that even a decadent Czar-ruled Church, conscious of still possessing the body of the faith in the validity of its priesthood and the genuineness of its sacraments, looks with contempt upon the pretensions of all sects which, having repudiated all authority, still seek for recognition as bodies authoritative from their own assumption of apostolic functions.

The most humiliating repudiation of all, however, is the latest one published. It is that of the Jansenist body. Through the mouth of the Archbishop of Utrecht this small schismatic body emphatically deny that the Anglican clergy possess any claim to be considered a canonical priesthood. The gist of the declaration is contained in the subjoined excerpt:

“The Established Church of England knows nothing of a sacrificing priest in the Catholic sense, as her Thirty-nine Articles and other declarations prove. Consequently, if it is indispensable that the power of offering the sacrifice of the Mass be expressed in the rite of Ordination, whether by word or sign, then it becomes impossible to recognize Anglican Orders. But on this point I wish to suspend my judgment until the whole Church shall have decided the point. But until the Anglicans reject their Thirty-nine Articles there can be no question of reunion between us and them.”

This is the common-sense view of the case, stated with Dutch simplicity; and when one considers the question from the point of view here taken, it does certainly strike the mind with amazement how any body of men with a clerical training could reason against the plain facts on which the Jansenist opinion is based.

Nowhere, then, is there any prospect of comfort for the anxious Anglicans. If there were hope of sympathy with their claims, outside the Roman communion, surely it ought to be looked for in the ranks of the schismatic churches. But what more convincing proof could be afforded of the impregnability of the Pope's position than the reluctant endorsement of his substantive contention by those semi-detached members of the once united body? They would, naturally, have been glad to seek confirmation of their own withdrawal by recognizing the status of the Anglican body as fellow-malcontents, if it were at all possible to do so. Now the ground is completely cleared for a new departure. We do not see any possible solution for the crux but a partition of the Anglican Church. The question cannot remain where it is, for there are millions of minds seething in a fever of doubt and unrest, and their yearnings can hardly be left unsatisfied much longer. The conscience of the better part of the nation is stirring, and this, the most potent force in all the world, is as certain to work out its effects as the snows and ice of the winter to disintegrate the soil for the plough.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

BIOLOGIC SOCIOLOGY.

WHATEVER subject the human mind inquires into, whatever phenomena it analyses of the soul within us or of nature without, it always pursues the knowledge of causes, proximate and remote, as its proper object. Eager and steady in this pursuit, it can never come to rest without ascending to the very fountain-head whence all effects ultimately spring into existence. Obeying this innate tendency of reason, philosophers who have made society their special study, not content with the knowledge of its end and organization, have also endeavored to trace its existence back to its proper cause and origin. Nor can this inquiry be dispensed with. For, indeed, it is not immaterial whether society is the result of blind causation or the product of an agent working with aim and purpose; whether it is formed by an arbitrary agreement of changeable men or shaped by the wise and benign Creator of nature to last as long as human beings will inhabit the earth. Society has a material existence, and obeys but organic laws. If it results from forces intrinsic to matter, but is a moral entity ruled by moral laws; if it springs from man's rational nature, as the highest evolution of a self-existent universe, it is supreme and independent, but is subject to the authority of a superior Lawgiver, if devised and instituted by a personal Deity.

I.

According to the teachings of the old school, society was an institution of nature. Aristotle's saying that man was naturally a social being was universally admitted as an axiomatic truth. Pursuing this thought, Christian Philosophy concluded to a still higher origin. While it held social life to be a natural requisite of man, it discovered in human nature not merely an animal organism, but also a spiritual element, immaterial reason; and regarding all nature as the work of God, it recognized reason in particular as His likeness and participation. Hence, in accordance with the Christian view, as an institution of nature society is imperatively demanded, not by merely organic but by rational laws, is framed by the Eternal Wisdom, ordained by the Divine Will, and is to be governed by the Eternal Reason manifesting its dictates through created intelligence.

This Christian conception was dimmed at the very dawn of the modern era. Shortly after the period of the Reformation the English philosopher, Thomas Hobbes, described society as the mere outcome of a human covenant. To his mind the original condition of our race was a war of every man against every man. Starting into existence with intense egoistic tendencies, with strong and unbridled passions, human nature could not but impel each individual to the pursuit of his own advantage regardless of, or even in opposition to, the interest of others. Such a state, however, was as unsatisfactory as it was harmful. Accordingly, by mutual agreement, men united in social life by establishing, of their own accord, an absolute authority, which, on the one hand, was to be obeyed by all with unconditional submission, yet, on the other, was pledged to maintain peace and order and afford protection. Thus society originated in the free-will of self-interested men.

On a somewhat different ground was the theory of a social contract in early times postulated by J. J. Rousseau. In his opinion, men originally lived in perfect isolation; harmless, upright and peaceful. Society was a cunning invention of man to substitute artificial for natural happiness, with the hope of greater, yet doubtful, advantages. Not being intended by nature, it came to be established by a general contract, by which all surrendered their original freedom of action and essential independence to a common centre—the will of the people—on the condition of sharing the universal sovereignty created by the accumulation of resigned individual rights.

For some time Rousseau's social contract was the basis of all political theories. Even Kant espoused it, notwithstanding his opposition to French materialism, and his no less decided leaning to idealism. But ere long the tide of philosophic opinion reverted to nature as the origin of society, not, however, to resuscitate the theistic views of by-gone ages. True, the state ceased to be considered as a mere artificial body devised by human wit. It began again to be looked upon as a natural organization. Yet, according to the new conception, human nature, which gives rise to society, is not a creature of God subject to His law, but a self-existent being evolving by independent activity. Such absoluteness was attributed to man, either as animated by Divine Reason or as the highest evolution of uncreated and all-comprising matter. The former view, altogether pantheistic, was an outgrowth of German idealism initiated by Kant; the latter, which was materialistic, was a development of sensism or empiricism

prevalent in France and England during the last two centuries. We shall not treat here of the pantheistic state, the absolute oppressor of individual liberty. It is the evolutionary thesis of society that occupies our attention.

But if evolution as applied to sociology is to be sifted, why should we not first of all direct our attention to the theory which has been elaborated most carefully and developed most consistently by him who is considered the ablest modern thinker—the theory of Herbert Spencer? Reasoning from the general idea of evolution, he attempts to show that society is an organism in the proper sense, and that consequently it rises and evolves from lower stages of life in strict accordance with biological laws. His Sociology, therefore, is biologic, a department of biology. Nor is this only his view. His authority and his writings have obtained for it the widest acceptance; so much so that Biological Sociology is regarded by many as pre-eminently the social theory. Let us, then, see on what line of argument he establishes his position.

II.

In his "First Principles of Synthetic Philosophy" he characterizes evolution as the universal process, one in kind and fact, by which the entire universe in all its parts and realms is formed, and to which all changes following one another in uninterrupted succession must be reduced. Summing up all its particulars, and all the conclusions arrived at, both inductively and deductively, he expresses its general law in the following formula:

*"Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite coherent heterogeneity, and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation."*¹

To fully understand this formula, we must bear in mind that the forces which are active during evolution are merely material. Indeed no one is more explicit in maintaining this view than Mr. Spencer himself, notwithstanding the fundamental tenet of his theory that beyond all phenomena, all perceptible changes, there lies as their ultimate cause an absolute unknowable, universal and persistent power intrinsic to the cosmos. The briefest analysis of this power will show us that it is merely material. It is absolute only when considered as unformed in itself, as an abstract entity, a common reality or element lying at the root of all. As such,

¹ *First Principles*, § 145.

however, it does not exist, for it is formed and determined by the particular existences we experience. It is unknowable only because it is represented in the mind not by a definite, but an indefinite and abstract notion. But this conception of it is formed by the generalization of our concrete perceptions, since it manifests itself through, and is implied in, all the phenomena of the visible universe. Hence "the universally co-existent forces of attraction and repulsion are aspects of it, forms and modes under which it is represented in consciousness." It is a persistent force, not because it is unchangeable,—for it is, in fact, constantly changing in its forms and its modes,—but because its quantity remains the same through all periods of time and under all changes. It is a universal intrinsic cause, not for the reason that it is above all phenomena, but because it manifests itself through all of them as modes of its own existence. Thus it is not distinct from nature, nor prior to, but identical with it. Arguing from its attributes, we must conclude that the absolute, the unconditioned, the unknowable, which is said to be the universal cause, is merely a generalization, an abstract conception of the different material forces transformable into one another; and that these, *vice versa*, are only forms and modes under which it exists and is present in our mind.

In fact, Herbert Spencer, in his "First Principles,"¹ attempts to account for the universe, its action and its form, by matter, force, motion, and their properties, such as indestructibility, equivalence, direction, equilibration, instability. In nearly every chapter of Part II. he goes through all nature, to show how by these causes and agencies all its parts and realms have been successively evolved according to one universal law; the whole solar system, no less than the individual inorganic bodies, the forms and varieties of organic life, the thoughts of the mind and the emotions of the will, from the brute and the lowest savage up to the wisest and holiest men. Of the universe thus evolved society is a special province. In his "Principles of Sociology" he expressly ranges its origin and gradual growth under the general formula of evolution.

"The many facts contemplated unite in proving that social evolution forms part of evolution at large. Like evolving aggregates in general, societies show integration both by simple increase of mass and by coalescence and re-coalescence of mass. The change from *homogeneity* to *heterogeneity* is multitudinously exemplified, up from the simple tribe, alike in all its parts, to the

¹ *First Principles*, 145.

civilized nation, full of structural and functional unlikeness. With progressing integration and heterogeneity goes increasing *coherence*. We see the wandering group dispersing, dividing, held together by no bonds; the tribe with parts made more coherent by subordination to a dominant man; the cluster of tribes united in a political plexus under a chief with sub-chiefs, and so on up to the civilized nation, consolidated enough to hold together for a thousand years or more. Simultaneously comes increasing *definiteness*. Social organization is at first vague; advance brings settled arrangements which grow slowly more precise; customs pass into laws which, while gaining fixity, also become more specific in their applications to varieties of actions; and all institutions, at first confusedly intermingled, slowly separate, at the same time that each within itself marks off more distinctly its component structures. Thus in all respects is fulfilled the formula of evolution. There is progress towards greater size, coherence, multiformity and definiteness."¹

It was not, however, in the "Principles of Sociology" that Herbert Spencer broached his idea for the purpose of unifying social and natural sciences; even his "First Principles" were intended to evince that society has gone through all the stages marked out in the general formula of evolution; and while attempting by lengthy inductions to make good this assertion, he has traced each stage of social development to the same properties and laws of matter to which he attributed the formation of the heavenly bodies out of a nebulous mass, and the rise and growth of organic life out of brute creation.

Society, then, as a product of universal evolution is contained within the self-evolving cosmos. But we might ask of what special province does it form a part? We are told that it belongs to the organic realm. Evolution is a process of equilibration, tendency to equilibrium being an essential property of the universal forces of attraction and repulsion. When equilibration becomes more complete, it constitutes life. In Herbert Spencer's theory this is a fundamental tenet. He defines life as the definite combination of heterogeneous changes both simultaneous and successive in correspondence with external existences and sequences, or as the maintenance of a moving equilibrium between the organism and its environment. The definition which he gives of the intrinsic constitution of a living being is in keeping with the definition given of life.

¹ *Principles of Sociology*, vol. i., § 271.

"Every living body exhibits in a fourfold form the process we are tracing out (equilibration)—exhibits it from moment to moment in the balancing of mechanical forces; from hour to hour in the balancing of functions; from year to year in the changes of state that compensate changes of condition; and finally in the complete arrest of vital movements at death."¹

Social life is a moving equilibrium of the same kind. Herbert Spencer's views on this special subject are very definite.

"The behavior of a single inanimate object depends on the co-operation between its own forces and the forces to which it is exposed. . . . Similarly with any group of inanimate objects. . . . It is equally so when the discrete aggregate consists of organic bodies, as of members of a species. For a species increases or decreases in number, widens or contracts its habitat, migrates or remains stationary, continues an old mode of life or falls into a new one, under the combined influences of its intrinsic nature and the environing actions, inorganic and organic. It is thus, too, with aggregates of men. Be it or be it not advanced, every society displays phenomena that are ascribable to the characters of its units and to the conditions under which they exist."²

The analogy between society and the organism, between social and organic evolution, is spun out in detail and illustrated throughout the "Principles of Sociology." To avoid endless quotations, we shall merely render the explanation which Mr. J. Fiske, in his "Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy," gives of Herbert Spencer's views—an explanation which, as to correctness, clearness and comprehensiveness, leaves nothing to be desired. After having set forth that organic life and society conform in the same manner to the general law of evolution, because both show the same primary features of integration and the same secondary features of differentiation, the American interpreter of the English philosopher affirms a fourfold essential resemblance between their respective progress as a necessary consequence. Social, as well as organic, evolution consists in the continuous adaptation to environment—that is to say, in the continuous equilibrium with it. Society, like the organism in the course of this adaptation, continually increases in definite heterogeneity through successive differentiations and integrations. In society, as in the organism, the increase of internal heterogeneity is determined by the continuous increase of heterogeneity in the environment. And this latter increase is de-

¹ *First Principles*, § 173. A fuller interpretation of life as a process of equilibration may be found in J. Fiske's *Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy*. Vol. 2, pp. 64 and 65.

² *Principles of Sociology*, § 6.

terminated by the successive integration of communities into more and more complex and coherent aggregates, the same law holding also of organic progress.¹

"These four generalizations," he then goes on to say, "expressing the points in which social and organic development coincide, were summed up in the first clauses of our law of progress.² They are immediate corollaries of the law of universal evolution, and of the definition of life as adjustment. They are not to be understood as mere expressions of striking analogies.

"They are to be understood as implying that the evolution of life and the evolution of society are to a certain extent, and in the most abstract sense, identical processes. Such a conclusion, indeed, became inevitable the moment we were brought to admit that the phenomena of society constitute but a specialized division of the phenomena of psychical life."³

From positions like these the conclusion necessarily follows that society is an organism in the proper sense. In fact, Herbert Spencer devotes a whole chapter of his "Sociology"⁴ to argumentation in favor of this proposition. As reason for it he alleges identity observed in both with regard to laws obeyed, to growth, to division of labor, to unlikeness of parts and their activities, to mutual influence and dependence. It is not merely some resemblance; it is essential likeness between them that he endeavors to establish; for, as he says, the differences and contrasts that exist between them do not result in a difference of laws of organization. Speaking of division of labor as existing in both of them, he remarks:

"Scarcely can I emphasize enough the truth that in respect of this fundamental trait a social organism and an individual organism are entirely alike."⁵

Still, as Herbert Spencer expressly affirms, despite such coincidences of social and organic life, society is not comparable with any particular type of individual organism, animal or vegetal; for it agrees with organic bodies only in fundamental or general, not in specific, features.

"Here let it once more be distinctly asserted that there exist no analogies between the body politic and a living body, save those necessitated by that mutual dependence of parts which they

¹ *Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy*, vol. ii., p. 225.

² The law of social progress is thus worded by Mr. Fiske: "The evolution of society is a continuous establishment of psychical relations within the community, in conformity with physical and psychical relations arising in the environment."—(Page 223.)

³ *Ibid.*, p. 225.

⁴ *Principles of Sociology*, part ii., ch. ii.

⁵ *Ibid.*, § 219.

display in common. Though, in foregoing chapters, sundry comparisons of social structures and functions to structures and functions in the human body have been made, they have been made only because structures and functions in the human body furnish familiar illustrations of structures and functions in general. The social organism discrete, instead of concrete; asymmetrical, instead of symmetrical; sensitive in all its units, instead of having a single sensitive centre, is not comparable to any particular type of individual organism, animal or vegetal. All kinds of creatures are alike in so far as each exhibits co-operation among its components for the benefit of the whole, and this trait, common to them, is a trait common also to societies. Further, among individual organisms, the degree of co-operation measures the degree of evolution, and this general truth, too, holds among social organisms. Once more, to effect increasing co-operation, creatures of every order show us increasingly complex appliances for transfer and mutual influence; and to this general characteristic, societies of every order furnish a corresponding characteristic. These, then, are the analogies alleged: community in the fundamental principles of organization is the only community asserted."¹

Society, therefore, is an organism of its own kind, specifically different from any individual organic body. Its differential marks have been briefly pointed out in the passage just quoted. The social organism, it was said, is discrete and asymmetrical, whereas the individual organism—the organic body—is concrete and symmetrical. The former consists of sensitive units, whereas the latter has only a sensitive centre. This is the cardinal difference. For hence it is that in society the welfare of the units is the end of the whole body, whereas in the individual organism the benefit of the whole is the end of the component parts.²

From the specific nature of society thus explained, it will be understood why Herbert Spencer is wont to call it a super-organic evolution. He evidently cannot mean to deny its organic nature, or to predicate of it immateriality, after he has proved it to be an organism and to conform to all the general or fundamental traits of organic life. If he really did, he would commit himself to palpable self-contradiction. What he means is to bring out the specific difference that exists between society as an organism consisting of several living and sentient units and a single organic body composed of parts having no separate life and perception—a dif-

¹ *Ibid.*, § 269.

² *Ibid.*, §§ 220-223.

ference implying for the former superiority in perfection and posteriority in origin. Any doubt whatever that might remain as to this interpretation is removed by Herbert Spencer himself, who, in defining supra-organic evolution, says :

“ We may conveniently mark it off as including all those processes and products which imply the co-ordinated actions of many individuals.”¹

But if the resemblance between the individual and the social organism is only general, and the difference between them specific, as has been stated, how is it still possible to regard social evolution as biologic or to explain it by biologic laws? The question seems to assume a special importance, if it is to be granted that society comes into being only after the evolution of psychic life, and that consequently, as psychology intervenes, Sociology does not come into immediate contact with Biology. All evolutionists do not agree in their answer; some even positively dissent from Herbert Spencer. Still the solution of the difficulty is plain enough. According to evolutionary views, the force which is thought to produce all cosmic phenomena, whether inorganic or organic, psychic or social, is essentially one, and the laws which it follows in its universal activity are always the same. Accordingly the process of evolution is but one, and that gradual, rising from lower to higher forms of existence. So, too, life is one continuous process of equilibration, though it goes through many stages, and grows to even higher degrees of perfection and complexity, being at first merely organic, then psychic, and at last social. The differences marking off the successive grades in the vital forms evolved arise from newly-resulting circumstances, under which the one force works and the universal laws are applied. For this reason it must be granted that the phenomena of organic, psychic and social life are unlike in complexity, and are consequents of widely-different antecedents. They are, therefore, the subject-matter of different inductive sciences. But these very sciences, like the phenomena themselves, branch off from one another as the offshoots of the same trunk.

Hear Mr. Fiske on this point :

“ As we have seen psychology to be an offspring from biology, specialized by the introduction of inquiries concerning the relations of the percipient mind to its environment, we must similarly regard sociology as an offspring from psychology, specialized by the introduction of inquiries of many percipient and emotionally-excited minds to each other and the common environment.”²

¹ *Ibid.*, § 2.

² *Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy*, vol. ii., p. 198.

Thus connected, these sciences have the same principles and the same laws in common, and are resolved into one fundamental or universal science, which is no other than the science of life, not indeed of life organic or psychic, under any particular form, but of life in general; as all particular phenomena inquired into are vital processes. Biology, then, in its wider and general sense, is the ultimate and philosophical interpretation of society, as well as of the individual organism and of the mind. And *vice versâ* Sociology, if we trace it back to its ultimate and highest reasons, explains the social phenomena by biological laws and principles.

III.

Thus in Spencer's system society is a stage of organic evolution—indeed the highest and ultimate—and Sociology a special branch of Biology. We must now investigate how, during the process of universal evolution, from the lower forms of sentient and psychic existence causes emerge and laws result so modified as to give society a peculiar organic nature, and to make Sociology, though biological in its general features, a special science distinct from all other branches of human knowledge.

Society, as explained thus far, is to be conceived as a permanent union for co-operation towards a common end, and as an equilibration between extrinsic and intrinsic forces. Both conceptions must of course coincide, and in fact do, inasmuch as each of them means an adjustment of parts to one another, and an adjustment of the whole to the achievement of a certain object in the world by which it is surrounded and acted upon. Whether conceived as a permanent union of men in the pursuit of a common end, or as a system of forces equilibrated within itself and its environment, society needs a bond which secures its existence by holding its units together, and promotes harmonious co-operation by regulating their activities. This first and most necessary constituent of social life has been identified by Herbert Spencer with the social instinct and sympathetic feeling. The social instinct—sociality—arises from a permanent co-existence of several sentient beings, demanded by their natural needs and consolidated by the survival of the fittest. The sympathetic feelings result from a life led in common, and grow in proportion as social relations are strengthened and multiplied. Once awakened, sympathy enhances sociality, and thus the two are acting and reacting as cause and consequence; greater sympathy making possible greater sociality, public and domestic, and greater sociality serving to further cultivate sympathy.¹

¹ *Principles of Psychology*, §§ 504, 512. *Justice*, § 20.

From this explanation the nature of the causes which, according to evolutionary views, give existence to society may easily be understood. Plainly, they are those which give rise to sociality and sympathy. By threatening evils which cannot be avoided, and by offering goods which cannot be obtained but by united efforts, external causes necessitate communal life on the part of many individuals. In consequence, they not only rouse social and sympathetic feelings, but also give them a decided advantage in the struggle for existence. Internal causes both widen and strengthen sociality and sympathy, and serve as means to promote and organize co-operation for a common end. Evidently causes like these may be conceived as tending to establish an equilibrium between society and its environment, or an adjustment of the social units to one another, and of the society to an end to be achieved in the external world.

The external as well as the internal causes radically pre-exist in the sub-human stages of evolution. For as human life in general, according to the evolutionary theory, is but a higher development of animal existence, so social life "arises out of an order no higher than that variously displayed in the animal world at large." Owing to the need of co-operation for the achievement of necessary ends, co-existence, sociality, and sympathy, and consequently also a sort of association, are found among brutes. Association is, of course, upon the whole, very imperfect; still in some animals it is said to have reached such a remarkable degree of development as to bear the closest resemblance to human society.

"All know that bees and wasps form communities such that the units and aggregates stand in very definite relations. Between the individual organization of the hive-bee and the organization of the hive as an orderly aggregate of individuals, with a regularly formed habitation, there exists a fixed connection."¹

"Among some species of ants super-organic evolution is carried much further. The most advanced show us division of labor carried so far that different classes of individuals are structurally adapted to different functions. White ants, or *termites*, have, in addition to males and females, soldiers and workers; and there are in some cases two kinds of males and females, winged and un-winged, making six unlike forms. Moreover, among members of the communities there is a system of signalling equivalent to a rude language, and there are elaborate processes of mining, road-

¹ *Principles of Sociology*, § 3.

making and building. In Congo, Tuckey found a complete banza (village) of ant-hills placed with more regularity than the native banzas, and Schweinfurth says a volume would be required to describe the magazines, chambers, passages, bridges contained in a *termites*-mound.

“Certain gregarious mammals, however, as the beavers, carry on social co-operation to a considerable extent in building habitations. Finally, among sundry of the *Primates*, gregariousness is joined with some subordination, some combination, some display of the social sentiments. There is obedience to leaders, there is union of efforts, there are sentinels and signals, there is an idea of property, there is exchange of services, there is adoption of orphans, and the community makes efforts on behalf of endangered members.”¹

Herbert Spencer does not hesitate to consider associations so wonderfully constituted as super-organic evolutions. Still, though ranking them in this highest class, he finds an essential difference between them and social unions in the strict and proper sense. Comparing the aggregate of insects with social aggregates, he reduces the marks which distinguish the one from the other chiefly to the following: The former is a union among individuals of the same parentage, differentiated merely in consequence of sex and community of descent, whereas the latter is a union of individuals independent in parentage and approximately equal in their capacities, yet differentiated by specialization of classes, which are not required by the rearing of offspring. Consequently, human society is the highest though not the only super-organic evolution, immensely transcending all others in extent, complication and importance.²

If a distance of such width separates animal from human associations, there must also be a difference between the social instinct and sympathetic feelings which constitute mere gregariousness, on the one hand, and sociality and human sympathy, which unite men into states and nations, on the other; and a difference, moreover, between the causes that engender these qualities in brutes in a bare rudimentary form, and those which produce and develop them in man to full perfection. These latter, then, are the specific causes of the origin and growth of human society—the causes that make it evolve out of animal aggregations, and grow from an initial and embryonic condition to a state where it is endowed with all the vital power and organization corresponding to the su-

¹ *Ibid.*, § 4.

² *Ibid.*, §§ 3, 5.

periority of its nature. There will be no difficulty in determining these causes after the admission that life in general, and society in a special manner, is an equilibrium between intrinsic and extrinsic forces, between the organism and its surroundings. First of all, they must be in part external, in part internal, and both these classes of causes must again be subdivided, according as they give origin to society or promote its growth and development. This distinction is of importance, inasmuch as philosophical inquiry is in a special manner concerned with the primary causes. Herbert Spencer terms the former division original, the latter derived factors. As original external factors, he marks out the earth; its surface, uniform or multiform; its climate, hot or cold; its flora and fauna, scanty or plenteous, hurtful or useful.

Supposing man to be the social unit, the physical, mental and emotional faculties of his nature are considered as original internal factors. The results, on the contrary, of his social activity, after society has once been established, are termed derived factors. Such are in the *environment*, the alterations artificially brought about in the climate, and in the vegetable and animal kingdom, in *society itself*, the density of population, and the influence exercised by the social body on the members, and *vice versa*. To this kind of factors also belong the action and reaction of neighboring societies, and the products of evolved faculties, such as implements, appliances, languages, knowledge, sciences, laws, and arts.¹

But let us go back to human nature, the original intrinsic factor. The chief cause which gives rise to social union is man's higher intelligence. It is this faculty that restrains the egoistic tendencies, widens and develops sympathy, forecasts the consequences of actions, devises social institutions, determines the relations between one member and the other, and between the members and society. To it is further due the fundamental character of all social progress, consisting, as Mr. Fiske says, in the continuous weakening of selfishness and the continuous strengthening of sympathy. In his "Data of Ethics,"² his treatise on *Justice*³ and his *Principles of Psychology*,⁴ Herbert Spencer expressly derives from intelligence the higher degrees of sympathy, and from higher sympathy the higher evolution of social life, though, in his opinion, the latter also helps to develop the former. In his "Principles of Sociology" he proposes to show how primitive human intelligence produces primitive society, and more fully evolved intellectual ideas estab-

¹ *Ibid.*, §§ 8-15.

² *Data of Ethics*, § 94.

³ *Justice*, ch. 4.

⁴ *Principles of Psychology*, p. 8, ch. 7, 8.

lish better and firmer social relations and superior political institutions. Nowhere does he fail to attribute civilization to psychic factors, or, in other words, to base Sociology on Psychology.

IV.

Such, then, are the causes of social existence. How do they work? What are the successive phases of the evolutionary process whose resultant is human society? By making them out step by step, Herbert Spencer intends to illustrate the gradual growth of society in accordance with the general biological laws. At first society is a small savage tribe, but it becomes ever wider in size and extension, and ever more perfect in organization, until it covers an immense territory, comprises nations, and reaches the climax of civilization. The method employed by him is not deductive, but inductive; for he does not deduce the course of social evolution from general principles, but from experience and observation he endeavors to evidence the general conformity of its evolution with organic growth and development.

Social evolution begins with integration or union of elements. The original units of which society is formed are comparatively as small as the cells which constitute the organic body.

"Societies, like living beings, begin as germs—originate from masses which are extremely minute in comparison with the masses some of them eventually reach. That out of small wandering hordes have arisen the largest societies is a conclusion not to be contested."¹

Social integration, however, soon becomes complex, as composition is directly followed by recombination. Units combine into groups wider in extent, and groups unite, in turn, among themselves.

"There is increase by simple multiplication of units, causing enlargement of the group; there is increase by union of groups, and again by union of groups of groups."

This process, continued till the social body has reached the widest dimensions, is essential to strength and vitality.²

Recompounding not only follows compounding, but is often also simultaneous with it. The union of groups increases the size of the social organism, but does not give it the density required for solidity. To obtain the latter it is necessary that in the enlarged body every particular group increases in the number of individuals.

¹ *Principles of Sociology*, § 224.

² *Ibid.*, §§ 226, 227.

"Social integration, which results from the clustering of clusters, is joined with augmentation of the number contained by each cluster. If we compare the sprinklings in regions inhabited by wild tribes with the crowds filling regions in Europe, or if we contrast the density of the population in England under the Heptarchy with its present density, we see that besides the growth produced by union of groups there has gone on interstitial growth."¹

Herbert Spencer believes he has given ample inductive proof that social evolution as just described conforms with a general law or organic growth. Even plants and animals develop by continuous multiplication of cells and clusters of cells, so that size chiefly results from the number of clusters, density from the number of cells.

In the process of evolution, integration is accompanied by differentiation, or unlikeness of parts and structures, and consequently also of functions. So, too, it is with society.

"As we progress from small groups to larger, from simple groups to compound groups, from compound groups to doubly compound ones, the unlikenesses of parts increase. The social aggregate, homogeneous when minute, habitually gains in heterogeneity along with each increment of growth; and to reach great size it must acquire great complexity."²

Owing to differentiation, advance of aggregation is followed by advance of organization, and is followed alike in the individual living beings and in society; for in both differentiation conforms to the same law expressed in the following terms:

"Differentiations proceed from the more general to the more special. First, broad and simple contrasts of parts; then, within each of the parts primarily contrasted, changes which make unlike divisions of them; then, within each of these unlike divisions, minor unlikenesses, and so on continually."³

Since Biological Sociology lays special stress on the analogy between organic and social development, we have to trace the process of differentiation and consequent organization both in the individual organic body and in society in some detail. What are the principal stages in the formation of the individual organism, that is, in embryonic development? In the vertebrates the blastoderm of the unpregnated ovum divides, when the cells have multiplied, into three different layers, termed, in physiological language, epiblast, mesoblast, and hypoblast, of which the mesoblast is latest in formation, because derived from the two others. From these three layers all the different organs and parts of the body are sub-

¹ *Ibid.*, § 227.

² *Ibid.*, § 228.

³ *Ibid.*, § 230.

sequently formed, each layer giving rise to tissues specified in kind, the outer and the inner to epithelial, nerve and muscular, the middle to connective tissue.

After the division of the cells into the layers, the earliest evidence of differentiation is the thickening of the mesoblast, by which the primitive groove is formed. Then in front of the latter two folds rise in the epiblast, joining immediately behind the head, but diverging posteriorly until they are gradually lost. The furrow separating them is the medullary groove, which as the folds, adjoining and covering it, grow upwards and close, is converted into a canal. It is this canal that is the earliest representative of the nervous centres and eventually becomes the brain. Of the mesoblast lying between the medullary canal is formed, by a slow and gradual process, the vertebral column, which is to surround and protect the spinal nerves. First, therefore, in evolution is the nervous system with the brain built of cells derived from the epiblast. Then follows the formation of the alimentary canal, the stomach, the intestines, the œsophagus, and, in connection with it, of the lungs; the hypoblast furnishing the epithelial lining, the mesoblast the muscular, vascular, and connective tissue and the serous coverings. Next in origin are the glands, the liver, the pancreas, the spleen, after which comes the blood vascular system. Of course, the order thus outlined marks the time when the evolution of the several systems commences, not when it is completed; for the fuller development of all vital parts goes on simultaneously, until a perfect and self-sufficient organism is formed. However, according to evolutionary views, the process described represents epochs in the evolution not only of the individual living beings, but also of the whole animal kingdom, for the embryo is thought to pass through stages which exactly correspond to the ascending forms and degrees which animal life has successively reached in the course of its development. This is usually expressed by the maxim of evolutionists that ontogeny is the repetition of phylogeny. Herbert Spencer puts it in the following words:

“The hypothesis of evolution implies a truth which was established independently of it—the truth that all animals, however unlike they finally become, begin their development in like ways. The first structural changes, once passed through in common by divergent types, are repeated in the early changes by every new individual of each type. Admitting some exceptions, chiefly among parasites, this is recognized as a general law.”¹

¹ *Ibid.*, § 237 a.

Consequently we may expect—and, indeed, Biological Sociology attempts to prove, a parallelism between the evolution of society and that of the animal species, besides the parallelism between the stages of social and individual evolution. The parallelism between the evolution of society and that of the higher species is considered to be of no small importance, because, if proved to be a fact, it shows that the lower forms of social existence disappear, and the higher evolve and continue in the same way as the lower types of organic beings perish and the higher survive, and it so evidences the survival of the fittest as a law reigning throughout all nature, in human society no less than in the animal kingdom.

Herbert Spencer sets forth this twofold parallelism in its minutest details. But we must content ourselves with the outlines of his inductions. As in the embryo first the nervous system, the future regulator of the entire organism, is formed and differentiated, so in social aggregations of individuals and tribes first the controlling agencies, military, political and religious, take rise, and, soon after they have sprung into existence, divide into branches and orders.

“Always with the maintenance of an aggregate approaching to, or exceeding a hundred, we ordinarily find a simple or compound ruling agency. This is the first social differentiation. The holding together of the compound cluster implies a head of the whole as well as the heads of the parts; and a differentiation analogous to that which originally produced a chief, now produces a chief of chiefs. Sometimes the combination is made for defence against a common foe, and sometimes it results from conquest by one tribe of the rest. In this last case the predominant tribe, in maintaining its supremacy, develops more highly its military character, thus becoming unlike the others.”¹

“In simple tribes, and in clusters of tribes, during their early stages of aggregation, we find men who are at once sorcerers, priests, diviners, exorcists, doctors—men who deal with supposed supernatural beings in all the various possible ways: propitiating them, seeking knowledge and aid from them, commanding them, subduing them. Along with advance in social integration there come both differences of functions and differences of rank.”²

The formation of the alimentary canal and the glands connected with it in the animal organism has its correspondent in the rise

¹ *Ibid.*, § 228.

² *Ibid.*, § 230.

and differentiation of classes taking care of sustentation in the social aggregate. Among the lowest tribes, while the men, who have unchecked control, carry on external activities, chiefly in war, the women are made drudges to produce the necessaries of life. When, later on, the tribe has grown and obtained superiority, the prisoners of war are joined to them as slaves. Thus, little by little, there arises an operative or industrial part which is clearly marked off from the regulative or military part. Differentiation very soon sets in also in this new division. As soon as a union of tribes is effected, or at least as soon as they live in peace with one another in different places favorable to unlike kinds of production, unlike occupations are initiated, and exchange of diverse kinds of commodities begins to be carried on. Besides the difference of dwelling places, there will be also a difference of abilities among the workers. In consequence, not only various trades are introduced, but also a division of labor is made in the manufacture of the same article. The result is unlikeness among industrial organs, and unlikeness even among the parts and structures of every organ. These component parts and subordinate structures, though unlike among themselves, are substantially the same in all industrial organs, however different the functions may be which are performed by them.

“Be it a cotton-weaving district or a district where cutlery is made, it has a set of agencies which bring raw material, and a set of agencies which collect and send away the manufactured articles; it has an apparatus of major and minor channels through which the necessaries of life are drafted out of the general stocks circulating through the kingdom, and brought home to the local workers and those who direct them; it has appliances, postal and other, for bringing these impulses by which the industry of the place is excited or checked; it has local controlling powers, political and ecclesiastical, by which order is maintained and healthful action furthered.”¹

In a word, the rise, evolution and arrangement of industrial establishments destined to manufacture the necessary means of sustenance closely resemble the origin and structure of glands or secretory organs in the animal body. There is similarity between the workers and the cells, between the various crafts of the former and the diverse functions of the latter; similarity between the unions of workers in manufactories and the follicles, in which, as in elongated sacs, cells are clustered; similarity between an organ-

¹ *Ibid.*, § 231.

ized aggregation of unions of workers having a common outlet for forwarding their product to other parts of the social body and an integrated group of follicles which, though each has a separate orifice for discharge, still emit the juice produced to the surface through a common duct. There is similarity between the channels, on the one hand, through which the raw material is conveyed to industrial establishments, and the vessels, on the other hand, through which nutriment is conveyed to and distributed over the whole gland so as to reach even the minutest parts; between the ruling agencies which preside over industrial production and the nerves which stimulate the cells and control and co-ordinate their activities. Diversity of organs is necessarily attended with diversity of function, and the latter again entails mutual dependence of parts, because with increased specialization of functions comes increased inability in each part to perform the functions of other parts. Hence injury to one means injury to others, in so much that in highly-developed societies derangement of one portion causes perturbation of all.¹

In living beings the organs adapted to various functions do not stand apart, but are reduced to systems, which, when again united, constitute the whole organism; and, what is most remarkable, the several organs are co-ordinated on the very same plan on which the differentiated cells are at first arranged. In vertebrates the cells, as was said above, divide into an inner and outer layer, which soon give rise to a middle layer. So, too, when the organs combine into systems, they form external parts, which deal with the environing existences—earth, prey, enemies, and internal parts which utilize for the benefit of the entire body the nutritious substances conveyed to them. In the lower species of animals, evolution does not progress farther, but in higher grades of life there develops between the external and internal a third and central part, the blood-vessels. These vessels, with the heart as their centre, are intended for the distribution of the nutriment to all the organs, both outer and inner, in proportion to their needs.

The social organism conforms in its development to the latter type. The primary divisions of warriors and laborers differentiate, each within itself, subdividing into lower and higher ranks, chiefs and dependents, free and bond, employers and employed, skilled and unskilled. Yet of whatever kind the differentiated parts may be, they all unite by co-ordination or subordination, and co-operate

¹ *Ibid.*, §§ 234-237a.

to the achievement of a common end, governmental or industrial. Thus, two differentiated systems spring up, the one regulative, the other sustaining.

These are at first in direct contact, but withdraw from each other as society increases in size, tribes are consolidated, and industry is localized and specialized. Then an appliance for transferring commodities becomes necessary. It consists in persons carrying on interchange and in channels facilitating commercial intercourse. Accordingly, an intermediate or distributing system arises—"an entire class of men engaged in buying and selling commodities of all kinds, on large and small scales, and in sending them along gradually-formed channels to all districts, towns and individuals, so enabling them to make good the waste caused by action."¹

Once established, the three systems do not remain stationary, but ever continue to evolve by further differentiation. The sustaining system, as a whole, assumes such new structures and correlative activities as are determined by the general environment, organic and inorganic, the special parts always differentiating in adaptation to local circumstances. Accordingly, industrial specializations arise owing to the peculiar products with which the several parts of the population have to deal, and aggregate in localities most favorable to success.²

The distributing system differentiates in proportion as the two other systems develop. When the division of labor has progressed so far that parts which are at some distance from one another cooperate, the growth of the channels of distribution and multiplication of agents becomes necessary. When parts highly specialized in functions multiply and combine in producing an increased amount of general life, there is also an increased need for large distribution in steady directions. When the social aggregate advances to greater unlikeness of parts and organs, the circulating currents also must be diversified, and must contain not crude but well-prepared matters, and these not scarce but abundant. The structures, too, which take from them the raw materials, to operate on them, and again deliver to them the products, must grow in fitness to perform their proper functions.

The regulating system differentiates in proportion as the social body grows in size and complexity. In a single tribe there is one chieftain ruling everything. When an aggregation of tribes has taken place there are several subordinate chiefs, one for each

¹ *Ibid.*, §§ 240, 270.

² *Ibid.*, § 243.

tribe, and one supreme chieftain. His power is at first but weak, that of the tribal chiefs being yet too firmly established. However, after some time, as wars with external enemies require combined action and do away with internal conflicts, his authority becomes uncontested and absolute. The chieftains who were originally independent become dependent local centres, serving as deputies under command of the general centre, just as the local ganglia are agents under the direction of the cephalic ganglia. In this stage, all freemen being warriors, the military body is co-extensive with all that part of society which has political life.

Soon the chief of chiefs begins to require helpers in the exercise of control. He gathers around him some from whom he gets information, some with whom he consults, some who execute his commands. No longer a governing unit, he becomes nucleus in a cluster of governing units. Thus is formed around him a ministry employed in financial and judicial affairs and in the revision of laws, and after some time also a deliberative national assembly concerned with the general interests and enacting laws for the whole commonwealth. As evolution goes on in this direction, the king falls more and more into the hands of his agents, through whom he makes his judgments. The ministry begins to rule through the original ruler. At a still later stage the ministry falls in its turn into subordination to the legislative body, and being dependent on the support of majorities, is restricted to executive functions. In the meantime, also, the appliances through which control is exercised, the internuntial lines and agencies, are developed, and what is of still greater importance, diverse organs and structures are formed, through which different functions are carried on; for it is a general law of organization that distinct duties entail distinct structures. In a special manner must the function of regulation be distinct, if it is exercised in departments widely unlike. But most unlike are, in fact, the departments of warlike and sustaining activities. Success in conflicts with other societies implies quickness, combination and special adjustment to ever-varying circumstances. On the contrary, the actions by which sustentation is achieved are, upon the whole, uniform, constant, and altering but slowly. The structures, therefore, regulating these two activities must be altogether different, nay, to some extent independent. Hence they must constitute two distinct regulative apparatus. Commerce, also, when considerably developed, requires a regulation peculiar and independent.¹

¹ *Ibid.*, §§ 251-257.

Thus little by little three regulating apparatus are established, distinct and in some regard independent, still reduced to unity. For one of them, be it that one which regulates warlike activity or that which regulates sustentation and industry, will always be predominating, and, while exercising a general control, impress its peculiar type on the whole of society. As long as the nation, that is the united tribes, is engaged in war, defensive or offensive, a military system of regulation predominates and impresses on society a military type, which is characterized by despotic central power, unlimited political control over personal conduct, and compulsory co-operation. When industry has become general, its regulative system predominates and impresses on the social body a type which is characterized by democratic or representative power, limited control over personal conduct, and voluntary co-operation.¹

V.

By the process thus far set forth, society—so, at least, it is claimed—has approached complete life and activity. It has taken such dimensions as to comprise multitudinous tribes inhabiting a wide-extended territory; it has blended these original units so perfectly as to form of them one compact, indivisible nation; it has developed into a perfect organism by co-ordinating and subordinating all its parts and adapting them to functions different in kind, but completing one another; it has brought forth within itself a regulative power which, on the one hand, insures unity in the universal co-operation for a common end, and, on the other, gives scope to the widest possible freedom. Society so constituted is the highest evolution, consummate in order, harmony, and organization, guided by the best laws not only in the working of its parts, but also in its working as a body, whose aim and object is the greatest good of the greatest number.

Biological Sociology, it is claimed, is thus justified by the most splendid results. For this reason it would seem also to recommend itself as the solution of a great problem presented to the modern mind. As a new moral science had to be devised after the Infinite Good had been denied and the Divine Lawgiver and Rewarder of virtue and Avenger of vice set aside, so a new social theory is needed, after nature has been emancipated from the Creator and made the last origin of society and ultimate basis of social order. A task, indeed, of no easy performance; for from matter in a chaotic condition there must be derived not only

¹ *Ibid.*, § 270.

the individual man with his wonderful intellectual gifts, but also the social organism in which millions of human beings co-operate to start and advance civilization, arts, sciences, industry, peace, and justice. And from laws which in their nature are not distinct from those of the corporal world there must be drawn rules which, in the absence of a divine extra-mundane Lawgiver, are sufficient by their own intrinsic strength to enforce order, curb and control human passions, overcome innate egoism, elevate mankind above the low and sensual pleasure to pure and disinterested virtue. Nor is it becoming to perform this task but imperfectly, arduous though it be. Since the theory to be devised is intended to supersede the views of all former ages, it should broach a more enlightened doctrine and support order more firmly than the Christian teaching has done for so many centuries. It should keep up with modern thought bent on scientific research, on progress and higher culture, and stimulate to ever more perfect civic virtues based on solid truth and profound knowledge. It should, in particular, be a new light in higher education leading the present generation to more advanced civilization and showing it a shorter and safer path to universal happiness than was known heretofore in ages more or less benighted.

Herbert Spencer is confident that his Biologic Sociology is the theory demanded by our age of progress, and his admirers find his confidence borne out by the unsurpassed thoroughness and depth of his philosophic speculation. For an unprejudiced mind this is, however, not at once a decisive motive. An unconditional acceptance of his views would follow only after a careful examination has evinced that in reality he has advanced a satisfactory solution of the great problem by fully interpreting the origin of society and by laying down wise and beneficent laws for the development and ultimate perfection of social life.

A criticism of Biologic Sociology may be written from a two-fold point of view, according as the theory of evolution is admitted or rejected. Evolutionary views may be espoused, and yet it may be denied that Herbert Spencer's Sociology is the logical and necessary outcome of them, or that it is a full and consistent interpretation of social phenomena, the premises on which it rests being too vague to admit of the conclusions drawn as necessary consequences, or the facts, from which it starts, being generalized illegitimately and not with due exactness. Evolution may be denied either as a whole or as applicable to man's higher faculties and to human society. Theistic philosophers mostly deny it in its full extent. Yet whether complete or incomplete, its denial always

entails the repudiation of Biologic Sociology; for there can be no development of the higher from the lower by merely material forces, and according to merely organic laws, where we have to deal with free will in an immaterial sphered action. Nor can chaotic matter be considered as the ultimate origin of things when it is known that the Self-Existent is infinitely perfect; for, being such, it is the cause of the finite world not by immanent self-evolution, but by creation.

The limits of the present essay, already too lengthy, do not allow us to centre on any criticism. Yet uncriticized and unexamined a theory should not pass which, purporting to supplant the social science accepted nearly from the beginning of history as the firm basis of order and prosperity, advances tenets and interpretations scarcely intelligible, not only from their novelty, but much more from their utter abstruseness.

JOHN J. MING, S.J.

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

IN April, 1895, this REVIEW published the words of Mr. John S. Ewart, Q.C., the enthusiastic and chivalrous counsel for the Manitoba Catholics in their struggle against the instinct and prejudice of a young "British Philistine" community.

Mr. Ewart was hoping then to see the grievances of his clients settled by their own provincial government, that so there might be no great public Canadian quarreling, and that the federal government would not have to pass a bill of relief.

But there *has* been a great quarrel, and there has been no thorough relief of grievances. For the moment there is a lull. Nor has this been violently disturbed by the decision from Rome, lately received by the Canadian bishops, and just now, early in January, made public. Though "something has been done to amend the law," the Holy Father says, yet "the law which has been enacted for the purpose of reparation is defective, imperfect, insufficient." And yet the Pope's words, as they counsel "moderation, meekness and brotherly charity" to Catholics, so they do not irritate others at the outset; nor can any fail, in their better selves, to hear the tone appealing for the gospel law in treating others, and expressing the spirit of Pope Leo XIII.'s own words elsewhere:

“The first law of history is to dread uttering falsehood ; the next, not to fear stating the truth ; lastly, that the historical writings should be open to no suspicion of partiality or of animosity.”

Almighty God reminds His creatures once again what is the law of life under His full revelation. Every Catholic Christian must feel now even something more of the great responsibility that is laid on him not to speak or write except in the spirit of His law and His counsel.

Catholics were urged by Rome to avoid, in the interim, the very semblance of being contentious. And these latest words of the Church, while telling them what is of God, and what is of Cæsar, counsel a generous readiness to meet justice in any men, and help it forward wherever found.

The moment is fitting for placing clearly before our minds this school question, “assuredly one,” as the encyclical says, “of the greatest importance and of exceptional gravity.”

In these pages it is not necessary to tell of what interests are at stake in an education question, nor of how wandering thoughtful minds seem to be looking in the same direction as does the Church—with blinkers on, however, as it were, lest by any means they should be found to be seeing eye to eye with Rome. Still she must be glad, though saddened, too, even if not amused, noting their strange infatuation about the one guardian of the Christian family and school. And her mind is not least interested just now in these matters as they stir among English-speaking people or their fellow-subjects. American readers will spend some time well in looking once again at this school question in Manitoba.

And they will not be offended at information set down here as to the condition of Canada. Many of them naturally know little about that thinly populated country—too little, often, whether they be business men, patriots, or founders of true and wise relations between the American countries of the future.

Canada, *i.e.*, almost all the habitable country north of the United States—so we mean for practical purposes in our writing now—has yet a population of barely 5,000,000 ; the Province of Ontario (formerly Upper Canada) having over 2,000,000 ; the Province of Quebec (formerly Lower Canada), about 1,500,000.

For the whole of Canada the chief religious statistics (1891) are : Catholics, 2,000,000 ; 41 per cent. of whole. Methodists, 850,000 ; 17 per cent. of whole. Presbyterians, 750,000 ; 15 per cent. of whole. Episcopalians, 650,000 ; 13 per cent. of whole. Baptists, 300,000 ; 6 per cent. of whole.

And for national descent the 1871 Census gave : French, more

than 1,000,000; Irish, 850,000; English, 700,000; Scotch, 550,000.

There can read and write (1891): of the whole population, 3,176,667; in Manitoba, 106,250.

Manitoba is therefore above the general average in reading and writing.

For the population of Manitoba, these are the figures: 1870, 12,000 (2000 whites, 5000 Scotch or English half-breeds, 5000 French half-breeds); 1871, 25,228; 1881, 62,260; 1891, 152,506.

The chief religious statistics in 1891: Presbyterians, 30,000; Episcopalians, 25,000; Catholics, 20,000; and the number of enrolled pupils in the schools, 28,706.

Manitoba has been, since 1870, a province of this new Dominion of Canada, which came into existence by the British North America Act of 1867, the act confederating Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and now known as the Canadian constitution.

It is a farming, wheat-growing country—"the prairie province"—very cold and very hot. At first it had been settled chiefly from French-speaking Catholic Quebec. In 1870, the Catholics were 50 per cent.; in 1890, about 15 per cent. This is the minority of whose troubles men have heard.

Before 1870, when Manitoba became a Canadian province, there were Catholic and Protestant schools.

From 1871 to 1890 there were still separate schools, placed more regularly under Catholic and Protestant Boards of Education—something like those in Ontario and Quebec, where separate schools exist to-day.

In 1890 separate schools were abolished in Manitoba.

From 1890 to 1896 there were appeals and decisions this way and that as to (Catholic) minority rights, the two chief being (1) that the abolishing separate schools was legal, and (2) that an aggrieved minority had a right of appeal.

June 23, 1896, the present Liberal party, under Sir Wilfred Laurier—as he is, since Queen Victoria's Sixtieth Jubilee honor distribution—came into power, and made a "settlement" of the Manitoba school question, which the Catholic Archbishop of that province—Langevin, of St. Boniface—declared to be no settlement at all.

"I do refuse you for my judge, and here,
Before you all, appeal unto the Pope,
To bring my whole cause 'fore his holiness,
And to be judged by him."

With "Rome, the nurse of judgment," it lay to decide for Catholics whether "the Laurier Settlement" is to be accepted, tolerated or rejected.

So much for a sketch of the facts. And now let us go over them in some detail, and be thus able to give a reason for the faith that is in us, taking note, as we pass, of some strange treatment given by the letter of the law to its spirit.

I. *The Manitoba Act of 1870.*

This was passed by the Dominion of Canada Federal Parliament at Ottawa. By it, part of the Northwest Territory was made into the province of Manitoba. *The British North America Act of 1867* (providing that any province having separate schools before confederation shall have them for all time; also that any province not having them at the union, but conceding them at any time, shall concede them as a right which can never be taken away), *was made to apply to Manitoba*—except those parts of the act referring to other provinces specially; and except as the B. N. A. Act might be varied by the Manitoba Act.

How did this affect education?

The B. N. A. Act guarantees separate schools to those provinces that *by law* had separate schools at the time they entered the Dominion of Canada.

Hence Ontario (Upper Canada) and Quebec (Lower Canada) had guarantee of separate schools.

Hence New Brunswick, another entering province, had no guarantee. And the New Brunswick separate schools, existing *by custom or practice* only, were abolished.

[An "understanding," by which, in a few places, certain State schools have Catholic teachers, is all the Church in New Brunswick has kept. And for this compromise there is no protection by any existing law.]

The Manitoba Act had before it the law of Ontario and Quebec (protected by the B. N. A. Act) and the practice of New Brunswick (not thus protected); and *therefore* it enacted that no law should be passed by the Legislature of Manitoba which should "prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law *or practice* in the Province at the Union."

Those italicized words, *therefore*, and *by practice*, let all readers consider over again in their context, and bear in mind when reading what follows.

Now, if you are guaranteed separate schools, "by practice,"

does that imply that you are guaranteed exemption from paying for public or State schools? And the answer is that the 1871 Act legislators either did not consider that, or else that they did indeed consider it, but meant "to keep the word of promise to our ear, and break it to our hope."

For a plain man the meaning would probably be plain that it *did* so imply. Certainly, when the declarations of the legislators were read, with no word in them as to the legally established "separate-school parent" being bound to pay also as a "non-sectarian parent," and when is added the consensus of general public understanding as to implication, then the plain man would feel sure.

So much for the spirit of the law. But what of its letter? We shall see.

However, first, *des pièces justificatives* :

(a) "I think every man in the country understood the Manitoba Act of 1871 to mean that the minority, whether it was Catholic or Protestant, should enjoy the same privileges as the Catholic minority enjoys in Quebec. [The Privy Council did not appear to see the matter in that light. I have no doubt they came to an honest decision, but they went by the strict letter of the law.]" (Hon. G. W. Ross, Minister of Education for Ontario, December 19, 1895.)

(b) "By the Manitoba Act the provisions of the B. N. A. Act respecting laws passed for the protection of minorities in educational matters are made applicable to Manitoba. . . . Obviously, therefore, the separate school system in Manitoba is beyond the reach of the [Manitoba] Legislature or of the Dominion Parliament."

(The Late Sir John Macdonald [Conservative] Prime Minister of Canada, and a framer of the Manitoba Act. *Memoirs*, vol. ii., p. 248.)

(c) "We [when passing the Manitoba Act] certainly intended that the Catholics of Manitoba, or whatever denomination might be in a minority, should have the right to establish and maintain their own schools. You see, the words '*or practice*' were inserted in the Manitoba Act, so that the difficulty which arose in New Brunswick when separate schools actually existed, but were not recognized by the law, should not be repeated in Manitoba. [And thus the right of appeal to the Federal Parliament was given to make assurances doubly (*sic*) sure.]"

(Hon. W. MacDougall, 1892.)

(d) "Because it was doubtful whether the schools of Manitoba could be said to exist by law. . . . The clause was made to read, by law *or practice*, in order that the minority might be absolutely sure of protection. [We who were members of the Government at the time could see no reasonable objection to granting the same privileges in Manitoba that were given in Ontario and Quebec.]"

(The late Sir Leonard Tilley, Governor of New Brunswick. "The Sun," St. John, N. B., April 28 (?) 1896.)

But now, after this Act of 1871, and before 1890, there came immigrants,

"strange men, new faces, other minds";

and all was changed. The Catholics, as has been said, fell from 50 per cent. to 15 per cent.; and so another "asylum of Papists

. . . . in a remote corner of the world" [Bancroft on Maryland] has found what it is to be ruled by a Protestant majority, to whom in the days of its weakness the Catholic majority gave coveted privileges and its equal rights.

It is easy to see beneath the baser "non-sectarian" surface. What is the use of gazing into that mingled flood of fanaticism and bad faith; whether it be driven along by Burke's "merciless policy of fear," or heard to keep uttering his "uniform language of tyranny—your liberty is incompatible with my personal safety"?

II. *The Non-Sectarian Act of 1890.*

The men who passed this act, and especially Mr. Joseph Martin, had solemnly and publicly promised not to oppose the language and the institutions of the French Catholics of Manitoba. Mr. Fisher, a liberal member of that Legislature, gives us an account of this, and adds that in the actual circumstances, and considering that promise, he has always thought the establishment of the present school system and the abolition of the Catholic schools, in spite of the protests of the minority, to be a grave fault. Personally, he said, he had indeed made no promise, but he had felt himself bound by the promise, just as much as if he had made it himself. (Quoted from "La Presse," Montreal, April 13, 1895.)

For the solemn sworn declarations of witnesses to the promises as to French language and Catholic schools made by Mr. Greenway, the present destroyer of these, by law, in Manitoba, see Archbishop Taché's pamphlet of 1893, "A Page of the History of the Schools in Manitoba During Seventy-Five Years."

Various causes were given for passing the act—the inefficiency of the Catholic Schools, the desire for national unity, and so on.

At first it was proposed that the schools were to be absolutely secular. Then the Protestant majority, in pulpits and on platforms, protested, and Mr. Joseph Martin, maker of the act, yielded, while declaring that he thinks the "religious exercises" part of the act to be "*rank tyranny*" over Roman Catholics.

That men should be found to think that schools of human beings *could* be "neutral" is indeed strange. There may be such men—but perhaps they only think they are thinking. There are, of course, many who *say* they think it. But in Manitoba there was no deception.

By the Act the Manitoba Government took from the Catholics the school-buildings used by them, and an accumulated sum of \$14,000 (acknowledged by letter of government as an acquired

right of the Catholic schools), which sum was then placed in the general school fund.

Now, had the Provincial Legislature of Manitoba the right to pass this "non-sectarian" Act of 1890? Those who framed the 1870 Act establishing the province said no. So said the Canadian judges.

III. *Decisions of the Privy Council.*

The Privy Council of England, as highest appeal court, said that the Manitoba Legislature *had* the right.

This, then, is *the first decision of the Privy Council: viz., The Act of 1890 is not "ultra vires."*

At the risk of wearying all readers, we so repeat.

The ground of the decision was: You have the same privileges as before; you can have separate schools; the only difference is, you must now pay, also, for other schools. As was said to the bourgeois gentilhomme, "giving = giving + paying." "He, a shopkeeper! a mere slander on a man who was a judge of cloth, and therefore liked to give it kindly to his friends—if they paid him."

And *the second decision* (January 29, 1895) *of the Privy Council* was: That *the minority in a province has the right of appeal to the Federal Parliament.*

What did the Privy Council here say?

That the Federal Parliament ("the Governor-General in Council") "has jurisdiction to make remedial orders as far only as the circumstances of each case may require" (Manitoba Act, 1871); "that this appeal is well founded"; but that the particular remedy need not be pointed out. It said:

"That it is not essential that the statutes repealed by the Act of 1890 should be re-enacted, or that the precise provisions of these statutes should be again made law. The system of education embodied in the Acts of 1890 no doubt commends itself to, and adequately supplies, the wants of the great majority of the inhabitants of the province. All legitimate ground of complaint would be removed if that system were supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievance upon which the appeal is founded, and were modified so far as might be necessary to give effect to those provisions."

Now, do readers thoroughly understand these two decisions? and will they forgive the sorrow upon sorrow of repetition?

By decision 1st, the "Non-Sectarian" Act is legal; Catholics may still have their own schools, but must pay for others.

By decision 2d, Catholics may appeal, and the Federal Government has a right to interfere.

What is the result of these decisions?

The first stands by the letter of the law. You thought the gift

a gift; you must pay for it, however. Nothing has been taken away; you still have it.

"Is that the law?" Does the law not mean that if I have as before, I do not also pay for what is got by others? And the answer comes: "I cannot find it; it is not in the bond."

To your masters, indeed, we, the Privy Council, say: "It is not so expressed," but, "it were well you do so much for charity."

"Charité, charité chérie!"

This, then, is the net result of the Privy Council's decisions:

(a) The letter of the law is against you; you have had no rights and no privileges taken away.

(b) You can appeal, we imply, to the principles of general justice, and to those who have jurisdiction to remedy the legitimate grievances we imply that you have—the grievance of your hard but fated lot.

The present writer has to say that he has come to his conclusions, expressed above, not without some patient and serious thought, not without considerable reluctance, and certainly not without some contempt for

"the ways of men so vain and melancholy."

However, the Church, rather than the Revolution, will be the last to give up singing:

*"S'il tombe, nos jeunes héros,
L'Église en produit de nouveaux,
Contre vous tout prêts à se battre."*

IV. *The Remedial Bill (1895-96).*

The decisions of the highest court having been given, the Federal government "advised" the provincial government to apply the suggested remedy. They answer made, "they would not."

The following are the terms of this Remedial order:

(a) The right to build, to maintain, equip, manage, conduct and support Roman Catholic schools in the manner provided for by the said statutes, which were repealed by the two Acts of 1890 aforesaid.

(b) The right to share proportionately in any grant made out of the public funds for the purpose of education.

(c) The right of exemption of such Roman Catholic schools from all payment or contribution to the support of any other schools.

The Conservative Government then itself brought in a Remedial Bill, which died (1896) with the Parliament in which it was discussed and obstructed. In this bill there was no appropriation of money for the schools of the minority.

And now as to *the treatment the decisions received indirectly by the action of those supporting and those resisting the Dominion Conservative Government.*

It may be recalled here that the Conservatives have been the Orange party and the Anglican party in Ontario, and also the old-fashioned Clerical party in Quebec ("les Bleus"). The Liberals have been more or less, as in England, the younger English-speaking men with ideas of change, and those less religious. They stand more or less as the Liberals stood a generation or so back in England, in the heyday of popular education, free trade, Philistinism, and general scientific progress and forgetfulness of original sin. In Quebec the Liberals ("les Rouges") have gathered into their ranks the "emancipated," the pleasure-seekers, the *anti-cléricaux*, much after the manner of France, together, indeed, with many nobler souls, and with those ready for perhaps generally wise educational reforms. The Conservatives have been for protection, the Liberals for free trade; the Conservatives for England, the Liberals for America. But these are only suggestions, and nowadays this new Liberal government is more Imperialist than the most Imperialist Conservative. The Liberals would call the Conservatives "the stupid party." The retort is, "the disloyal party," by the Conservatives who opened up the West by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

It seems that Canadian political corruption cannot be beaten anywhere, and that "base politicians" of all sorts will there, as elsewhere, talk high words, deceiving (God knows) perhaps even themselves, taking "upon us the mystery of things. As if we were God's spies."

And so good men and bad spoke and wrote in 1895 and 1896, after the times mentioned in this REVIEW by Mr. Ewart.

To the French Catholics in Quebec the Liberals came and said: "Behold those wicked Tory Orangists;" and thus these Liberals to the Ontario Orangemen: "You see those priest-ridden Tories in Quebec."

And Conservatives told the French that the Liberals were destroyers of Church and family and State, and Conservatives told the English that to destroy that disloyal French Church and State was indeed a great aim, to be perhaps silently pursued.

In the fight over the Remedial Bill the Conservatives said: "Obey the Constitution as expressed by the highest court"; the Liberals said: "We protest against coercing a province." It was hard for the French Catholics to look for sound champions among Orange Tories; and to have a French Canadian Premier seemed a

grand triumph. This would-be (and to-be) Premier, besides, said he would do better for Catholics with the help of the Manitoba government than the Conservatives would ever do by their trying to force an unwilling province. "I will not coerce anybody," shouted M. Laurier at Toronto; and there were wild cheers from the young Liberals.

From the first, when appealing for interference, the minority in Manitoba had, by their counsel, Mr. Ewart, argued judicially; the majority, by their counsel, Mr. Dalton McCarthy, politically—"The advocates of the Catholics," said the London "Speaker" (March 30, 1895), "it must be admitted, having the best of the law, and those of the provincial government basing their arguments chiefly on grounds of policy." "However," the bitterly anti-religious education "Speaker" added, cynically, "the Government have issued the order; 'let them enforce it if they can.'"

"No coercion," cried the Liberals. But the French might have answered, as to the abolitionist of capital punishment: "Que messieurs les assassins commencent." Surely it is you Liberals who coerced the minority in Manitoba. Surely on the morrow of the Reformation, when, in Lecky's words, the creed of a thousand years was proscribed by the opinions of yesterday, it was not for the Reformers to cry "no coercion" when the Catholics claimed an open church or two in a city that was once their own.

Anyway, it is the law that there *is* jurisdiction of federal over provincial, that there *is* in this way protection for provincial minorities in religion and education.

Further, the first appeal of this sort was by the Quebec Protestant minority. The Federal Government advised the Quebec Catholic Government to give redress, and redress was accordingly given.

In January, 1897, there was another such instance, which at least may serve as an illustration. School-district boundaries being rearranged, had left a number of Protestants without a school of their own, and bound to pay to the public (Catholic) school. Said the Halifax (Protestant) "Evening Mail":

"The promptness and completeness with which the grievances of the Protestant rate-payers of St. Gregoire le Thaumaturge have been remedied by the Government of the Roman Catholic Province of Quebec should incite the Protestants of Canada to exhibit an equally commendable spirit in respect to the grievance of the Roman Catholic citizens of Manitoba. Squirming and wriggling and trying to find excuses for not respecting the conscientious objections of others, and for not keeping faith with those of a different creed, do not look well when compared with the recent action of the Quebec Government."

Oh, but, we hear on one side, amid all the voices crying round

about, the Quebec and the Manitoba cases are not alike. True; but not for the reason you think or echo. They *are* alike in this: that Manitoba's *practice* is covered by the Acts, as well as Quebec's *law*. Only to Quebec's law is added: you need not pay other schools, and this is not added to Manitoba's practice. There is the real difference. Quebec law could not, by the Privy Council's letter-of-the-law decisions, save the Protestant minority from paying for Catholic schools also, if there were no clause exempting them; and if, we may add, the Catholic majority had ceased to have a go-to-confession conscience as to duty to their neighbors.

From Protestant Liberal Manitoba, however, was heard, in the words of the already-quoted Mr. Fisher of Winnipeg:

"The Federal authorities must not coerce Manitoba, we are told. . . . In Manitoba it is coercion—is it?—for the Federal authorities to entertain an appeal specially provided by the Constitution for the protection of a certain number of her Majesty's subjects. But . . . in Quebec, under a like measure, it is otherwise." (January, 1896.)

"I look at it," said the Protestant Conservative, Sir Leonard Tilley, in the same year, "as a solemn compact between the Parliament of Canada and the people of Manitoba. . . . It seems to me that sympathy ought to go out to the aggrieved in Manitoba, rather than to the aggressor. . . . If it were Quebec Province that had repealed the provisions allowing Protestants their separate schools, we should all have protested, and have demanded protection, as we should have been justified in doing."

So far so good. We are on high ground, even if the adversary cannot follow. But Mr. Fisher comes down to where he is, later on, honorably worsted.

"Not only is there a right of appeal," he says, "but the facts show that the minority have been aggrieved by the law of 1890 in that *they have been deprived of valuable privileges* that they enjoyed by law for nearly twenty years—privileges in the enjoyment of which the Constitution was intended to protect them."

Now, the Privy Council—again this has to be repeated to the good Protestant's unwilling ears—distinctly says that by its letter-of-the-law reading, *the minority have not been deprived of privileges*, though such privileges have been "affected."

They had privileges. True. They have (practically) lost them. But yet—they have not lost them. It sounds like a legal joke. But it is no joke for Catholics in Manitoba.

The same answer must be made to the words of the Conservative Catholic, M. Ouimet, that the Privy Council

"Déclara que de fait les Catholiques (a) *avaient acquis* par la législation en force jusqu'à 1890, *des droits, qui ne pouvaient leur être enlevés* sans leur assentiment, et que (b) *c'était le devoir du gouverneur général en conseil* (i.e., the Federal Parliament) d'intervenir pour (c) leur faire rendre leurs écoles séparées telle qu'elles existaient avant la loi de 1890."

The answer is that the Privy Council said neither (a), nor (b), nor (c).

If the provincial minority had been *de jure* deprived of privileges, as well as *de facto*, then the Privy Council's first decision could not stand, even in its own eyes.

As to the *duty* of intervening, Mr. Fisher speaks more correctly than M. Ouimet :

“The opinion is ‘advisory,’ to assist the Federal Government in coming to an opinion. . . . But”—and he is on high, safe ground again—“it is one thing to say that Parliament is not ‘bound’ by the opinions of the Court; it is quite a different thing to say that there is no moral obligation to give relief in a case in which the Court has found there is a grievance, and that the Constitutional Act is a ‘Parliamentary compact’ by which the Crown was pledged to protect the minority against such a grievance.”

In the old days, indeed, when it was the Quebec Protestant minority who were appealing to the Federal Government, the violent anti-Catholic and anti-Manitoba minority orator, Mr. Dalton McCarthy, said that

“The *duty* and power—because where there is power there is a corresponding duty—are cast upon the Federal Government to revise and review the acts of the provincial legislative bodies.”

Well may the observant dramatist lay down :

“Les opinions se discutent : les sentiments
Ne se discutent pas.”

For, much of all this is, at bottom (as, both *à priori* and *à posteriori*, our readers have fairly judged), a matter of religious or anti-religious sentiment. It is often kept in the background; we have now kept it there. But all must act as if “things are what they are,” knowing that “their consequences will be what they will be.” “It is always useful to know the true temper of the times and country in which you live.”

On the other side from those quoted, who have been making too much out of the Privy Council judgments as aids to justice, Mr. Greenway, the Manitoba premier, evidently is making too little when he says (a) they do not declare any grievance, but simply (b) note the *facts* of the taking away of the separate schools or the rights. By those manifestly erroneous words he denies (a) what the Privy Council does say, and states (b) what they do not say.

But it does not appear that Mr. Greenway and his colleague, Mr. Sifton, take the trouble even to pretend to be without real

sound anti-Catholicism. One need not doubt they have the real thing in their invincible hearts. There is plenty of it in Canada, as in the poor heart of a passenger down the St. Lawrence, who said that the sight of the village churches there made him sick. He longed to have at them and stamp them out. The present writer heard this man of charity from Toronto. It was a Sunday morning, and the wagons of the farmers stood outside the church doors, and the Sacrifice of Love was being offered within; the Catholics on board the ship assisting, no doubt; and, if true to their religion of charity, praying for those who hate and spitefully use them.

Mr. Sifton's speeches do *read*, at least, like the words of an Irish Tory under Lord Castlereagh. M. Paul Bert's career is no doubt one he would emulate in his own. To pass compliments back from France, Mr. Greenway's acts, as far as *sympathie* and *cœur* are concerned, seem to show, like his face, *la dure inintelligence* of a "half-baked" civilization. Fancy an Archbishop Taché or an Archbishop Fabre face to face with such a personage, who might take exquisite courtesy for an uncomfortable joke, and whose acts might prove the truth of Burke's words on chivalry being gone.

But things are as they are.

And yet not all Canadian Protestants speak as these ministers do. Ministers of another sort sometimes speak differently.

In the Toronto "Mail and Empire" for April 12, 1895, occurs:

"The Rev. Mr. Andrews, the oldest Methodist minister in active service in Manitoba, says that the restoration of separate schools, with a provision for the definite qualification of the teachers and the public inspection of the schools, should be satisfactory to all, but no injustice to Protestants, and would heal the breach which is rending the Dominion."

Yet a young Methodist minister from that province, a gentle but hard-working man, is heard this year saying that he thinks the minority have no grievance. And perhaps the old man stands alone—like Sydney Smith for Catholic Emancipation among the Tory Yorkshire parsons—for he has these words, too:

"As I see it so must I write. When a resolution was brought up in the Methodist Conference in 1890 expressing approval of the act, *I alone*" opposed it.

He said he had been five years in Quebec, and felt ashamed at the moral effects which our School Act would have in Quebec, [he little knows, poor old man. Fancy Archbishops Bruchesi and Bégin agitating to force Protestant pupils into their schools],

having seen the working of Protestant schools in that province. For if here in Manitoba, where the Catholics have had separate schools for eighteen years, we can take these away, just because we are in a majority, what about Quebec?

"We have always boasted of Protestant fair play, yet in this case the might downs (*sic*) the right. . . .

"The real contention [of the Catholics] is that we Protestants have taken what the highest court of this great Empire has decided was their right, according to the declaration of the Constitution, and they are seeking its restoration in a legal and regular manner. . . .

"That it would be better for all to be educated together seems highly desirable (*sic*); yet if the minority concerned think it otherwise, surely we have slender ground to set aside law and justice to accomplish our purpose.

"There is little weight in the argument that Mennonites, Germans and others [of our settlers] may also seek separate schools. No one seriously thinks these would ever be established. Besides, along these lines of action only the great division between Catholic and Protestant has ever been legally received, and no other is likely to be introduced; and the permanent healing of even this breach can only be done (*sic*) by kindness and fair treatment; and this I believe our Protestant people will be ready to accord when the excitement arising from heated declamation shall have subsided, and a calm and deliberate view of the situation is taken."

"The North West Baptist," too, wrote:

"Let Manitoba recognize this decision. There ought to be a readiness on the part of the Provincial Government to be a party to discovering (*sic*) when our legislation has wronged our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens; and upon discovering, willingly make every endeavor to do them justice."

And the Presbyterian Principal Grant, of Queen's University, Kingston, probably the most prominent Presbyterian minister in Canada, moved in the General Assembly, in 1895, the following resolution, acknowledging facts, and approaching them in a temper leaving little to be desired, and inspiring hope even yet:

"Whereas the Dominion of Canada is a confederation of provinces in which federal and provisional rights respectively are finally defined by her Majesty's Privy Council; and whereas the Privy Council decided that the National School system established in 1890 by the Province of Manitoba was within its constitutional power; and whereas the Privy Council has since decided that the Act of 1890, though constitutional, inflicted grievances on the Roman Catholic minority of the province, and that the said minority has the right under the constitution to appeal to his Excellency, the Governor-General-in-Council, for a remedy, and that the Parliament of Canada has the right, in the event of failure on the part of the province, to pass remedial legislation; and whereas it is admitted on the one hand that remedial legislation by Parliament would interfere with provincial autonomy in education, and lead to deplorable friction between the Dominion and Provincial Governments, and, on the other hand, that when the Supreme Court of the Empire has decided that a minority in any province is suffering a grievance that province should, in the interests of righteousness and the general welfare, give immediate attention to the matter and seek to remedy the grievance; therefore, Resolved: I. That the General Assembly has seen with pleasure the earnest efforts that have recently been made by all the parties concerned to find a settlement of the ques-

tions involved which would give relief to the minority without imperilling either the principle of national schools or the principle that education should be based on religious sanctions, and inspired by Christian ideals. 2. That the General Assembly, learning that the Government of Manitoba claims that there was not available to the Governor-General-in-Council full and accurate information on the subject, and suggests a deliberate investigation, with the offer to assist in making such an investigation, and thus finding a substantial basis of fact upon which conclusions could be formed, and a reasonable and permanent settlement come to, earnestly presses upon the Dominion Government the duty of acceding to this request of the Government of Manitoba. 3. That the General Assembly, impressed with the conviction that national unity and well-being can rest securely only on a spirit of mutual confidence animating the various creeds and races who inhabit the land, trusts that on this and all questions affecting the feelings; and even the prejudices of any section of the people, no hasty action shall be taken, but that, on the contrary, the greatest care and deliberation shall be exercised, full and thorough investigation made, and full and fair compensation offered for any injustice that may have been done."

The Toronto "Mail," alluding to the Low Church Anglican Archbishop of Rupert's Land's words about this difficulty, notes that at least not a word was said by him in favor of the refusal of Manitoba [in his diocese] to act according to the decision of the Privy Council.

As to Manitoba politics, indeed, the "anti-remedial" government was returned last year again with an overwhelming majority; and for Manitoba the words of one indignant writer may be used:

" . . . Then, indeed, has Might usurped the throne of Right, and we in Canada no longer acknowledge that fundamental principle of British jurisprudence, 'Ubi jus ibi remedium.' "

V. *The Federal Election of 1896, and The Laurier "Settlement."*

Here was heard the cry from the Liberals-in-opposition, "no coercion," "no interference with provincial legislatures, even if according to the constitution." The cry comforted Catholic Liberals, and disheartened or won over Protestant Conservatives.

Writers like the one last quoted had written as Liberals, protesting that there was a duty of interference :

"This right of the Manitoba minority to Separate Schools was clearly stipulated for, and solemnly accorded as one of the terms of the arrangement under which that province entered Confederation; and the preservation of that right was certainly intended to be guaranteed by the provisions of the Manitoba Act. . . . And are we now to be told that the provisions of this solemn compact are futile; that a wronged minority must look in vain for redress; that the Dominion authorities are powerless to restore to it rights thus acquired and thus guaranteed?"

The Conservative Protestant (such as the son of Sir John Mac-

donald) could say—for party purposes, in momentary generosity, or from sound principle—that he would have expected the Catholics to obey a decision adverse to them, and he is prepared to do the same now that it has gone against him.

Even an Orangeman—Mr. Sawers, of Peterborough, Ontario, could say to his brethren :

“ Remedial legislation was entirely and aggressively opposed by me until the recent decision of the Privy Council. But . . . it seems clear to my mind that under the constitution the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba has a grievance.”

And perhaps even more admirable (in both senses) was the confession of the hopelessly anti-Catholic Montreal “ Daily Witness,” thus turning the tables of no coercion :

“ Bound to protect the liberties of the most erroneous faith as much as we protect the liberties of our own . . . we are strongly convinced that Protestants not living as strangers and foreigners in a land, but in a country which they call their own, would strongly resent any dictation from a majority holding different views as to how their children should be educated ; and feeling this in our bones, we, as honest Christians governed by the golden rule, cannot but sympathize with others who do so.”

But all was of no avail—principle, generosity, or craft. The party bringing in a remedial bill by the Federal Parliament, now that the Provincial Legislature had refused to bring one in, was beaten, and beaten by the vote of Catholic Quebec.

But our French champion, M. Laurier, would settle everything ; he will arrange with the Manitoba Government ; they are Liberals together ; that promise stood out because the Federal Government was on the other side ; and so on.

Yet Mr. Greenway, if once false to Archbishop Taché, that he might get into power, was now, with his new provincial majority, falsely true enough. His letter during the Dominion campaign might have sounded a warning :

“ It has been reported that the Manitoba Government would settle the school question if M. Laurier came into power. The Local Government, so long as I have any connection with it, would never make any settlement of the school question which would involve the restoration of separate schools.”

It must be noted that at this election of 1896 many Protestant Conservatives were elected pledged against remedial legislation, and many Catholic Liberals pledged for it. This is important to bear in mind when considering all men and things now, and in the stirring time that may be.

M. Laurier's arrangement or settlement was published in November, 1896. The minority in Manitoba were not consulted.

By this arrangement, of course, there were no separate schools; but if (1) a majority of the Board of Trustees authorized it, or if (2) a petition came signed by parents or guardians of at least ten children in a rural district, or at least twenty-five in a city, town, or village, then religious instruction might be given out of the time for secular school-work; for within this line there shall be no separation by religious denominations. If the average attendance of Catholic children in villages and rural districts reaches twenty-five, and in towns and cities forty, they may claim a Catholic teacher.

The Archbishop (Langevin) of St. Boniface protested in his cathedral against calling this a "settlement," in a country where Catholic schools had been given, guaranteed, taken away.

And taken away we may surely agree they were, as Mr. Goldwin Smith recognizes when judging the Privy Council judgment by common sense. For "you *do* compel a struggling settler in a new country to send his son to your school when you take from him, by the school tax, the means of sending his child to a school of his own."

The Archbishop said:

"No Catholic can approve of these schools unless he wishes to separate himself from the Church. . . ."

"We wish (1) control of our schools; (2) Catholic school-districts everywhere; (3) Catholic histories and reading-books; (4) Catholic inspectors; (5) competent Catholic teachers instructed by us; (6) our taxes, and exemption from taxes for other schools:

"The Remedial Bill gave us all that in principle. . . . But what has been given us in its place? Not one of our sacred rights, not a single one."

"The Western Churchman," described as the organ of the Anglican Church in Manitoba, said:

"Some people, who know no better, speak as if the Roman Catholic minority had got more than they had any reason to expect. The whole thing, as his grace of St. Boniface put it, is a miserable farce. . . . We do not blame his grace if he does publicly announce that the strife is just commencing. No earnest Roman Catholic could accept such a settlement at all. It is not permission to teach their children the truths of their faith for half an hour or even an hour a day that will satisfy the Roman Catholic minority. They want, and rightly so, to surround their children all day long, and every day, with an atmosphere of religion. They want not merely to impress upon their young people's minds certain important dogmas, but to so fill them with a sense of the close relationship that ought to exist between these dogmas and the conduct of their everyday lives, that they will grow up Christian men and women."

Mr. Goldwin Smith, from Toronto, wrote in the local "Sun" (December 1, 1896) in words showing that he understands the Christian ideal in education, though he is out of sympathy with it. His words illustrate what the most cultivated English Liberal

can say, and suggest that in Canada he has a fit audience, if few. Of course, Mr. Goldwin Smith writes, himself, as a disbeliever in Christianity :

“ At last the curtain has risen, and disclosed the terms of the Manitoba settlement. They have evidently been framed with great care, and a sincere desire to do justice. They will, probably, satisfy the bulk of Protestants, who wish the question out of the way, and the less-exacting Catholics. The thoroughly devout Catholic no mere safeguards, or hours reserved for doctrinal teaching, will entirely satisfy. He wants the Catholic atmosphere, the Catholic surroundings. He wants the child's whole character moulded upon the Catholic model. Nor is it very easy to see how you are justified in compelling him to send his child to your school, as you must do when you take from him, by the school-tax, the means of sending his child to a school of his own. Our public-school system, overriding paternal right and conscience, rests on considerations of public policy superior to natural justice.”

Which, of course, is pretty good Paganism, or Platonism, but hardly good Protestantism for those Protestants who believe in Christianity and its law of life.

The Catholic press in the United States condemned the “ settlement,” the “ Sacred Heart Review,” of Boston, adding :

“ Nor . . . is it a victory for the Protestant majority. They have defied the Constitution of Manitoba and repudiated their promises before the world.”

Adding further what, as was said, must not be forgotten now and in the near future :

“ Yet it was the Catholic voters of Canada who permitted this thing, and a Catholic Premier who consummated it.”

This coming election, the London “ Tablet ” had written, will be decisive for at least a decade, and it “ fears Mr. Blake's opinion must be accepted as final,” that M. Laurier's “ settlement ” is “ infinitely more advantageous to the Roman Catholic minority than any Remedial Bill which it is in the power of the Parliament to force upon the Premier of Manitoba.”

Mr. Blake was the counsel for the minority. He is the eminent lawyer, once leader of the Canadian Liberals, now an Irish Home Rule member.

The “ Casket,” of Antigonish, Nova Scotia, that small but interesting paper, with principles, thoughts and ideas, severely criticises the “ Tablet ” and Mr. Blake (March 4, 1897). It quotes against him Mr. David Mills, “ perhaps the ablest man in the Liberal ranks,” who says that the claim to a remedial law, as guaranteed by the British North American Act, implies that those making the claim have a right, and that they are invoking the party to whom the law has given the power of redress.

The "Casket" considers as "almost unspeakably absurd" the "Tablet's" remark that "practically it comes to this: that the judgment [of the Privy Council] does nothing but establish a moral claim on the part of the Catholics of Manitoba to the favorable consideration of the Government of the Province."

And that, as was said above, is the conclusion to which the writer of this article came, independently. So he respectfully says to the "Casket," though thus he seems like the humble dancing-master, who said: "Il n'y a en Europe que trois grands hommes—le roi de Prusse, Voltaire et moi."

How have Catholics received this Laurier-Greenway "settlement"; and what do they look forward to?

All Catholics would be uncompromising, surely; and they ought to be so. That is what the world says, when it is not in conflict with the Church's children, nor desiring to get anything of its desires from them or through them. Indeed it has a cynical or amused contempt for what in the American sense is a Liberal Catholic, a sort of Joseph-ite German Catholic of the generations before Windhorst, a political Gallican Catholic without old Gallican religious severity, almost a would-be Elizabethan Anglican. "Render unto Cæsar" and "render unto God" is for them a text whose directions never conflict. Thoughtless, or ignorant, or wilful, or corrupt, they are instinctively sure of one thing, that "On fait avec le ciel des accommodements."

And then the power of party. There are older priests from Ireland, such good haters of Tories that Sir Wilfred Laurier is still well trusted by them. There are many religious Catholic lawyers whose worldly course of rational public life is to be run with the Liberal party. There are thousands brought up under systems of school and college compromises tolerated by the Church; and a sort of public Sunday and private week-day Catholicism seems to them very nice; and indeed who knows how excellent these men often are, notwithstanding this semi-penal-law-hunted Christianity, shy at least and timid, fitting nicely into the modern world's conspiracy of silence about the Church.

All this seems silly enough to those who think, whatever be their religious belief, or lack thereof. The real life of the Church does not theorize continually about it, but simply lives on as if this compromising of some of its members were an ill-fitting garment that somehow was clinging to it, or some malady on the surface, causing indeed, discomfort, and even pain. The only wonder, to those who think, is that the Church is not in practice even more severe than she is, about religious education; nothing, indeed, can

be more severe about it than are her mind and heart. She is not less logical and rational in the eyes of the Revolution-Masonic spirit—deistic or atheistic, as the accidents of country just now may determine—than she is in her own, that is in the eyes of her Lord.

In 1895 one good Catholic and good Liberal almost echoed the words of the Ontario Protestant Liberal Minister of Education, who advised Catholics to refrain from using even their constitutional right of Federal Government power over provincial. Beware of blind Protestant bigotry, the Minister implies :

“If pressed in the present tone and temper of the country, interference will produce an irritated condition of the public mind which will not subside for many years.”

And here is the Catholic echo :

“As the Catholics have now the constitutional victory, it would redound to their credit, and at the same time evoke a generous feeling likely to end in a fair compromise, were the Manitoba Catholics to make a public declaration of their general opposition to any interference by the Central Government with provincial laws. . . . To my mind there is an immense field of usefulness open to a few cool-headed politic Catholics of Manitoba at this juncture; but I fear they may be disposed to stand firmly by their well-won laurels to the end. Still nothing crowns victory like generosity, and perhaps the clergy may favor and guide such a step.”

Children of this world, and children of light, one may well exclaim, when one reflects on the contrast between victors on one side and on the other.

And now here is a Catholic lawyer-politician of last month (December 8, 1897):

“I have not changed my views on the Manitoba School question; if anything they are stronger now than ever. Of course if Rome speaks we must obey; but, I have too much confidence in the far-seeing and progressive policy of the illustrious Leo XIII. to think for one moment that he will condemn the Laurier settlement *in toto* or command us to desert our respective political parties. I have no doubt that he will affirm what is and always has been the Catholic teaching on the subject of education, but at the same time will counsel prudence and moderation for the attainment of the end we all so earnestly seek.”

The writer continued :

We are “between the duplicity of the Conservatives and the failure of Laurier’s settlement to meet the views of the more sanguine Liberals; between a ‘remedial bill’ unworkable and ineffective, and a ‘settlement’ that gives something but not enough; between a warlike attitude that can breed nothing but contention, animosity and strife and a ‘sunny way of peace.’

“The matter, it appears to me, resolves itself into three questions: 1. Did the Privy Council decide that the minority had a grievance? 2. Can the Federal Parliament pass such a measure of remedial legislation as will be a substantial remedy? 3. If they cannot, what is best to do in the circumstances?”

As to (1), *he thinks the Privy Council gave no decision that there was a grievance.* The letter added: "That a great grievance exists, you and I admit."

And it must be further added here (as already stated), that even if the Privy Council gave no "decision" that there is a grievance, yet they "admit" its existence, at least by implication.

As to (2), *it is a question of financial aid.* And this writer said:

"It is admitted on all sides that no remedial legislation can compel Manitoba to contribute to the maintenance of separate schools; but it is claimed that the Federal Parliament can relieve the minority from taxation in support of the Common Schools. Is this so? Notwithstanding that Mr. Dickey, then Minister of Justice, in his speech on the bill when it was before the House, expressed very grave doubts, his camp followers were and are far more confident about it. They argue that as the power is given to do a certain thing, so all things incidental thereto follow. This is the argument of the layman rather than the lawyer. Any lawyer of ordinary reading knows that legislatures frequently pass laws which become dead letters on the statute-book because no machinery has been supplied for the carrying out of them. We have now, however, the opinion of Mr. Blake, counsel for the minority, that such is not within the purview of the Dominion Parliament. It is not denied that Parliament might make an allowance; but what would the tax-payers of Canada say? With all due respect to his Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface, I think that he expressed the severest condemnation of the Conservative remedial bill when he said that he admitted that it did not amount to much, but that it legislated the principle, and the rest would be secured afterwards. In other words, a perpetual religious war in Canada, with its inevitable result in a country where the majority is antagonistic."

And as to (3):

"Now, if I be correct in saying that Parliament cannot legislate a substantial remedy, what is best to do in the circumstances? (a) Surely accept all that you can get, and in the local legislature by persistent endeavor strive for much more. This is evidently what Sir Wilfred had in view. (b) And of his settlement let this much be said: it is better than the one the Conservatives tried to bring about; and (c) it is far, far better than the one in New Brunswick."

Lettering those words, we conclude that (a) is what the Archbishop proposed; for you cannot quietly assume that this settlement is accepted so far by all, either within parliaments or without; it is not, any more than the Conservative remedial bill settlement was.

As to (b), the people most concerned deny this.

As to (c), even once again let it be repeated, the New Brunswick allusion is irrelevant—just as much so as to say to a man robbed of \$1000, "I give you back \$200; you are far, far better off than the man who holds \$10 on sufferance." In New Brunswick, before confederation, they never had separate schools by law, as they had in Ontario and Quebec; and they had no act with the expressly inserted saving words *by practice*, as they have in Manitoba.

Another prominent and influential Catholic Liberal wrote (December 11th):

“As to the school question, I may in a few words sum up the whole case. The Liberals should, I think, have insisted upon getting for our people a system similar to that prevailing in Ontario. . . . I cannot express the extent of my contempt of the Tories for the manner in which they acted from start to finish. It was a policy of delay, hypocrisy and political chicanery. If Tupper had got into power we would be further than ever from a settlement, as some other scheme of postponement would be devised. He has no love for us—no sympathy for our cause in his heart. He went to the country with a cry in our favor, thinking he could capture Quebec and wheel into line the Orange hosts of Ontario. Once in power the juggling would, as I said, begin over again.”

A priest of Liberal traditions wrote, on December 12th :

“Personally, I fully believe that party advantage alone prevented Laurier from accepting Tupper’s Remedial Bill ; that he has made the school question a stalking-horse under cover of which to get into power ; and that, now he is Premier, he will accept anything that will stamp out the agitation.

“The Manitoba Catholics are still suffering injustice, and the question will never be definitely settled until that injustice is *fully* repaired.”

VI. *The Mission of Mgr. Merry del Val.*

It is said that Pope Pius the Ninth wanted to know : “What is the matter with you in Canada? You give me more anxiety than any other country.” About Popes, no doubt, foolish stories are told. This story, however, need not be set down as such, seeing that, if not the truth of history, it has in it, at least, the poetic truth of much care in all the churches being upon the Pope.

The present Holy Father sent Mgr. del Val to investigate the Manitoba school question. This prelate was well received publicly, except, perhaps, by the vulgar Puritan press. Speaking fluently English and French, as well as the Spanish of his father’s family, and having been brought up in England when his father was a representative of Spain, the Pope’s ambassador had power over the material at hand, and won confidence in his good-will, prudence and sympathy. His mission certainly calmed the public mind. Upon the results of this mission and investigation the decision and counsel of the Holy Father has been given.

On hearing a report of a hostile decision, the Manitoba Attorney-General said, in December last : “It seems remarkable, but the antagonism of the minority to the public-schools system has apparently rather increased than diminished since the settlement.”

The antagonism is “remarkable,” if not in the speaker’s sense. The school question is dead only as long as the minority does not stir. That is the net result. What is it O’Connell said? Some-

thing like: "As long as the timid will cower, the cruel will kick." Or was it Sydney Smith? Let them be named together as examples of great courage and unwearied endeavor—Catholic champion and Protestant defender. And let us, thinking of how the old English Protestant tradition has got battered since their day, rather laugh in hope than sigh in despair. The Church is in upon the breakers; but the fact is the sea is always rough, and Popes talk and act as Apostles of old. It is an awful world, because evil exists. There is nothing else awful about the state of the Church now.

Heaven helps those that help themselves; "aide-toi, et le ciel t'aidera"; it is bilingual, and suitable to Canada.

The Greenway government (Liberal) organ says, indeed: "No political party in Manitoba will undertake the responsibility of re-establishing separate schools" (November 17th). And Mr. Hugh Macdonald, speaking in Manitoba (as a Conservative), says: "Neither party would ever again take the school question up as an issue." Perhaps not; but these be brave, comfortable words, when Laurier is friend and patron of Greenway, and when French Catholic Quebec is Laurier's support. That the Conservatives, whether as honest politicians or as schemers, should wash their hands of French Catholics in Canada is not surprising just now. But pique yields to new plans, and men will give you lawful payment for your bait. There are other party questions. There is the instinct for self-preservation. Even the weak Manitoban minority may count, when it has the strong Quebec majority with it in the ranks.

Besides, the Catholic Church *does* doubt, with all her heart and mind, that natural good works "have the nature of sin." The Catechism tells of "a strong inclination to evil," but not of nature totally depraved. Men of good-will are heard all around. Judge by some heard in this article. Judge of Canada by the United States. Here is a tribute to true humanity and Catholic schools heard lately from Senator Vest, who was once Indian Commissioner, and who has never lost a favorable opportunity of testifying to the fact that the Jesuit missions and schools were superior to all others; that, in fact:

"Out of eleven tribes that I saw—and I say this as a Protestant—where they had had Protestant missions, the Indians had not made a single, solitary advance towards civilization, not one. Yet, among the Flatheads, where there were two Indian missions [of the Jesuits], you find farms, you find civilization, you find Christianity, you find the relation of husband and wife and of father and child scrupulously observed. I say that an ounce of experience is worth a ton of theory at any time; and this I say, and I know it."

Is not the last report (1897) of secondary education in France striking testimony once again : Decrease in attendance at State schools, 675 ; increase in attendance at religious schools, 4327. And this notwithstanding aid to State schools amounting to sums almost past belief. *La vérité vraie*, as is said there, is, to say the least, not being less and less heard now. The Ruskin of a generation ago, now, comparatively, *prêche des convertis* :

“Education does not mean teaching people to know what they do not know. It means teaching them to behave as they do not behave. It is not teaching the youth the shapes of letters and the tricks of numbers, and then leaving them to turn their arithmetic to roguery, and their literature to lust. . . . It is a painful, continual and difficult work, to be done by kindness, by watching, by warning, by precept, and by praise, but, above all, by example.”

“He that is not against Me is on My side.” And if the poet of rebellion half grieves :

“Though Justice against Fate complain,
And plead the ancient Rights in vain,”

he goes on to imply that there is no need that thus “in vain” the pleading should be ; for those “Rights”

“do hold or break
As men are strong or weak.”

W. F. P. STOCKLEY.

MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER FROM THE POPE.

TO THE ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS, AND OTHER ORDINARIES IN THE
FEDERATED STATES OF CANADA
IN GRACE AND COMMUNION WITH THE HOLY SEE.

POPE LEO XIII.

VENERABLE BRETHREN,
HEALTH AND APOSTOLIC BENEDECTION.

WE can scarcely address you, which we most willingly do from our heart, without remembering the mutual goodwill and that continuous interchange of good offices which have ever existed between the Apostolic See and the Canadian people. The love of the Catholic Church stood by the cradle of your State, and since the time when she received you into her maternal arms has never ceased to hold you in a close embrace, to foster you, and to load you with good things. The great works which that man of immortal memory, Francis de Laval Montmorency, wrought so successfully and so holily for the good of your country, of which your ancestors were witnesses, he accomplished through the support of the authority and favor of the Roman Pontiffs. And it was from no other source that the works of the Bishops who succeeded him, and who were men of such signal merits, took their origin and drew their hopes of success. In the same way, too, to go still further back, it was under the inspiration and on the initiative of the Apostolic See that noble bands of missionaries journeyed to your country, carrying along with the light of Christian wisdom a more elevated culture and the first seeds of civilization. And it was by these seeds, which were gradually ripened by the arduous labor of these men, that the Canadian people won a place on a level with the most civilized and most glorious nations, and thus became, though late in the field, their rival.

All this it is pleasant for us to recall, and the more so because we see the fruits of it, and they are by no means small, still remaining. The greatest of all these fruits assuredly is that amongst the multitude of Catholics there is a love and an ardent zeal for that divine religion which your ancestors, in the first place from

France, then from Ireland, and others from elsewhere, so religiously professed themselves and transmitted inviolate to their children. And if those children faithfully preserve this precious heritage it is easy for us to understand how much praise is due to your vigilance and activity, Venerable Brethren, and to the zeal of your clergy; for all work assiduously with one heart and one soul for the preservation and progress of the Catholic faith, and, to render this tribute to the truth, without meeting any disfavor or obstacle on the part of the laws of the British Empire. Accordingly, when out of appreciation for your common merits, we some years ago conferred the honor of the Roman purple upon the Archbishop of Quebec, it was our desire not only to acknowledge his personal qualities, but also to render a solemn homage to all Catholics in the country.

EDUCATION IN CANADA.

As regards the education of the young, upon which rest the best hopes of religious and civil society, the Apostolic See has never ceased to work zealously in concert with you and your predecessors. Thus numerous institutions for the moral and scientific education of your children have been founded under the favor and protection of the Church. Amongst these the great University of Quebec, adorned and strengthened with all the dignity and rights which the Apostolic authority is accustomed to confer, assuredly occupies the place of honor, and stands as sufficient witness that the Apostolic See has had no greater desire or care than the formation of a race of citizens as distinguished by its intellectual culture as it is rendered commendable by its virtues. Wherefore, it is with the greatest solicitude, as you yourselves can easily understand, that we have followed the misfortunes which have lately marked the history of Catholic education in Manitoba. For it is our wish and it is our duty to endeavor by every means in our power to bring it about that no harm befall the faith and religion of so many thousands of souls, the salvation of which has been especially entrusted to us, in a State which received the first rudiments of Christian teaching as well as of civilization from the Catholic Church. And since very many expect a pronouncement from us upon this question, and look to us to point out what course they should pursue, we determined not to come to any conclusion upon the matter until our Delegate Apostolic had examined it upon the spot. Charged to make a careful survey of the situation and to report upon it to us, he has with fidelity and ability fulfilled the task we imposed upon him.

THE QUESTION AT ISSUE.

The question at issue is assuredly one of the highest and most serious importance. The decisions arrived at seven years ago on the school question by the Parliament of the province of Manitoba must be remembered. The Act of Union of the Confederation had secured to Catholics the right to be educated in the public schools according to their consciences ; and yet this right the Parliament of Manitoba abolished by a contrary law. This is a noxious law. For our children cannot go for instruction to schools which either ignore or of set purpose combat the Catholic religion, or in which its teachings are despised and its fundamental principles repudiated. Wherever the Church has allowed this to be done, it has only been with pain and through necessity, at the same time surrounding her children with many safeguards which, nevertheless, it has been too often recognized have been insufficient to cope successfully with the danger attending it. Similarly it is necessary to avoid at all costs, as most dangerous, those schools in which all beliefs are welcomed and treated as equal, as if, in what regards God and divine things, it makes no difference whether one believes rightly or wrongly, and takes up with truth or error. You know well, Venerable Brethren, that every school of this kind has been condemned by the Church, because nothing can be more harmful or better calculated to ruin the integrity of the faith and to turn aside the tender minds of the young from the way of truth.

THE NEED OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

There is another point upon which those will agree with us who differ from us in everything else ; it is not by means of a purely scientific education and with vague and superficial notions of morality that Catholic children can quit school trained as the country desires and expects. Other serious and important teaching must be given to them if they are to turn out good Christians and upright and honest citizens ; it is necessary that they should be formed on those principles which, deeply engraven on their consciences, they ought to follow and obey, because they naturally spring from their faith and religion. Without religion there can be no moral education deserving of the name, nor of any good, for the very nature and force of all duty comes from those special duties which bind man to God, who commands, forbids, and determines what is good and evil. And so, to be desirous that minds should be imbued with good and at the same time to leave

them without religion is as senseless as to invite people to virtue after having taken away the foundations on which it rests. For the Catholic there is only one true religion, the Catholic religion; and, therefore, when it is a question of the teaching of morality or religion, he can neither accept nor recognize any which is not drawn from Catholic doctrine.

Justice and reason then demand that the school shall supply our scholars not only with a scientific system of instruction, but also a body of moral teaching which, as we have said, is in harmony with the principles of their religion, without which, far from being of use, education can be nothing but harmful. From this comes the necessity of having Catholic masters and reading-books and text-books approved by the bishops, of being free to regulate the school in a manner which shall be in full accord with the profession of the Catholic faith, as well as with all the duties which flow from it. Furthermore, it is the inherent right of a father's position to see in what institutions his children shall be educated, and what masters shall teach them moral precepts. When, therefore, Catholics demand, as it is their duty to demand and work, that the teaching given by school-masters shall be in harmony with the religion of their children, they are contending justly. And nothing could be more unjust than to compel them to choose an alternative, or to allow their children to grow up in ignorance, or to throw them amid an environment which constitutes a manifest danger for the supreme interests of their souls. These principles of judgment and action, which are based upon truth and justice, and which form the safeguards of public, as well as private, interests, it is unlawful to call in question or in any way to abandon. And so, when the new legislation came to strike Catholic education in the province of Manitoba, it was your duty, Venerable Brethren, publicly to protest against injustice and the blow that had been dealt, and the way in which you fulfilled this duty has furnished a striking proof of your individual vigilance and of your true episcopal zeal. Although upon this point each one of you finds sufficient approbation in the witness of his own conscience: know, nevertheless, that we also join with it our assent and approval. For the things that you have sought and still seek to preserve and defend are most holy.

THE NEED OF UNITED ACTION.

Moreover, the hardships of the law in question themselves plainly proved that there was need of complete union if any opportune remedy of the evil was to be found. So good was the

Catholic cause that all fair and honest citizens without distinction of party ought to have taken common counsel and acted in concert to defend it. Unfortunately, however, and to the great detriment of the cause, just the contrary was done. And what is still more deplorable, Catholic Canadians themselves were unable to act in concert in the defence of interests which so closely touch the common good, and the importance and moment of which ought to have silenced the interests of political parties, which are on quite a lower plane of importance.

AN INSUFFICIENT REMEDY.

We are not ignorant that something has been done to amend the law. The men who are at the head of the Federal Government and of the Government of the Province have already taken certain measures to diminish the grievances of which the Catholics of Manitoba rightly persist in complaining. We have no reason to doubt that these measures have been inspired by a love of fair dealing and by a good intention. But we cannot conceal the truth. The law made to remedy the evil is defective, imperfect, insufficient. Catholics demand, and have the right to demand, much more. Besides, the arrangements made may fail of their effect, owing to the variations in local circumstances; enough has not yet been done in Manitoba for the Catholic education of our children. The claims of justice demand that this question should be considered from every point of view, that those unchangeable and sacred principles which we have enunciated above should be protected and secured. This is what must be aimed at, and this the end which must be pursued with zeal and prudence. But there must not be discord; there must be union of mind and harmony of action. As the object does not impose a line of conduct determinate and exclusive, but, on the contrary, admits of several, as is usual in such matters, it follows that there may be on the line to be followed a certain number of opinions equally good and acceptable. Let none, then, lose sight of the value of moderation, gentleness and brotherly love. Let none forget the respect due to his neighbor, but let all, weighing the circumstances, determine what is best to be done, and act together after having taken counsel with you.

PARTIAL SATISFACTION TO BE ACCEPTED.

As to what regards particularly the Catholics of Manitoba, we have confidence that, God helping, they will one day obtain full satisfaction. This confidence is founded, above all, on the good-

ness of their cause ; next, on the justice and wisdom of those who govern ; and, lastly, on the good-will of all upright Canadians. In the meantime, until they succeed in their claims, let them not refuse partial satisfaction. This is why, wherever the law or administration, or the good dispositions of the people, offer some means of lessening the evil, and of warding off some of the dangers, it is absolutely expedient and advantageous that they should make use of them, and derive all the benefit possible from them. Wherever, on the contrary, there is no other remedy, we exhort and conjure them to use a generous liberality. They can do nothing better for themselves, or more calculated to redound to the welfare of their country, than to contribute, as far as their means will allow, towards the maintenance of their own schools.

There is still another point which calls for your united attention. Under your authority, and with the help of those who direct your schools, a complete course of studies ought to be carefully devised. Special care should be taken that those who are employed as teachers should be abundantly provided with all the qualities, natural and acquired, which are requisite for their profession. It is only right that Catholic schools, both in their educational methods and in the standard of their teaching, should be able to compete with the best. From the standpoint of intellectual culture and progress the design conceived by the Canadian provinces for the development of public instruction, for the raising of the standard of education, and making it daily more and more refined and perfect, must assuredly be allowed to be honorable and noble. And there is no class of study, no progress in human knowledge, which cannot fully harmonize with Catholic doctrine and teaching.

A WORD TO THE PRESS.

Towards the explanation and defence of all that we have written those Catholics can very largely contribute whose work is on the public—and especially on the daily—press. Let them then remember their duty. Let them religiously and courageously defend what is true and right, the interests of the Church and of the State, and in such a way that they do not outstep the bounds of decorum, avoiding all personalities, and exceeding in nothing. Let them respect and religiously defer to the authority of the Bishops and all other legitimate authority. The more difficult the times, and the more threatening the danger of division, the more they ought to strive to show the necessity of that unity of thought and action, without which there is little or no chance of ever obtaining that which is the object of our common hopes.

As a pledge of heavenly grace and a token of Our paternal affection, receive the Apostolic Benediction, which We lovingly impart in the Lord to you all, Venerable Brothers, to your clergy, and to the flocks entrusted to your care.

Given at St. Peter's, Rome, on the 18th day of December, 1897, in the twentieth year of Our pontificate.

LEO XIII., *Pope.*

DON ZEBALLOS AND THE JESUITS.

VERILY, Divine Providence is ever "playing in the world." (The Hebrew text has "laughing," as in the second Psalm.) Not only does God often visit the sins of parents "usque ad tertiam et quartam generationem"; not only does He generally punish national crimes by national calamities growing out of them, but He at times adopts, in carrying out His avenging designs, means so sudden, so strange, that they needs must arouse the amazement even of the unbeliever. If the simile were not so odd, we should compare the action of God "playing in the world" to the genius of Shakespeare interrupting the awful and pathetic course of tragedy by those more or less comical by-plays which seem to have nothing to do with the catastrophe, yet contribute powerfully to render its effects more striking.

Such were the reflections which suggested themselves to us as we pored over the documents presented in 1892 and 1893 to President Cleveland, as arbitrator in the boundary question between the South American republics of Brazil and Argentina, which His Exc. Don Estanislao S. Zeballos, the Envoy and Plenipotentiary of the latter, has published in two neat quarto volumes (Washington, D. C., 1894).

That the unhappy nations Spain and Portugal should have paid dearly for the crimes committed in their name, and, professedly, for their interests, through their Kings, Don Carlos III. and José I., by their Arandas, Pombals and Florida Blancas, is quite in agreement with the providential law, which even pagans could guess at, that "quidquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi." But that, at the end of the nineteenth century, the Protestant head of

a Protestant nation—such, at least, the A. P. A.'s hesitate not to call it—should be called upon to decide a quarrel which the Jesuits of the middle of the eighteenth century had tried to prevent or to settle, and for which they suffered slander, exile and martyrdom, is, if we may call it so, a “*lusus historiæ*” which is inexplicable, unless we recur to that frequently overlooked factor of history, an all-ruling Providence, which, whilst it respects the liberty of man, “plays” with events, ever long-suffering, because It is eternal, ever just, because It “searcheth the hearts and veins.”

Don Zeballos seems to be neither an enthusiastic admirer nor an enemy of the Jesuits, but he is what every true diplomat, every serious historian ought to be, a clear-headed and fair-minded scrutinizer of men and things, reporting events, as Tacitus wishes—“*sine ira et studio.*”

On page 53, vol. 2, Don Zeballos says: “The treaty of 1751 met with opposition among all the pueblos of the Governments of Paraguay and Buenos Ayres. This opposition has been attributed to the Jesuits, of whom, on this account, history has spoken very severely, in ignorance of the diplomatic secret connected with this affair. The Jesuits were in harmony with the public opinion of the country, and they *were right.*” And elsewhere (p. 156): “The Jesuits have been accused of engaging in intrigues. The Portuguese accuse them unjustly; for *they were right*, and were doing an exceedingly important service to the King, their master, by employing their knowledge of South America in order to maintain in his power the immense territories that belonged to the crown of Spain.”

The fact is this: Ever since the foundation of the Reductions of Paraguay and Uruguay, in which a people of converts lived under the peaceful sway of the Jesuits, who had conquered them for Christ and civilization, they had been a thorn in the side of their Portuguese neighbors. As early as 1657 we see repeated invasions of the so-called “Mamelukes” of San Pablo. The Jesuits saw themselves forced to organize their neophytes into military companies to resist the invaders and defend the integrity of the Spanish dominions. In this they were encouraged by the Spanish Government, well aware that its own officials would have been totally unable to protect its rights.

At the same epoch, and later—in defiance of the repeated enactments and orders of the Spanish Court—Portuguese spies were met with everywhere, sometimes even under the garb of the monk or the Jesuit. Their object was to explore the country, in which

they thought to find the Eldorado of the Jesuits, the fabulous gold mines which even modern thoroughness of exploration has not been able to discover. Whether these emissaries made false reports to Pombal, or *he* found it to his interest to falsify their reports, is not known; but the fable of the Jesuit millions, the Jesuit empire with its Emperor Nicholas I., the Jesuit armies, cannon and warships, was spread everywhere, and credited throughout the world.

The intrigues which preceded, accompanied and followed the exchange of territory in South America were exclusively the work of Pombal, who ruled over Portugal in the name of Joseph I., whose weak mind he had completely subdued by pandering to his passions and exciting imaginary terrors. Whether it was hatred or ambition which caused him to oppose the Jesuits, whom he had looked upon as the most formidable adversaries of his plans, may be left an open question. Certain it is that he succeeded but too well both in amassing untold wealth and in ruining the Jesuit Order not only in Portugal but all over the world. But the Jesuits rose again some forty years later, and found the body of the disgraced Marquis still unburied and his fortune swept away. And soon after, alas! the Bourbon Courts and the nations that had listened to Pombal, together with the Portuguese who had supported or at least endured him, fell from the greatness they had possessed for several centuries, and he now stands before History responsible for the destruction of "one of the greatest works which human sagacity could devise," as Chateaubriand says. Providence "playing" in the world!

Let us hear, again, Don E. S. Zeballos: "The Indians had been treated by the Spaniards as machines for producing wealth, by the Portuguese as slaves and wild beasts. The Jesuits treated them paternally, and the tribes took refuge under their kind protection. Upon this principle rested the foundation of the celebrated Spanish Jesuit Republic of South America."

Well, the dream was too beautiful to last. "Pombal, envious of a greatness he could not share, had resolved to crush them (both the Jesuits and the Indians). He knew that the Brazilian merchants would approve his design; for the Jesuits, as Mr. Santrey remarks, 'were the only unpopular Order, because they were the only missionaries, who uniformly opposed the tyranny of the Portuguese.' And of the charges brought against them, the same impartial witness says: 'All that are not absolutely false are merely frivolous.'"

In January, 1750, the Courts of Portugal and Spain entered into

a treaty of which Don E. S. Zeballos rightly says: "Whether from ignorance as to the territories in America, or weakness amidst the European complications which were driving Spain rapidly down the declivity of decadence, the fact is that Portugal gained under this treaty enormous advantages, entirely disproportionate, and in truth incomprehensible." Portugal yielded a problematic claim to the Philippine Islands, which Spain already possessed since 1565. In return, Spain granted Portugal an extent of territory which a single glance at a modern map will show us to have been nearly one-fourth of the whole continent of South America.

This famous treaty, in its 16th Article, stipulated a measure which may have commended itself to the theorizing economists or sophists of the eighteenth century, but which to-day would be deemed almost as equitable, practicable and politic as would the transfer of all our negro population over to Africa. It was determined that "the missionaries shall leave the towns and villages, . . . taking with them the Indians, to settle on other lands of Spain."

To insure the success of their new scheme the Portuguese had first to put the Jesuits out of the way, because, forsooth! they knew better than any others the real condition of their lands (even the maps of these countries were made by them), and could not be bribed into connivance at transactions which were so obviously detrimental to their country, and which would ruin their work of two hundred years. During that time they had won for the Church and for Spain many thousands of souls, and for themselves a world-wide reputation for political wisdom and heroic devotedness.

The wily Minister who, soon after the treaty (July, 1750), took the reins of government, found means of getting rid of the Jesuits. To forestall any opposition to his plans in Portugal he had them removed from Court, and when intimidation and slander had proved unsuccessful he had recourse to the vilest and most cruel persecution. To prevent Spain from awakening from her slumbers, the negotiations were carried on, not through the ordinary diplomatic channels, but through the Queen of Spain, Doña Barbara, the sister of Joseph I. of Portugal. A secret agent of Pombal was placed at her side, underhand correspondence was carried on, and an inexact map was forwarded to her, pointing out the territory coveted by her royal brother and his Minister. Libels were published, not only in Portugal and Spain, but in every country of Europe. The power, as well as the wealth, of

the Jesuits in America was grossly exaggerated. They were accused of illicit commerce, nay, of open rebellion, to which they instigated (it was said) the poor, unsophisticated Indians, whom they thus kept under their absolute power. All communication was artfully intercepted, and the General of the Order, in compliance with the Courts, was himself compelled to give orders altogether bewildering to his inferiors and detrimental to their work. It would appear that even the very terms he was to use in his letters were dictated to him. The Jesuits, as a matter of course, obeyed the commands of their superior, and only asked for time to manage the whole affair quietly and peacefully.

Soon, in fact, they began to put the orders into execution, and, though deeply regretting the situation, they hoped to succeed. But the relentless tools of Pombal could brook no delay. The consequence was that the Indians, growing suspicious as well of the Fathers as of the civil and military agents of Spain, finally revolted. Had they been united in their movements, and especially had they been guided by the Jesuits, as when, on former occasions, they had fought for Spain, they could easily have overpowered the mere handful of Spanish and Portuguese soldiers that had come to drive them from their homes. As it was, the Indians were subdued, scattered in every direction, and have never since recovered from the blow.

The unhappy Jesuits had to suffer for the crimes and blunders of their adversaries. The infidel press all over Europe, altogether in the hands of Pombal and his abettors—the philosophers and the secret orders—invented a term *ad hoc*: The Jesuit war in South America. It is impossible—at the present time, and with the historical data we possess—to read the papers and pamphlets of that epoch without experiencing a feeling of pity at the credulity of the people that allowed themselves to be deceived by the hollow productions of Pombal and his confrères at Lisbon, Madrid, Paris, and, alas! at Rome itself. But the calumny produced its effects: “Mentez toujours,” Voltaire had said; “il restera toujours quelque chose!” The Jesuits were expelled from Portugal in 1759, from France in 1763, and from Spain in 1767. In 1773 the Holy See itself, and the whole world with it, heretic Prussia and schismatic Russia excepted, followed the example of the three Catholic countries. Thus were verified the words of our Lord: “Eritis odio omnibus propter nomen meum.”

But, after all, the scheme failed to a great extent. The politicians found—too late—that it is easier to make covenants and enact laws on paper than to have them observed. Already the

following year it was thought necessary to agree upon additional clauses, which proved equally ineffectual. Of the commissioners sent to survey the boundaries, one party came too late and another was deceived by their Indian guides (unless these were tools of Portugal). The directions given to the surveyors were found impracticable, either because they were too vague or because the international committee agreed to spare themselves the trouble of following them. According to Don Zeballos, it would appear that a false map was substituted for the original one which formed the basis of the treaty.

Meanwhile, something or some person must have opened the eyes of the Spanish Government. Already, in 1755, but especially in 1759, it seriously endeavored to annul the treaty of 1750. This change of policy was probably due to the reading of a lengthy document of eighteen pages now published by Don Zeballos from the archives of Madrid. It is addressed by one "Honorable Regent" of Buenos Ayres, evidently a Jesuit, to José Payes, the Father Procurator-General of the Missions. The author probably was the Rev. Rector of Buenos Ayres, and its date about 1758, not 1756, as Don Zeballos thinks (since events of 1757 are mentioned in it). The document describes in the calmest tone, in the most business-like manner, and in all its details, the whole situation, and leads the reader to draw his own conclusions about the perfidy of the Portuguese and the blindness of the Spanish rulers.

A decree of Joseph I., on the 3d of September, 1759, expelling the Jesuits, was, Don Zeballos says, "the revenge for the opposition made by the Jesuits. A sterile vengeance!" Seven hundred and forty-seven Jesuits, mostly Portuguese, had already been transported to Civita Vecchia; some 200, mostly Germans and Italians, were confined in the dungeons of Azpeitano and Fort Juliao, where they were to linger till 1777. The vacancies created by death were soon filled by the coming of other missionaries from all parts of Asia, Africa and America where Portugal ruled. Queen Barbara had died August 20, 1758, and Ferdinand VI. on August 10, 1759. Don Carlos III. was not so easy to manage as his predecessor (though, at length, even his proverbial obstinacy was to finally give way before the intrigues of Alba, Aranda, Azara and Florida Blanca).

A royal cedula of Don Joseph (October 27, 1760) appointed commissioners for the partial abrogation of the treaty of 1750, and a new one was signed at Pardo, February 12, 1761. The reasons given for this treaty were that "after a series of successive

experiences such and so great difficulties were found that it has been impossible to this date to obviate them which have given many frequent motives and would give in the future to controversies and disputes," etc." Henceforth hostilities were to be suspended, and boundaries definitely settled by mutual agreement. All this was very clear; but Pombal was still alive, and by destroying the influence of the Jesuits at the Spanish Court he could hope still to conquer them. Consequently naught was done, and things remained in *statu quo*.

The year 1777 saw many changes in Portugal. The Jesuits were no more. Joseph I. died February 20th, and with him fell his powerful Minister. He was condemned to death, but was spared by Queen Maria, in consideration of her father. The dungeons were opened and gave back their victims, more dead than alive. Florida Blanca, who had just replaced Grimaldi in the councils of Don Carlos III., was anxious to show his skill and influence by some *coup d'etat*. After his first conversation on the subject with the Portuguese ambassador, Cotinho, the latter wrote to his government for instructions, expressing it as his opinion that Portugal should avail itself of the opportunity, "because," he said, "if, in the time it (the treaty) was made, a Portuguese Queen, willing to overcome all difficulties, could not accomplish it, how much the more difficult to overcome would not be the re-establishment of a cancelled treaty, hated by the King, make it?"

The Preliminaries of St. Ildefonso (October 1, 1777) and the treaty of Pardo (March 11, 1778) were intended to settle all difficulties. Florida Blanca wrote to Aranda, his ambassador at Paris, saying: "I have settled the old dispute, which it was in every respect to our interest to terminate, inasmuch as the injuries occasioned to us by sustaining it by far exceeded whatever sacrifices we have been obliged to make," etc. But, though Florida Blanca had yielded to Portugal almost all it had won in the original treaty of 1750, yet the settlement settled nothing. The very next year (February 5, 1779) the Viceroy of Buenos Ayres forwarded to the Minister the candid opinion of one Brigadier-General Don José di Sá, who evidently was no diplomat, but an honest military officer, well acquainted with the matter in question. "Your excellency can imagine," he says, "how violent a transmigration of Spaniards and Indians therein settled would be, and, also, what would be the consequence, especially among those recently converted to the Faith, who, on the slightest movement, get frightened and run to the woods."

And "run to the woods" they did—never to return. After

some beautiful passages from Southey and others, Marshall concludes: "Such is the last chapter of a history more full of sadness than any other in the modern annals of our race. Out of a population of 100,000 persons inhabiting 30 towns under the control of the Jesuits . . . not a thousand souls remained in 1825."

After these fruitless transactions came the French Revolution, whose evil effects were felt in Spain and Portugal. The American colonies separated from the mother countries, and, strange but true, one of their complaints was that Spain had arbitrarily deprived them "of the Jesuits, to whom we owe our social state, all our instructions and services, with which we can never dispense." Portugal or Brazil, her successor, occupied the greater part of the territory granted by the treaty of San Ildefonso; but the boundaries were never settled until Argentina raised the question again in our time. But we shall pass over this part of the history as foreign to our purpose.

There are, however, other parts of the work of Don Zeballos that deserve our attention. Page 285 of the first volume gives the names of the 14 Jesuit missions in the Diocese of Paraguay and of the 17 in the Diocese of Buenos Ayres, with their respective geographical positions in degrees and minutes; also the number of families and (adult) members, with the names of the missionaries in charge. Some of the missions had been at different times changed from their original localities either in consequence of the unhealthiness of the place, the incursions of the Portuguese, or the rapid increase of population. Two former missions comprised 9105 families, with 36,540 souls, and the latter 12,585 families, with 50,684 souls; in all, 21,690 families, with 87,224 souls, or about 4 souls (taxable adults only) to each family. Of the 71 Fathers, 3 bear apparently Italian and 20 apparently German names; of the 6 Brothers, employed as physicians, 1 seems to have been an Italian and 3 were Germans. The other Fathers and Brothers are Spaniards, and a few, perhaps, Portuguese. In 7 of these missions the census of 1750 gave 23,724 souls, which, in 1825, were reduced to 10,774.

Another remarkable document is a Royal cedula, dated Buen Retiro, December 28, 1743. Various accusations, based on popular clamor and the unfavorable reports of certain officials in South America, had been brought before the Council of the Indies. The King (Philip V.) stated that an investigation had been ordered, both official and secret. It produced, what such experiments commonly produce, very little that is clearly in justification of or in

opposition to the charges, thirteen in number. The irregularity of taxation and the confusion of the accounts are chargeable partly to the negligence of the officials and partly to the ever-changing numbers and residences of the Indians; the census has been as greatly exaggerated by some as it has been understated by others; the Jesuits have acted mostly in virtue of privileges granted them by the King himself and his predecessors, on account of the exceptional condition of the colony. The decree ratifies all that is past; gives some—more or less vague—directions for the future, and forbids all changes not authorized by new laws. It gives unreserved praise to the religious knowledge and eminent morality of the Indians, as proved by the uniform testimony of the bishops of Paraguay and Buenos Ayres, and by the governors of those provinces, who have at different times visited the reductions and examined the condition of things. The lengthy document—which evidently did not become clearer by being translated into English by a person (not Señor Zeballos) who seems to have been a rather indifferent scholar both in Spanish and English—concludes thus: “In no other part of the Indies is there more respect to my dominion and government than in these pueblos, nor is my royal patronage and ecclesiastical and royal jurisdiction so well established as shown by the continuous visits of the ecclesiastical prelates and governors, and by the blind obedience with which they carry out their orders, etc. . . . I have resolved that these royal letters be given expressing to the provincial the gratitude, with which I remain, after seeing the false calumny and lies . . . destroyed by so many proofs and the religion so well applied to everything tending to the service of God and mine and of those unfortunate Indians; and that I hope that they will continue in the future with the same zeal and fervor in the conversion and care of the Indians.”

Lastly, one of the features of the work of Sr. Zeballos is its maps belonging to different epochs and the discussion of their different value. The Portuguese alleged in their favor the original maps of the Jesuits, preserved in the archives of Rome. Don Zeballos—rightly, we think—objects to their use, because, owing to the circumstances of time and place, they were drawn without scientific correctness, being intended simply for the direction of the mediate Superiors of the Order. As it was sufficient for these to know the names of the missions and their relative positions, the exact distances were not given in the maps. As time went on, the Jesuits took care to determine the geographical data—in degrees and minutes—by the aid of which scientific maps could

finally be constructed. The secret map of José Monteiro de Carvalho, sent to Queen Barbara in 1752, is of that class. It shows correctly enough the relative sites of the missions, but it is well calculated to lead into error in favor of Portugal by exhibiting the country as much smaller than it really is—somewhat like our modern maps of certain railroads, which deceive the eye by short straight lines, whilst the cost of the tickets will at once convince the traveller that the road is considerably longer than he was led to believe. A simple comparison of that “secret map” with the exact modern map of Don Zeballos will show the deception at first sight. The distances in latitude are correct enough, but not so the distances in longitude. For instance, if we measure off on the Tropic of Capricorn the distances from Parana to Uruguay, and thence to the Atlantic, we find in the secret map the proportion to be as 2 inches to 4, whilst in reality it is as 3 degrees to 9, which is no small difference.

Many other interesting documents and arguments might be pointed out in the work of Don Zeballos. What has been said, however, suffices to show what a valuable mine it contains for the study of ecclesiastical and profane history of those times and places; nay, for the contemplation, in the history of mankind, of the often hidden ways of Divine Providence reacting “from end to end mightily,” ordering “all things sweetly.”

C. WIDMAN, S.J.

IN MEMORIAM.

MR. CHARLES A. HARDY.

THE rhythm of death and life has become so familiar to ears of maturity that we pay not much more regard to the measure than we do to the throbbing of the engine on the vessel that bears us over the seas or along the river. Old friends drop out, and the ranks are ever being filled up by new faces. Monotony dulls the edge of pathos. Yet once in a while some more than usual irony in the seemingly eccentric ways of death arouses our waning attention. Such a break has occurred by the demise of Mr. Charles A. Hardy, the man at whose bidding this magazine started into existence. There is a melancholy turn of reflection in the fact that pens which a man himself sets in motion with a certain object in view should be prematurely called upon to formulate his own epitaph.

Gratitude would impel us to speak of this departed benefactor in terms befitting his eminent services; respect for his own aversion from notoriety and applause, in life, restrains the pen. Yet it is due to the spirit of justice which presides over the cause of literature to render tribute to the worth of departed excellence, whether in so doing we obey our own irrepressible impulses of gratitude or the no longer mandatory predilections of our deceased friend and colleague.

This is an age of spurious claims in literature. Men who despair of catching the eye or the ear of a hurrying world by ordinary exertion of the pen endeavor to do so by thrusting their own personality offensively forward, as if the man who wrote were a more important object than what he had to impart. If novelty in matter be exhausted, then piquancy in manner is sought to be attained by a great insistence on the self-importance of the writer. Mr. Hardy's whole life and connection with literature have been a rebuke to this pretentious emptiness. Few ever heard of him outside the circle of his business—profession, we would rather say, inasmuch as he was distinctively a professional man; but he chose to

keep himself to a very large extent apart from the ordinary professional ranks in literature because of a native modesty of temperament and a natural disinclination for notoriety. Yet there were very few men, whether profuse in writing or sparing, capable of giving a sounder opinion on matters of high literary import, and very, very few, indeed, who had a finer perception of the intimate relations between literature and religion. For there was never a mind more imbued with the spirit of truth and purity and honor in all things than that of the founder of this magazine.


It was out of the profoundly religious bent of Mr. Hardy's mind that this literary monument was evolved. To promote the cause of religion by some practical means was an early anxiety of his. There were many ways of promoting it in the days when he set out on his mission, and he adopted many. But of all those to which he put his hand, none seemed to him so efficacious as the spread of Catholic literature. It was not merely the ordinary Catholic press which he had in his mind's eye. The higher reaches of the intellect required some means of transmission and interchange, and, fired with the ambition of providing such a medium, first "The Catholic Record," and afterwards this magazine, were started by him in conjunction with his partner, Mr. D. H. Mahony. In the *QUARTERLY* Mr. Hardy took an especial pride. It was his incessant care to procure for its pages the best thought of the whole Catholic literary world, and he was successful to a very rare degree. Under his generous management and the watchful supervision of its successive editors it has sustained, through every vicissitude of taste in literary standards, the purpose for which it was founded, and upheld the founder's standard.

Mr. Hardy's position in the matter was unique. His own part in the work of the magazine was never visible; still it was real, and quite indispensable to its success. His judgment was excellent, his literary instinct true. He was incessantly on the watch for the best writers, as well as for extending the sphere of influence of the magazine. All through, his sole and single purpose was the promotion of the highest interests of religion by means of the highest human instrumentality—the mind and pen.

It is mournful to behold such a man cut off in the flower of his ripened powers, at an age when many matured minds might reasonably look forward to a long period of useful work in any cause on which their ambition was set. Mr. Hardy was not quite fifty years of age when it pleased God to call him to Himself. We may mourn, but we may not murmur or complain. He who gave him for whom we sorrow to the service of the Catholic

cause knows what is best. Nor was it, indeed, until Mr. Hardy had seen his dream realized and his lifework crowned with substantial success that he was summoned away.

Still, his removal has been keenly felt. This is hardly an age of fervent piety, and such piety as Mr. Hardy all through life displayed is, in the case of men engrossed in business cares, of exceeding rarity. He was in the highest sense of the term a devout, practical Catholic, yet not an obtrusive one. His virtues were all of the same order. An exceedingly modest and unpretentious man, his nature shrank from anything like publicity or self-assertion. But he made hosts of friends, especially among the hierarchy and clergy—those best enabled to judge of his disinterestedness, his piety, his wisdom, and his sterling, manly qualities. Honor was his rule, good-will to men his study. He died on the eve of the season when the invisible choirs again take up the burden of that beautiful message, and so left behind him not only a cherished memory, but a sweet and consoling hope.



Scientific Chronicle.

THE DIVINING-ROD.

It must appear strange that science has not yet been able to pronounce definitively on the claims of the divining-rod and its users. There are many things in the realm of magic, particularly in the Orient, which challenge the verdict of science, and yet science is by no means in such a hurry to give it as in respect to the much more remote and intangible things embraced in the term, the "higher criticism." The divining-rod is one of the most remarkable heirlooms of civilization. It comes to us backed with all the prestige of the most hoary antiquity. It forms a link between the fortune-tellers of the present day and the Chaldean seers who gave us the basis of our astronomy as well as the now effete science of astrology. The divining-rod is as much in vogue to-day, in mining districts, for the discovery of the metallic lode and the subterranean spring, as when the Phœnicians, who probably brought it from the East, traded with the mining population of Cornwall. Scientists have frequently tried to grapple with the undoubted mystery which its results present, but so far without arriving at any definite opinion.

Professor N. F. Barrett, a very careful and conscientious experimentalist, long connected with the Royal College of Science in Dublin, recently published the results of some inquiries into the delicate subject. As a scientist, he had approached it with a rather skeptical mind. Professor Barrett is, we believe, a Catholic, and therefore not inclined to the belief in the supernatural attributes with which superstition invests the divining-rod. The rod itself is nothing more than an ordinary hazel twig. But he takes leave of the subject for the present in a very doubtful state of mind.

Professor Barrett publishes the story of his researches in a short treatise entitled "A Scientific and Historical Research as to the Existence and Practical Value of a Peculiar Human Faculty, Unrecognized by Science, Locally Known as Dowsing." "Dowsing" is the term employed to designate the operation by the peasantry in the rural districts of England and Scotland. Sir Walter Scott makes the name serve a characteristic purpose in "The Antiquary," wherein Dowsterswivel forms a prominent figure. Professor Barrett has collected all the most reliable historical *data* he could find, and he places a very large number of surprising cases before the public. A couple of these may be cited.

A sanitarium was to be built on high ground in Somersetshire, England. The site was apparently a dry one. Three professional "dows-

ers" were sent for separately, each unknown to the others, and each working under the conviction that he alone was employed. All three pointed to the same spot. A well was sunk there, and abundant water was found.

William Ward Spink, a justice in British Columbia, walked about over his grounds for an hour, blindfolded, and carrying a divining-rod in his fingers. Every time the wand dipped an attendant drove a peg into the earth. In many cases the justice would pass over a spot where the rod had moved before, and it would invariably give the same sign again. He dug wells at only two of the places indicated, but got water in both. This man declared that if he stood over a garden hose with a divining-rod in his fingers he could tell by its conduct when the water was turned on and off.

At Newport, Monmouthshire, a well was sunk to a depth of fifty-one feet without success. Local experts, noting the character of the soil, then pronounced the quest hopeless. A Cornishman who was present advocated a trial of the divining-rod, with which his boy, aged eleven, had had some successful experience. The lad was sent for. In his hands the twig gave distinct signs. But the people who would have to pay for the excavation were skeptical and hesitated. The Cornishman offered to take the contract himself, and stipulated that he would demand no pay if no water was found. The job proceeded on that basis. At a depth of forty-eight feet the diggers struck a gushing vein, and were obliged to fly for their lives.

It is not only for the discovery of water that the divining-rod is in vogue. Gold, silver, copper and tin are capable of being located by its proper use—at least so it was long believed. Mining populations in the old world pretty generally believe in its efficacy.

How or where this singular practice originated is a question that can never, probably, be settled. It is part of a universal system by which all sorts of agencies were employed as auguries and indications of what lay hidden in physics no less than metaphysics.

The instrument itself is shaped somewhat like a wishbone, and is about a foot long. The tip of one prong is held in each hand, and the hands are kept eight or ten inches apart. The elbows are usually in contact with one's sides, and the forearms extend straight forward horizontally. The twig itself stands almost vertically in front of the dowser's chest. In the majority of cases reported the upper part of the rod swayed toward the operator's body, but in a few instances it moved in the other direction—namely, downward toward the earth.

Those cases which Professor Barrett cites seem to be all attempts at discovering the presence of water. He cannot account for the phenomena, of which he has procured the most undoubted evidence, but he is confident that it is the operator, not the rod, that discovers the water. The movement is not due in genuine cases, he believes, to any attraction or repulsion exerted upon the twig (or the substitute therefor) by

the hidden stream, but to muscular action exerted unconsciously in response to some inward inspiration.

One reflection is suggested by this little excursion into a strange field. Here is a very simple fact in the laws of physical sympathy, the whole circumstances of which are open to investigation, and yet scientists are unable to determine whether it is a trick or a psychological manifestation. On what grounds, then, can it pretend to explain the infinite phenomena of creation and the relation of the human soul thereto?

THE SOURCE OF MEMORY-MEASUREMENT.

In a paper by Prof. Alfred Binet, the eminent French psychologist, in the *Année Biologique*, he says :

“Successive investigations have already been made on the measurement of the memory for figures and syllables ; these are localized memories, the development of which cannot be considered as a sign of the development of the other memories ; we must, therefore, make many reservations in interpreting the conclusions to be drawn from these experiments. An experiment may be made as follows : A series of figures is read to the subject at a regular speed (the speed used is in general two figures per second) and without any special accentuation ; as soon as he has heard the series, the subject, having been told beforehand of the requirement, endeavors to repeat the figures without error and in the order in which he heard them. The experiment is repeated several times, beginning with a small number of figures, *e.g.*, four, which any adult can give correctly ; it is then increased to five figures, then to six, and so on, until a number is reached which the subject can no longer repeat correctly ; care is taken to repeat each trial, and to allow sufficient intervals of rest to avoid fatigue and the confusion of figures in the memory. This procedure, adopted by Jacobs, Galton, and many others, has already borne fruit. It is not, properly speaking, a test of the memory alone ; it is extremely difficult, be it said in passing, to experiment on any isolated psychological phenomenon. The experiments taken together show, on the contrary, that the subject employs not only his memory but also his powers of voluntary attention ; this explains why children retain fewer figures by this method than adults ; their inferiority is certainly due to the fact that they have less control over their attention. The average educated adult retains seven figures ; a child from six to eight retains five ; a child of ten retains six. A difference of one single figure is of considerable importance in the results, and it is one of the drawbacks of this method that we cannot operate with fractions of figures.”

ENORMOUS LENGTH OF GEOLOGICAL PERIODS.

There is no subject which exhibits greater divergence of opinion than that of geological time. We doubt if any of the estimates published

have any real value, or have the power to convey any definite image or measurement to the human mind. Figures, it must appear to many thinkers, lose their substantial meaning after they pass the million stage; the fact that we can say seven or ten or a hundred millions does not mean that we can grasp what these millions have power to effect or that we can follow them out into the beginningless tract of time and space. However, to such people as may think they are able to follow battalions of figures it may be of interest to give the latest opinions on the work of the geological ages. Lord Kelvin estimates the age of the earth, since it was sufficiently cooled to become the abode of plants and animals, to be about 20,000,000 years, within limits of error perhaps ranging between 15,000,000 and 30,000,000 years. This estimate, nearly agreeing with another by Clarence King from similar physical data, has generally been regarded by geologists, says Warren Upham, in *The American Geologist* for October, 1897, as too short for the processes of sedimentation and erosion, and for the evolution of floras and faunas, of which the earth's strata bear record. More probably, as ratios and computations by Dana, Walcott and other geologists, somewhat harmoniously indicate, the duration of time since the beginning of life on the earth has been some three to five times longer than Kelvin's estimate, or from 60,000,000 to 100,000,000 years. The larger figures imply from the dawn of life to the development of the Cambrian and Silurian faunas probably 50,000,000 years; thence to the end of Paleozoic time, perhaps 30,000,000 years; onward through Mesozoic time, about 15,000,000 years, and through the Tertiary era, about 5,000,000 years. The comparatively very short Quaternary era, having, in its organic evolution, as shown by the marine mollusca, no higher ratio to Tertiary time than 1:50, may, therefore, have occupied only about 100,000 years.

THE GREATEST TUNNEL.

It becomes this country, which has so much of the greatest in known things, to be able to boast of the longest railway tunnel, as it safely can of the greatest mileage in railways. In a decade or so the boast will be justified, probably, unless a cataclysm overtake us. Down in Colorado the beginning of the undertaking has already been made. There will be a series of tunnels, indeed, rather than one, and they will all pass under the mass of mountain called Pike's Peak. The longest of these, which is intended to bring the towns of Cripple Creek and Colorado Springs within easy reach of each other, will be twenty miles in length. The starting-point is at the foot of the mountain leading up to Pike's Peak, near the old town of Colorado City. From thence it runs almost due southwest. The further edge of the tunnel is at the edge of the mountains at Four Mile Creek, over in Fremont County, Colorado, six

miles south of Cripple Creek and near the little town of Sunol. Two gangs of men, already, are working on the tunnel, one at each end. Just at present they are making progress at the rate of thirty feet a day. It is believed that the mammoth task they have undertaken will be completed in seven years from the first of the present month.

The main tunnel will pass directly under the cone of Pike's Peak at a depth of nearly 7000 feet, and 2700 feet beneath the town of Victor. Its average depth from the surface will be 2800 feet, and it is designed to test the mineral deposits of the territory at these great depths. Thirty miles of laterals are contemplated, and these will pass underneath all the Cripple Creek district at an average depth of 2800 feet. Cripple Creek, Victor, Gillette, the various small towns and a thousand mines are to be made tributary to this vast system. Under present circumstances the distance—the shortest way—from Colorado Springs to Cripple Creek is fifty-four miles. By way of the tunnel the two cities will only be sixteen miles apart. It is estimated by the contractors that the average cost per foot of excavation will be \$80. This makes the total probable expense of digging the tunnel and its subsidiary branches \$20,520,000. But these matters are almost invariably underestimated. Geological difficulties arise as the work proceeds, the nature of which it is impossible to foresee, and the problem of lighting and ventilation at such an immense depth as is here contemplated must be taken into account as one of the incalculable factors.

NOXIOUS INSECTS IN THE UNITED STATES.

There are seventy-three species of insects, according to Mr. L. O. Howard, which annually cause losses of hundreds of thousands of dollars in the United States. Of these, thirty are native, thirty-seven have been introduced and six are of doubtful origin, all but one of the species brought across the ocean having been accidentally imported. The spread of insects, like that of civilization, tends westward. While thirty injurious insects have been brought from Europe to America, it is said but three of like importance have reached Europe from America, and it is doubtless a fact that certain of our now cosmopolitan forms were originally Asiatic, and have travelled westward through Europe, to and across America, and thence to Hawaii, New Zealand, and Australia. A similar law is found in the study of plants. Out of two hundred American weeds, one hundred and three are introduced, of which ninety-six are from Palearctic regions, sixty-eight being native to Europe, while it seems that less than half a dozen American species have become troublesome in Europe. A number of American species, however, have been carried to Australia, where they flourish vigorously.

BURGLAR-PROOF SHUTTERS, SCREENS, AND CURTAINS.

Burglar-proof shutters are being made in Berlin. They are made on the principle of the roller shutters, of strips of iron or wood, but the present improvement consists in the strips being replaced by tubes made of hardened steel placed over rods or on pivots. These tubes can be made up to a diameter of 20 millimetres, or $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch. The roller shutters, for shop fronts, etc., are invulnerable to the burglar's tools for the simple reason that the only vulnerable parts (the sides) are hidden away in the grooves which hold them, while as the tubes, besides being of hard steel, revolve freely, the centrebit or other tools can find no hold or purchase. . . . Strong rooms can thus be made absolutely inaccessible, except to those who have a right there, because ceilings, walls and doors can be lined therewith in such wise as to leave no weak spot. This invention will prove invaluable for the curtains of theatre stages, as such curtains would in case of fire shut the audience completely off from the stage and isolate the seat of the fire (almost invariably behind the scenes), while it is claimed that the peculiar construction keeps such a curtain from warping. The cost of manufacture is said to be but little in excess of the defective systems now in use.

A VERY INGENIOUS BRIDGE FOR HIGH LEVEL TRANSPORT.

French engineers are still holding their own in the race for excellence in invention. The latest novelty is in the direction of bridge building. Engineers are greatly interested in a novel structure just begun at Rouen. It is called a "pont transbordeur," and is intended to serve all the purposes of a bridge, while not interfering with the free passage of ships, even those with masts 150 feet high. Two small Eiffel towers are to be erected—one at each bank of the Seine—and a narrow iron bridge will be suspended by chain cables between their heads. It is to be not less than 160 feet from the level of the quays, but is not intended either for carriages or foot-passengers. Several lines of rail are to be carried along this bridge, and on these a skeleton carriage or platform on wheels will run; this will be dragged from side to side of the river by steel ropes passing over a driving-wheel, to be worked by steam or electricity from one of the banks. To the skeleton platform will be hung, by steel hawsers, at the level of the quays, or 160 feet below the bridge, the "transbordeur"—a strong carriage—within which passengers and vehicles will be transported from one bank to the other. This carriage is to be 40 feet in width by 33 feet in length; electric tramways running on the quays on both sides of the river are to make a connection at this point, and this "transbordeur" will be fitted to carry the tramcars, so that passengers by them will cross the river without changing their seats.

ELECTRICITY IN THE CURE OF RHEUMATISM.

Apparatus and machinery for the application of electricity to cases of acute rheumatism have been fitted up by Dr. Kozlovski, of St. Petersburg. It includes an arc lamp using the energy of a six horse-power oil engine through a dynamo, and a battery of accumulators. The process is conducted in the following way: The patient, protected by a cardboard screen with an aperture over the affected part of the body, is placed about 5 feet from the electric light. The exposure lasts from three-fourths to two minutes, and three or four sittings—never more than a dozen—are usually given, at intervals of three or four days. Slight heat only is felt on exposure, the skin, however, peeling off in about forty-eight hours. A trial of several months seems to have yielded remarkably successful results in rheumatism and kindred diseases, even in chronic and severe cases.

REMARKABLE EFFECTS OF SUNSHINE AND OXYGEN.

The experiments of Mesnard, the French botanist, show that in general light soon decreases the strength of odors, and that oxygen first causes an increase and then a gradual decrease. The perfume of flowers is heightened, however, by the simultaneous action of light and oxygen. Water counteracts the effect of light, restoring the odor, which is weakest in an unwatered plant in a strong light.

The effects of sunlight on the human body have been a subject of investigation for many years by Dr. Robert L. Bowles, an English physician. He finds that sunburn is not due to heat, but is probably caused by the violet or ultra-violet rays—especially as reflected from snow at high altitudes—and that the reflected rays may not necessarily be of the same quality as the incident rays. Snow-blindness may be due to a similar cause, and sun fever may be associated with penetrating rays, while reflected rays burn deeply into wood. Freckles, which are but the milder effects of luminous or chemical rays, stop the penetration of those rays through the skin, as do various pigments, particularly red and yellow. Sun fever has been prevented in India by wearing an orange lining in the clothes and hat. Another illustration of the intercepting power of color is the experience of a lady who, after wearing a linen blouse of red and white stripes, found bright red stripes on her shoulders under the white of the cloth, the red having afforded protection from any action. These and other observations lead to the conclusion that Roentgen rays may be simply modifications of ordinary light. The work of other authors is cited to support the view that the vital changes on the skin are due to the chemical rays, and to those rays alone, and that the rays issuing from a Crookes tube are not an entirely new form

of energy distinct and separate from light, but contain a proportion of luminous and chemical rays, and that light, as such, as well as the divisions into which it can be split up, may penetrate wood, clothing, and the human tissues.

STEADY INCREASE IN THE FRENCH RAINFALL.

M. Camille Flammarion, who has compared all the hydrometric observations made at the Paris Observatory for about two hundred years, says the amount of rain that falls in France is increasing yearly. This increase may be seen at the first glance by examining the averages of different periods. From 1689 to 1710 there fell an average of 485.7 millimetres (191.2 inches) of water :

From 1720 to 1751,	409.4
“ 1773 to 1797,	492.5
“ 1804 to 1824,	503.7
“ 1825 to 1844,	507.5
“ 1845 to 1872,	522.4
“ 1873 to 1896,	557.4

FALLACIES ON IMMUNITY FROM DISEASE.

Those who have looked into the subject of contagious and infectious diseases have frequently found how erroneous are the opinions usually entertained on the subject by the unscientific and uninformed. It has often been the cause of wonder how doctors and attendants on patients smitten with cholera and other pestilences escape contagion. Personal cleanliness is the sole safeguard. The experienced doctor merely washes his hands when leaving the sick room, and perhaps inhales some anti-septic odor, such as that of camphor. These simple precautions to a person of regular habits and steady nerves are usually sufficient. Another popular delusion is that persons who have once suffered from an infectious disease are not susceptible to a second attack. An eminent German physician, Dr. Gottstein, has been experimenting in the subject, and some of his observations were published in the “British Medical Journal” for November.

Dr. Gottstein considers it unjustifiable to conclude that because a man does not have an infectious disease twice he has become immune to it through the first attack ; he considers this to be a result of the doctrine of chance. The author dismisses the prophylactic action of vaccination on the ground that this is not strictly comparable with variolous inoculation. . . . Human acquired immunity should, according to him,

be investigated without reference to experiments on animals. He proceeds to inquire as to which acute specifics are definitely held to confer immunity, and by collecting the opinions of various authors finds that smallpox, measles and scarlet fever are alone universally stated to do so. As regards the first two, cases are not uncommon in which the same patient suffers from the disease twice, or even more often, and the rarity of this is only in accordance with the law of probabilities. Three factors combine to add to this infrequency. First, many diseases, such as diphtheria, are particularly associated with the early years of life, so that when a patient is exposed to a second infection he has very often passed the age of especial liability. Other affections, again, such as cholera, typhus and recurrent fever, occur typically in short infrequent epidemics, so that the subject has but little chance of meeting with them again. Lastly, and this is most important, deadly diseases such as cholera, diphtheria and plague spare only those who are most resistant, in whom the probability of a recurrence sinks very low. The author then gives a number of examples of the repeated occurrence of infectious diseases in the same individual, and enters into elaborate statistics to show that the frequency of such repeated infections is actually in excess of what might be deduced from the calculation of probabilities. Thus he quotes from Maiselis statistics of 33 second attacks of scarlet fever, 37 of measles, and no fewer than 514 of smallpox, and refers also to the recurrence of whooping-cough.

Book Notices.

MORAL PRINCIPLES AND MEDICAL PRACTICE THE BASIS OF MEDICAL JURISPRUDENCE. By *Rev. C. Coppens, S. J.* Benziger Bros. : New York. 1897. Pp. 222. Price, \$1.50.

The physician who recognizes the dignity and responsibility of his profession, be he Catholic or otherwise in religious belief, often feels the necessity of guidance in the discernment and application of the ethical principles underlying medical practice. Although those principles are sufficiently patent to the average cultured mind, their clear and distinct discernment is largely conditioned by the moral status of the individual, and the full appreciation of their content supposes a special mental training, whilst their correct application depends alike on a certain blending of moral and mental endowments and acquirements. No one so well as the physician realizes the necessity of mental discipline, long study, and much technical experiential familiarity with the sciences and arts that constitute the medical curriculum, in order to form and perfect the reliable practitioner, and no one is so sensitive, and justly indeed, of the encroachment of the undisciplined, unstudied laity into the domain of medical theory or practice. If long and patient study and experience are requisite for the mental assimilation of the facts and laws of the physical sciences, surely a proportionate amount of intellectual training is needed for a mastery of the matter and bearing of the truths of ethical science. Whilst this is true of the acquisition of the latter science in its individuality, it is most emphatically the case when there is question of the delicate adjustment of moral truths to the complex specific duties of the physician. By necessity, therefore, of the absorbing character of his other studies, the physician, both in his preparatory training and in his subsequent practice, must largely depend on the skilful, experienced ethicist for guidance in the moral sphere of medicine—that is to say in medical jurisprudence. “Medical jurisprudence in its wider sense,” the author of the present work tells us, “comprises two departments, namely, the study of the laws regarding medical practice, and more especially the study of the principles on which those laws are founded and from which they derive their binding power on the human conscience” (p. 17). The former of these two departments is cared for in every well-organized medical college by a special professor. If the rights and duties of the physician were set forth and limited by the mere legal enactments of human courts and legislatures, the study of medical jurisprudence in its philosophical sense would be in so far unnecessary, “for jurisprudence studies the principles that underlie legal enactments,

and if there were no higher law there would be no such principles; then the knowledge of the human law would fill the whole programme" (p. 32). The necessity of this deeper science of the higher law is all the more apparent and pressing in that the influence of positivism and monism on present physical science is in the direction of negation of all such law. Several of the leading medical universities of this country realizing this necessity have at times supplied their students with a systematic course of lectures on the ethics of medical practice. The work at hand embodies such a course delivered by its author in Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska. Works more or less akin written by Catholic authors have for some time existed in French and German, and one of the latter has been translated into English; but so far as the present writer is aware, Fr. Coppens has been the first to produce a work which unfolds the teachings of sound ethics in their precise bearing on those main facts and features of medical practice which lie directly on the border-land and overlap the inter-relations of body and soul, domains of the physical and moral sciences.

The book contains nine lectures. The first outlines the scope of the course and lays down some fundamental concepts of medical ethics. The second and third explain the moral duties of the physician in the matter of craniotomy and abortion. Nothing stronger can be alleged to show the necessity of just such a work as this than the citation in the fourth lecture on "Views of Scientists and Sciolists," from a recent contribution to the "Medical Record." "The writer of the article asserts: 'Procuring the death of the foetus to save the life of the mother is, I am sure, to be defended on ethical grounds.' And here is the way he attempts to defend it: 'We may safely assume,' he argues, 'that the theory of evolution is the best working hypothesis in every branch of natural science. We are learning through Herbert Spencer and all late writers on ethics and politics that the same principle will best explain the facts.' He then goes on to argue that if the evolutionary hypothesis be admitted it must necessarily follow that, while the human embryo is from the first alive, it is not a human being until it has developed and differentiated to such a point as corresponds to that point at the birth of the race where the animal becomes a man" (p. 100).

The same hypothesis has been adopted to justify the practice of a known obstetrician (cited by an eminent physician), who declared that "he would as lief kill, if necessary, an unborn child as a rat" (p. 94). Fortunately for the moral interest of humanity this dictum does not represent the mind and practice of the nobler members of the medical profession; but that it should be publicly defended in an authoritative professional review, emphasizes the necessity of defending and propagating the teachings of sound ethical science. The ways in which the physician, true to his noble profession, may carry on his work of physical and moral beneficence for the individual and human society are

traced with a firm yet delicate hand in the fifth lecture on "Venereal Excesses."

The physician's natural rights and duties in matters regulated by civil and criminal legislation are set forth in the sixth lecture. The nature and the legal aspects of insanity form the subjects of the two succeeding lectures. The concluding lecture is devoted to the theories and applications of hypnotism, occasion being here taken to treat somewhat of spiritism and other allied phenomena on the "border-land of science."

From this general indication of the contents of the work our readers will discern that the matters treated demand a keen insight into the value of moral principles, a broad acquaintance with the facts and truths of physical sciences to which the principles apply, and a steady, tactful hand in the adjustment of the one to the other. It is but simple justice to say that, throughout, these qualities are reflected in the work. Fr. Coppens is well known to the English-reading world for his solid contributions to scholastic literature. In the present volume he has entered upon a new and hitherto almost untouched field. He has produced a work unique, solid and interesting—a work, above all, that was sorely needed. To this should be added a word of praise for the clear, vigorous English in which the lectures are wrought out, and the attractive material make-up of the book.

Though the work is addressed primarily to medical students and physicians, it will prove useful to professional men generally, but especially to the clergy, who, in their ministerial work in the Confessional, and particularly in the sick room, are so often called upon both by the doctor and the patient, as well as the family, to furnish information and advice on many of the difficult and delicate matters here treated.

In conclusion, just one little word of criticism. Speaking of the acts of a person under the influence of chloroform, the author says that the prayers or curses then unconsciously uttered "are no doubt the effects of acquired virtues or vices" (p. 21). The judgment in its latter half seems severe and liable in certain circumstances to lead to unjust inferences. It is well known that persons under the influence of narcotics may give utterance to expressions which they may have but casually heard and which they would be farthest from using in their normal state. Any antecedent sense-impression, even though but passively received, may in such a condition work itself out in speech, so that it would be as unscientific as unjust to attribute the expression to an acquired habit.

F. P. S.

THEOLOGIÆ MORALIS INSTITUTIONES quas in Collegio Lovaniensi Societatis Jesu tradebat Eduardus Génicot ex eadem societate. Lovanii : typis et sumptibus Polleunis et Ceuterick. Two volumes in 8vo, 1609 pages. Price, 12 francs.

This compendium of moral theology is published as a text-book for seminaries. We have examined it to see what answers are given to such questions as have arisen during our own times, and the general character of the work. The learned author follows the beaten track of

almost all writers on moral theology, in his division of the subject-matter and enunciation of principles. His style is clear and forcible, and as a rule he meets most of the difficulties suggested by the question under discussion. In his solutions he invariably takes the milder view, insisting always on the fundamental law, *salus animarum suprema lex*. He has striven to bring his compendium fully up to the times. To mention only a few of the questions treated: On the obligations of voters; on Liberalism and how a confessor is to act with so-called liberals; on dancing; on cremation; Hypnotism; What constitutes just wages; Monopolies; Stock-speculation; de Ebrietate, whether it is ever lawful; Attendance at funerals of non-Catholics; Special cases de Matrimonio: Disparitas cultus and mixta religio, in which the non-Catholic party refuses to fulfil the conditions concerning the education of the children. We would have wished that here the author would have also treated the greater difficulty, viz., where the infidel party refuses to renew the consent. He answers this indirectly, p. 684, Vol. II., de Sanatione in radice.

These are a few of the questions we have examined, and show the thoroughly practical nature of the work. At the end of Vol. I. the author adds a decree of S. C. R., June 8, 1896, in which every bishop, whether diocesan or titular, is declared not only to have the right to offer Mass in his own private oratory or on a portable altar wheresoever he may stay, and to permit another to say Mass for his benefit; but also that the faithful who are present at such Mass fulfil the precept of the Church.

At the end of Vol. II. is a long supplement on prohibited books, showing exactly what is to be held at present on that much-mooted question.

The work is an excellent text-book for study or review.

The publishers have done their share of the work well. The paper is very good, the print large and clear. I. F. H.

DE RELIGIONE REVELATA LIBRI QUINQUE. Auctore *G. Wilmer, S. J.* Pp. iv., 686. Pustet: New York. 1897. Price, \$2.50.

PRÆLECTIONES DOGMATICÆ. Vol. v. Tract, I. de Gratia, II. de Lege Divina Positiva. Auctore *Chr. Pesch, S. J.* Pp. xi., 323. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis, Mo. 1897. Price, \$1.90.

INSTITUTIONES THEOLOGICÆ DE SACRAMENTIS. Auctore *J. B. Sasse, S. J.* Vol. I., pp. xv., 590. Herder. 1897. Price, \$2.90.

Three recent solid contributions to dogmatic theology, two just beginning whilst the other approaches conclusion, indicate the productivity of the field and the incessant activity of the workers. Though written by different authors, the general unity of subject-matter justifies their being brought here together for review.

The first work deals with the nature and basis of religion and of general theology. Fr. Wilmer speaks with universally-admitted authority on this subject, as is testified by the high appreciation accorded to his

large work in German, of the same character though less scholastic in form—a work, by the way, that has passed into French, and is well known in English to students in our Catholic higher institutions through the solid compendium, “Wilmer’s Hand-Book of Religion.” When a theologian of the author’s power and experience, after passing the fourth score of his years, produces a work in his specialty, one may fairly expect to find therein singular largeness of view and thoroughness of treatment. But little reading of the work here at hand is required to verify this expectation. Fr. Wilmer has, of course, in mind the needs of ecclesiastical students who, having completed a curriculum of philosophy, are pursuing studies cognate to his own branch. Subjects, therefore, of a purely philosophical character, such as the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the existence of natural law—subjects generally expounded in less didactic Apologies—are, therefore, here either omitted or but lightly touched upon. The same is true of matters purely historical and such as appertain to strictly Biblical science. The author’s teaching centres on five main points, answering to the same number of Books into which the volume is divided: (Book I.) religion and revelation in general—the necessity of religion—the possibility, necessity, etc., of revelation—the demonstration of revealed religion by the various criteria, external and internal; (Book II.) the pre-Christian revelations; the Christian revelation as demonstrated (Book III.) from the mission of Christ, (Book IV.) from its propagation, (Book V.) and from its continuation and life in the Church. On these lines the matter is wrought out very methodically and solidly and with considerable erudition, and, on the purely mechanical side, with that varied use of letter-press which adapts the book for its special service in the class hall. A fair conspectus and a good index add to the latter purpose, and give completeness to the present volume though the author promises two successive volumes for the near future, one on the Church and another on faith and its rules, to complete the work.

In the order of publication of Fr. Pesch’s prelections on “Dogmatics,” the fifth volume was postponed until after the appearance of the seventh. The gap is now filled up and the series brought within two steps of completion—the eighth and ninth volumes dealing with the Virtues, Sin, and the Consummation of things temporal. The subjects expounded in the volume now at hand are Grace—actual and habitual—and merit; also the divine positive Law of the Old and of the New Covenant.

In the impenetrable problem on the efficacy of Grace the author maintains the Congruism defended by Suarez. A difference between Congruism and Molinism has been thought to exist by some theologians, amongst others by Billuart; and the contention has been made that the Jesuit theologians had abandoned the latter and embraced the former opinion. Fr. Pesch shows that no such difference really existed and that the Society made no such change in its schools (p. 162).

As Fr. Pesch’s series of volumes nears its close, Fr. Sasse opens the

publication of the theological course he was wont to deliver for many years in the Jesuit institutions at Maria-Laach in Germany and at Ditton Hall in England. The course has been so arranged as to warrant the issuing of the various tracts irrespective of their logical position in the system of theology. Accordingly he has inaugurated his work with the theology of the Sacraments, and assigned to the present volume the Sacraments in general, Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist. Another volume will be required to complete the sacramental doctrine. The remainder of the course in separate volumes is promised, "si Deus vitam et vires dederit."

The author has aimed throughout at a judicious combination of the positive or authoritative with the scholastic and more dialectical theology of his subjects. Consequently, the Scriptural, Patristic, Pontifical, Conciliar and other demonstrations are especially full and thorough, so that nothing has been left undone to impart to the student a clear apprehension of the *dogmata fidei*—the principles of theology as a science. At the same time, neque minus cordi mihi fuit, ut partes theologiæ scholasticæ, quæ *quæreūt intellectum dogmatum*, sollicitè exsequeretur (p. 4). It is this harmonious union of the *intellectus quærens fidem* and the *fides quærens intellectum* that indicates the sound theological temper, and its embodiment here makes of this work a valuable aid to divinity studies.

DE ACTIBUS HUMANIS, ONTOLOGICÆ ET PSYCHOLOGICÆ CONSIDERATIS SEU DISQUISITIONES PSYCHOLOGICÆ-THEOLOGICÆ DE VOLUNTATE IN ORDINE AD MORES. Auctore V. Frins, S. J. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis, Mo. 1897. Pp. viii., 441. Price, \$2.10.

If every student and professor of ethics and moral theology would study and master the second part of St. Thomas's "Summa Theologica" and the expansion of its subjects presented by Suarez in the fourth volume of his "Opera Omnia," there would be hardly sufficient reason for producing works like the one here at hand. But since "the precise, profound and penetrating disquisitions of the old scholastic theologians on the ontology and psychology of human actions in their bearing on moral development, are not so much contained as buried in their massive folios," therefore writers like Fr. Frins find it desirable and even necessary to unearth the treasured wisdom of the past and present it *modo huic ætati magis accomodato*. True, the number of works, especially in Latin, dealing with human conduct is already not small. They are, however, for the most part compendia in scope and method, and do not, on the whole, enter very deeply and extensively into the subject. New problems in morality are constantly arising and the substructure and entire edifice of moral principles and laws are forever being assailed with varying methods, but with one intent—the breaking of the bonds and the casting off of the yoke. For these reasons summaries of fundamental morals are insufficient.

Profundiore et ampliore rerum moralium tractatione etiam indigemus. With this intent Fr. Frins has gone to the masters of moral science, St.

Thomas and Suarez, and here sets forth their wisdom with a generous hand. Three questions centering in the human act are discussed. The first on the end in its causal influence; the second on the voluntary character of conduct; the third on the actions in detail elicited and commanded by the will. These are of course very familiar subjects to every student of scholastic ethics. The author aims at neither novelty nor originality as to subject or method. Appreciative students, however, will find that he makes good his claims, viz., to unfold thoroughly and clearly the ultimate principles involved in the moral life of man.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF MADAME GUYON, translated in full by *Thomas Taylor Allen*, Bengal Civil Service (retired), in two volumes. St. Louis: B. Herder. 1897. Price, \$5.25 net.

This is an odd book to appear in the catalogue of so representative a Catholic firm as Herder's; and it is difficult to understand how he was deceived into publishing it. The translator in his preface reveals himself as an aggressive Buddhist and Pantheist. Regarding the book itself, Mr. Herder had but to turn to his own great "Lexicon," vol. v., page 1402, to convince himself that it is not a genuine work of the gifted and unfortunate Madame Guyon, but a compilation made by Protestants after her death. We have deemed it our duty to draw public attention to this, lest the book fall into unwary hands and cause mischief. There are hundreds of valuable works in foreign tongues clamoring for translation into our language, and the fact that so inferior a book as the one before us has received an unmerited honor should set us seriously reflecting on our culpable negligence.

THE JESUIT RELATIONS AND ALLIED DOCUMENTS. Edited by *Reuben Gold Thwaites*, Secretary of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Vol. IX. (Quebec, 1636.) Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Company.

The ninth volume of this great collection contains the concluding portion of Father Paul Le Jeune's "Relation" for the year 1636. The narrative, though "jotted down hastily, now in one place, now in another; sometimes upon the water, sometimes upon the land," as the good missionary tells us, is extremely graphic and at times thrilling. Intermingled with the account of his labors and travels are many accurate observations of supreme importance regarding the habits and superstitions of the natives, the climate of Canada, and the proper method of colonizing the province. Our readers will thank us for the following touching description of the death and burial of Champlain:

"On the twenty-fifth of December, the day of the birth of our Saviour upon earth, Monsieur de Champlain, our Governor, was reborn in heaven; at least, we can say that his death was full of blessings. I am sure that God has shown him this favor in consideration of the benefits he has procured for New France, where we hope some day God will be loved and served by our French, and known and adored by our Savages. Truly, he had led a life of great justice, equity and perfect loyalty to

his King and towards the Gentlemen of the Company. But at his death he crowned his virtues with sentiments of piety so lofty that he astonished us all. What tears he shed! How ardent became his zeal for the service of God! How great was his love for the families here!— saying that they must be vigorously assisted for the good of the country, and made comfortable in every possible way in these early stages, and that he would do it if God gave him health. He was not taken unawares in the account which he had to render to God, for he had long ago prepared a general confession of his whole life, which he made with great contrition to Father Lalemant, whom he honored with his friendship. The Father comforted him throughout his sickness, which lasted two months and a half, and did not leave him until his death. He had a very honorable burial, the funeral procession being formed of the people, the soldiers, the captains, and the churchmen. Father Lalemant officiated at this burial, and I was charged with the funeral oration, for which I did not lack material. Those whom he left behind have reason to be well satisfied with him; for, although he died out of France, his name will not therefore be any less glorious to posterity.”

For the next volume we are promised Father Brebeuf's report of the Huron mission. Thus the interest in this great work deepens as we proceed.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- A SHORT HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. By *F. Goulburn Walpole*. New York: Benziger Brothers. London: Burns & Oates.
- CARMEL IN IRELAND. By *Father Patrick*, of St. Joseph, O.D.C. \$1.35. New York: Benziger Brothers. London: Burns & Oates.
- ALICE O'CONNOR'S SURRENDER. By *Mary E. Casey*. Boston: Angel Guardian Press.
- THE EUCHARISTIC CHRIST. Reflections and Considerations in the Blessed Sacrament. By *Rev. A. Tisnière*. Translated by Mrs. Anne R. Bennet-Gladstone. With a Preface by Rev. D. J. McMahon, D.D. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE WONDER-WORKER OF PADUA. By *Charles Warren Stoddard*. 50 cents. Notre Dame, Indiana: The Ave Maria Press.
- ILLUSTRATED EXPLANATION OF THE PRAYERS AND CEREMONIES OF THE MASS. By *Rev. D. I. Lanslots, O.S.B.* New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE COMMANDMENTS EXPLAINED. By *Rev. Arthur Devine*, Passionist. New York: Benziger Brothers. London: R. Washbourne.
- TRUE POLITENESS. By the *Abbé Francis Demore*. From the French, by a Visitandine of Baltimore. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- ILLUSTRATED LIFE OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN. By *Rev. B. Rohner, O.S.B.* Adapted by Rev. Richard Brennan, LL.D. \$1.25. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- LIFE OF ST. ALOYSIUS GONZAGA. By *Rev. J. F. X. O'Conor*. 75 cents. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- OUR OWN WILL. By *Rev. J. Allen, D.D.* With a Preface by Right Rev. J. D. Ricards, D.D. Fourth Edition. 75 cents. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XXIII.—APRIL, 1898.—No. 90.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION IN THE FIRST CENTURIES.

A.D. 33—A.D. 476.

IT was upon the summit of Olivet, at the moment of his Ascension into heaven, that the Saviour of the world gave his disciples their commission to teach all nations. "Euntes docete."

Thoroughly imbued with the spirit which his words imparted, they set forth upon their great work of universal civilization and reform. As we survey the checkered retrospect of the ages that have since elapsed and philosophize upon the marvellous transformation which their efforts effected, we cannot but be profoundly impressed by the vitality of Christian truth and its unmistakable mission in the life and character and affairs of mankind. Like the tiny mustard-seed of which he had once spoken in parable, its beginnings were scant and literally "underground"; but in the sunlight of Divine favor and watchfulness it soon sprouted into a mighty tree sheltering all the world, and scattering its benedictions far and wide. Wherever civil power and prestige led the way, there it followed. Wherever intelligent minds and responsive hearts were to be found, there it was also to be met with, pleading for acceptance as against the tangled mysticism and confused follies of a paganism which it was eventually to supplant. In Greece, in Britain, in Gaul, in Spain, in distant Asia and Africa—everywhere, in fact, were multitudes of Christians whose noble lives and deaths bore eloquent testimony to the genuineness of the early instruction which they had received. So rapid was the spread of the new teaching; so tenacious its hold; so redoubtable

the fortress behind which it was intrenched, that in less than a hundred years it had become a prominent factor in the social and moral, and, we may also add, in the political development and destiny of the Empire. "At the commencement of the second century," writes Saint Justin, "there is no people among whom we do not find believers in Jesus Christ." Such is the universally admitted historical fact. And as we pause to moralize upon it, we naturally ask where and from whom did this numerous throng acquire the knowledge or those prolific principles which had wrought such a wonderful transformation in their lives, and which they were only too glad to possess as a substitute for the teachings of the Academy and the Lyceum. To the casual observer, nothing unusual had transpired. The great Roman world moved on as before. The Cæsar sat upon his throne. The profane multitudes revelled in the bloody spectacles of the amphitheatre. The public marts re-echoed to the customary hum of traffic. The forum was the scene of competition as brisk and sharp as in the days of Cicero and Hortensius. Yet despite the outward seeming a tremendous change had come over the spirit of their waking no less than of their dream. Where, then, were the teachers and where the institutions at whose hands and within whose precincts those athletes of the new Gospel were trained? Writers upon the early Christian schools pass over in almost absolute silence the first half of the first century, assigning as their reason for so doing the total absence of historical documents. While we do not condemn the wisdom of their course when there is question of a formal treatise on the subject, we do not propose to imitate them in our present consideration. Dialecticians assure us that it is quite logical to reason from known effects to the nature of unknown causes; and applying the principle to the fact of which we have just spoken, that is to say, the rapid and widespread dissemination of Christian doctrine, we arrive at various conclusions not less interesting than reliable.

First, there is no doubt that whatever education was bestowed upon the early Christians was of a purely *domestic* character. "Every house," says Saint Chrysostom, "was a church." In the deep seclusion of the catacombs, in the privacy of the family circle, in some secret and commodious retreat upon the grounds of a rich patron recently converted to the faith, the Christians gathered, and there, together, read and prayed, while they taught their children the elements of sacred knowledge. The reason for these precautions was, of course, the persecutions to which they were constantly exposed in Jerusalem and Antioch no less than in

Rome. It was a crime to be a Christian, and such as professed Christianity openly did so at the peril of their lives. Even in the heart of the earth they were not safe, and more than one instance is on record of how Jewish vindictiveness and Roman savagery tracked them even there. Hence the profound reserve with which they veiled all their proceedings. They wrote and spoke in symbols ; and it is not to be wondered at that their educational methods, if we may use the phrase, are as little known to us as the other features of their hidden life. Furthermore, another new and distinctive trait of their teaching was that *it was for all equally*. This was a departure in the history of education. Until the coming of Christ, knowledge had been looked upon as the exclusive privilege and right of the higher classes. And this because it was viewed as a matter of State, whose principal if not sole object was to qualify its possessor for some public trust, political, civil or priestly. But with Christ it was quite different. His teaching, no less than his redemption, was for everyone alike, Gentile as well as Jew, bond as well as free. Hence the beautiful spectacle that so often presents itself, in the scenes of those distant days, of the rich and poor, of the noble and the plebeian, the master and the serf, intermingling in the sweet intimacy of children of one and the same household. "See how they love one another" expresses it exactly. Baptized at the same font, fed at the same table of life, it was under the same conditions that they drank of the well-spring of wisdom. Saint Paul's tender solicitude for the slave Onesimus, as pictured in his letter to Philemon, is an index of the situation as it was in his day and had been from the beginning.

Again, the teaching of the first Christians, as far as we know, was confined to *religious instruction*. It was in the nature of the case that it should have been so. They could not without danger to their souls as well as their bodies frequent the pagan schools of their times. Besides, it was all important, in view of the special difficulties of the situation, that they should become thoroughly imbued with the maxims of that Gospel of which they were to be the first witnesses and exponents. By comparison with the delights which it afforded, pagan learning could have had no charm for them ; neither could it have been of any use so long as they had cast their lot with a system in virtue of which they were ostracized from all human society. If, as some will have it, their pupils dipped occasionally into the works of pagan authors, it could only have been as a matter of individual and rare experiment, and was conducted with all the supervision and safeguards which their exceptional zeal and holiness of life would naturally

suggest.¹ Let us not suppose, however, that the instruction bestowed upon early converts to the faith because, exclusively religious, was at all barren or superficial. Cardinal Hergenroether, in his interesting work upon "Primitive Christianity," which, as he himself informs us, is scarcely more than an excerpt from De Rossi's monumental treatise on the catacombs, rehearses the points of doctrine with which they were familiar. His enumeration covers in substance the essential field of dogmatic theology; God the Creator, the Trinity, the Angels, man and his fall, the leading events and personages of the Old Testament, the coming of Christ, the mysteries and chief happenings of his life, the four Gospels, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Church, the Primacy, the seven sacraments, and that epitome of Christian revelation, the Apostles' Creed. All this and much else that had to do with the virtues, with the acts of the early martyrs and the liturgical practices of those days, was taught to them carefully; and, as if to graven it upon their memories, was traced in mysterious outlines upon the walls and diptychs of their subterranean abodes. True, the life of the early Christians was a diversified one. Not every day was a rainy day. Persecution did not rage continuously. Not every city was Rome or Jerusalem or Antioch, and, for all we know, their condition in some quarters may have been favorable enough to have allowed them to live and teach in public. Let us refrain from saying so, however, since to assert it were merely to surmise. But whilst, in their educational life, we behold no trace of schools in the common acceptation of the term, we can discern the germ element of two features which were to play a prominent part in the historical growth of Christian education in after centuries. We allude to the practice of community life, and the custom which prevailed with the Apostles and their immediate Episcopal successors of gathering around them as pupils, and often as members of their own households, such young men as they deemed it advisable to qualify for the sacred ministry. In the one we recognize the monastic principle at work; in the other the far-off

¹ Even as late as the fourth century we find the Fathers of the Church antagonizing one another on this very point. But the reasons adduced in support of the study of pagan authors at that late date could have had no force when applied to the opening years of the Christian era; that is to say, as long as the persecutions lasted. The time had not yet come when Origen could write to Gregory Thaumaturgus: "We are permitted when we go out of Egypt to carry with us the riches of the Egyptians, wherewith to adorn the tabernacle." The time had not yet come when the brilliancy of the Alexandrian school and the polemical acumen of its immortal professors were to give Christianity a standing never to be gainsaid or undone. The Patristic age, too, which even Guizot admits to have been the brightest literary period since the dawn of religion, was still a thing of the remote future.

dawnings of a system which, with varying fortunes, was to lead up to the Episcopal or Cathedral Schools of the Middle Ages and the seminaries of modern times.¹ And this is all of education we discover any vestige of in the earliest infancy of the Church—the inculcation in secret of the tenets of the faith to children and catechumens when and where the vicissitudes of the time would allow, and the private schools which centred around the Apostles and first bishops, and whose purpose was distinctly ecclesiastical.

It was not until the flourishing period of the Alexandrian Academies, under the presidency of Saint Pantaenus, and as late as A.D. 181, that we observe any departure from the exclusively domestic methods which, until then, had been the vogue. These Academies or Catechetical Schools, as they were generally called, were already more than a hundred years old when Pantaenus appeared on the scene. Their origin, according to Saint Jerome, dates from Saint Mark, the Evangelist, who, upon the dispersion of the Apostles, had been sent by Saint Peter to preach in Egypt. He arrived at Alexandria in the seventh year of the reign of Nero and the sixtieth of the Christian era. At the time, "Alexandria, the beautiful," as she was called, was not only one of the commercial emporiums of the world, but its literary capital as well. The combined civilizations of the East and West had poured into her lap the garnered fruits of years of uninterrupted social and political advance. The proud Roman, the subtle Greek, the opulent Jew, traders from Syria, India, Arabia and Ethiopia, no less than the native Egyptian, found it to their respective interests to

¹ It is noteworthy that the custom of living together was not merely forced upon the first Christians by stress of circumstances and the imperative need which they felt of combining for mutual comfort and support, but was adopted in imitation of the Saviour himself, who had organized his Apostles, and for that matter all of his disciples, into a family of which he was the father, the director, the teacher. In the desert, upon the lake-shore, upon the mountain, in the vestibule of the temple, upon the highways and byways, it was "the multitude" that was gathered around him. And so speedily and fully did this idea commend itself, and so general had the practice become, that the very hermits in the desert, long before the advent of monasticism, felt the necessity of it, and at stated intervals met together for prayer, or reading, or pious conversation. Thus up to Christ, through the first Christians and the Apostles themselves, is the canonical rule of life distinctly traceable. Hence with truth could Saint Augustin say in after years, in reply to certain attacks made upon him by the Donatists for having established a community of regular clergy, that, "While the name of monastery is new, the manner of life which we adopt is coeval with Christianity itself." In like manner the Apostles gathered around them their young students destined to aid and to succeed them in the ministry. For instance, we are told that Saint Peter was assisted by a chosen band of companions, of whom the names of Saint Mark, Saint Clement, Saint Evodius and Saint Linus have come down to us. Tradition has also preserved the memory of the numerous disciples of Saint John, notably of Polycarp and Papias, who sojourned with him at Ephesus, where the declining years of his life were spent.

live within her borders, and be made participants in the countless advantages which she alone could offer. But her material prosperity was not to be the secret of her greatest renown. Her schools and university, generously patronized by the savants and youthful *literati* of foreign lands, were to immortalize her yet more.¹ They afforded every facility for the acquisition of that broad and deep intellectual culture which forms such a marked feature in the mental structure of her many distinguished scholars. Literature, art and science—all that went to constitute a liberal education, was within her gift; while the stimulus which she gave to investigation in the upper fields of thought was to make itself felt throughout all subsequent ages. Under the patronage of the first Ptolemies, and until Roman oppression had dimmed the lustre of her ancient glory, scholarship was in good and universal repute. The old philosophies had ripened to their fullest in the sunshine of her royal favor. The abstractions of Plato, the speculations of Aristotle, the "mystical rationalism" of Philo, and, later on, the Neo-Platonic vagaries of Ammonius Saccas and Plotinus, found in her midst an atmosphere most congenial for the exercise of whatever activity they possessed. The Christian element alone was wanting in the frame-work of her intellectual build, and it was supplied by the advent of the Evangelist, Saint Mark. As we have already observed, whatever teaching was done, owing to an always present danger, was bestowed in secret; and that not only in Rome but in the Provinces, and wherever the zeal and enterprise of early converts had carried the Christian name. Saint Mark seems to have adopted the same prudential measure in his new and fertile field. Six years after his arrival, that is to say, A.D. 66, and about thirty years after the dispersion of the Apostles, the first general persecution broke out at Rome under Nero, and doubtless rendered it advisable, in a cosmopolitan centre like Alexandria, for Christians to be more than ordinarily circumspect, and pursue their vocation secludedly until the storm had ceased to threaten. Certain it is, even in default of historical testimony, that the catechetical schools were multiplied rapidly from his day onward, steadily radiating from his Episcopal See to all quarters of the East. It was traditional in St. Jerome's time, towards the close of the fourth century, A.D. 375, that Saint Mark had made it a point to group about him the most eminent scholars he could find equally skilled in sacred and profane learning. These he

¹ For a beautiful account of the Alexandrian University or "Museum," see Newman's *Historical Sketches*, vol. iii., c. viii.; also Allies' *Church and State*, p. 345. For an account of the Church of Alexandria, see Newman's *Arians*, sect. iii.

perfected under his own eyes and sent forth to repeat the work, which they had learnt from him, by the organization of similar schools elsewhere. We can see no reason to discredit the tradition. The numerous schools which, a century later, leaped to the surface within the very shadow of the university and in the principal cities of Egypt, Syria and Arabia, when temporary peace was granted to the Church, all fashioned upon the Alexandrian model, as well as the many distinguished converts from paganism who had come under their saving influence, spoke volumes in their praise, and indicated not only that the schools had existed, but also that their thoroughness testified to long years of painstaking and systematic development. They threw upon the field, on the first favorable opportunity, a fully-equipped army of representative scholars to assault, and that in public, the very strongholds of pagan philosophy and prejudice—like some titanic force, slumbering and yet alive, within the bosom of the earth, in silent expectation of the day and hour of its overwhelming manifestation. As to the method of instruction adopted by Saint Mark and his successors down to Saint Pantaenus, that is to say, for the first hundred years, we are not historically informed. Writers upon the subject, however, surmise, and with considerable show of truth, that it was, if not the same, at least very much like that pursued by the Christian teachers in Jerusalem, of which we have some record, and where we are told "the catechumens were assembled in the porch of the church, the men and women sitting apart from one another, and the Master standing to deliver his instruction." The matter of the instruction was always confined to the doctrines of faith, treated catechetically or apologetically, and beyond this neither the first schools at Alexandria or elsewhere seem to have gone.

It was in the year 181 that Saint Pantaenus, successor to Athenagoras, succeeded to the presidency of the Alexandrian Academy, over which he presided for ten years. He was in all likelihood a Sicilian by birth, a convert from Stoicism, a man of superior attainments and celebrated amongst the gentile philosophers of his day. His entrance upon office was contemporaneous with a transitional period in the history of Christianity. The dreadful persecution which had been raging, we may say uninterruptedly, since the days of Saint Mark, had abated. The lull in the storm only spurred the Christians to redoubled efforts in the interests of religion. Naturally enough, their activity manifested itself nowhere more conspicuously than in and about the catechetical schools of Alexandria. Pantaenus felt that the moment

was auspicious. Being in every sense what in modern parlance we would describe as "a man of the times," and, therefore, keenly alive to the needs of the situation, he was persuaded that the hour had come for Christianity to make somewhat of a departure from the extremely conservative methods hitherto pursued. The light of the world had been long enough under a bushel. He would set it upon a mountain, that "nations might walk in its splendor and kings in the brightness of its rising." The magnificent deposit of Divine truth which had been whispered in secret, and which had shunned, as contamination, all allegiance with profane knowledge, he and his learned *confrères* would proclaim from the house-top, while they threw down the gauntlet of debate to the proud philosophers of the University, whether Platonist, Peripatetic or Eclectic, who fancied that in the speculations of Plato and Aristotle they had reached the "Ultima Thule" of human investigation. The schools, which had hitherto been only for the Christians, were now thrown open to all indiscriminately. The result is easily imagined. Heterogeneous throngs upon throngs packed the lecture-halls, attracted thither by the growing reputation and held enchained by the lofty eloquence of the speakers, as most of all by the sublime truths which, for the first time, they heard enunciated, and which were in strange contrast with the scientific vagaries to which they had been accustomed. Men of the superb calibre of Titus Flavius Clemens, better known in Christian annals as Clement of Alexandria, and whom Saint Jerome eulogizes as the most learned writer of the Church, were set thinking, and could not, as a result of their logical reflections, but prefer the Personal God of the Christians to the hazy "emanations" of Plotinus; the usefulness of a theological system which had a practical bearing, and intimately effected the morals of men, to "Platonic myths and Pythagorean theories of mortification," whose pursuit invariably terminated in dissatisfaction and confusion. Philo, at the very dawn of the Christian era, had sought to reconcile, and even identify, in a common origin, the writings of Moses and Plato, and out of his endeavor sprang the short-lived compromise of Neo-Platonism—"the Puseyism of Paganism," as it has been styled. That which he attempted for the Old Testament the Christian Doctors of Alexandria did in a measure for the New. They harmonized Pagan with Gospel science in this sense, that they pointed out to their eager listeners what was admirable and tenable in Pagan writers, demonstrating how the higher truths of Christianity were a necessary complement, and that, if they would have their investigations terminate in something better than misti-

ness and discouragement, they must press them beyond the horizon of the Natural into the realm of the Supernatural; from the domain of pure reason into that of faith and revelation. In short, that human wisdom was at best only the handmaid of Christian theology. As Saint Paulinus subsequently and in other connections wrote to Jovius: "You need not abandon your philosophy if you will but hallow it by faith and employ it wisely by uniting it to religion." With this maxim as a basic principle of operation, the Alexandrian Catechists could and did handle the ancient authors with impunity, making it clear that whatever beauties they possessed were, after all, only the broken gleams and scattered fragments of the one infinite and incommensurate Truth, whose logical and adequate expression was the Christian concept of the Godhead, and whose visible actuality was none other than the Word made Flesh. Like fire when it seizes upon stubble, the new truths and the fame of the new teachers swept through Alexandria—throughout all Egypt; wherever, in fact, Egyptian ships and caravans wafted the renown of her enterprise and commerce. The truth had ceased to be a thing of the closet—a mere exotic. Its champions were to be met with everywhere, pushing its claims and making sad havoc of the traditional follies to which even the wisacres were clinging. In season and out of season, upon the busy thoroughfares of the city or in the lecture-rooms of the University of Serapeion; in the libraries and gardens, and upon the public drives and crowded wharves—in all places and at all times they were to be found teaching, and, by dint of the most compact logic, opening up entire vistas of unexplored verities for the contemplation of the ripest geniuses of the day. The harvest was bending for the sickle. The laborers, though necessarily few, were multiplying daily, and the necessary result was large and constant accessions from all grades and classes of society to the ranks of the Christian fold. We are not to suppose, however, that the work of the Alexandrian school was confined to argument with pagan literati and philosopher. That were an injustice to its saintly professors and to the spirit of its Apostolic founder which still hovered about its precincts. Though it was the most conspicuous, it was by no means the only or even the principal work. The catechetical classes for catechumens and children were its most efficient features. While Pantaenus and his successor Clement, and later on Origen, met the learned Pagan upon his own ground and lectured upon the most recondite subjects, numerous well-trained disciples were appointed to look after the interests of simple minds. Eusebius expressly narrates, and it were easy to infer

it without being told, that Origen divided his school into two sections, one for the more advanced and another for beginners; understanding by beginners not merely, as some have done, adult converts from Paganism, but also, as Fleury insists, children.¹ For, while it is true that the character of the instruction was generally better suited to persons of age, it is a mistake to suppose that it was all of one description. The Alexandrian school continued to prosper steadily for twenty-two years, from A.D. 180 to A.D. 202. It was then, and while Saint Clement was in charge, that the fifth general persecution under Septimus Severus broke out. The schools in Alexandria and elsewhere were closed. Their pupils and teachers were disbanded. The persecution raged incessantly until A.D. 211, the year of the Emperor's death at York, in Britain. He was succeeded by Carracalla, and peace was once more restored. Clement, on the breaking out of the persecution, had retired to Cappadocia, where he died in the year 217. We are in ignorance as to whether he ever returned to Alexandria or not. Meanwhile the illustrious Origen, then only eighteen years of age, was called upon to pilot the destinies of the school after its reorganization, which he continued to do for twenty years, until A.D. 231, when he resigned his post and left Alexandria forever. It was not to discontinue the work of teaching, though, for we soon find him at Cesarea, in Palestine, at the head of another institution, modelled upon the Alexandrian pattern. At the time Cesarea was an important religious and intellectual centre, and, with the exception of Alexandria and Antioch, compared favorably with the other cities of the East. This offshoot of the Alexandrian school was but one out of many similar educational foundations emanating from the same source, and animated by one and the same principle and spirit. As further examples we may mention those at Jerusalem, Edessa, Antioch, and, somewhat later, at Nisibis in Armenia, and at Sidon.

How long the Catechetical School of Alexandria flourished is a matter of historical conjecture. The more common opinion is

¹ But when he (Origen) saw that he was not adequate at the same time to the more intense study of divine things and to the interpretation of the Scriptures, and in addition to the instruction of the Catechumens, who scarcely allowed him to draw breath, one coming after another, from morning till night, to be taught by him, he divided the multitude, and selected Heraclas, one of his friends, who was devoted to the study of the Scriptures, and in other respects also a most learned man, not unacquainted with philosophy, and associated him with himself in the office of instruction. To him, therefore, he committed the elementary initiation of those that were yet to be taught the first beginning, or rudiments, but reserved for himself lecturing to those that were more familiar with the subject.—Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.*, b. vi., c. 15.

that it lasted, in itself or its ramifications, until the middle and possibly the close of the fourth century. The period of its greatest *éclat* was that during which it was administered by Pantaneus, Clement and Origen, for after theirs, no name of equal distinction appears upon its roll of masters. Of Origen's immediate successors, the names of Heraclas, Dionysius the bishop, Saint Pierius,¹ Achillas, Theognostus, Serapion and Peter the Martyr, have been preserved. Various reasons, more or less plausible, have been adduced for the gradual decadence of the school. The departure of Origen, its brightest light, to other fields, and the establishment by him of a similar institution at Cesarea, would naturally rob it of some of its quondam prestige, and divide with it public patronage and attention. Besides, and we deem this a more potent reason, it had served its time and purpose in the Providence of God. It was, after all, only a phase in what was to be an interminable process of educational development. That it was an improvement upon the primitive and elementary condition in which Christian education found itself during the early years of the century, no one will gainsay. Where the proselytizing of the first Christians had been mainly amongst the Jews, the doors of the Catechetical school stood open for all alike, irrespective of race and caste. Where the matter at the beginning was confined to the doctrines of religion, the teaching of the Alexandrians covered, in addition, the entire field of pagan research, scientific as well as literary. They could descant upon the charms of Homer and Virgil and rout the fallacies of Plato with the same dexterity and grace with which they interpreted a chapter of Genesis or taught the youngest of their children to make the sign of the cross. And to their everlasting credit be it said that they were the first who brought the wisdom of the pagan to the steps of the altar and made it kneel down and adore. Moreover, the critical situation in which the first Christians were placed made them, as a matter of self-preservation, seek seclusion and retirement. The altered condition in which the Alexandrians found themselves at

¹ We have mentioned Saint Pierius as head of the Catechetical schools of Alexandria upon the authority of Rohrbacher—an authority, however, with which the Bollandists are at variance. They say: “Quæcunque disputata sunt de tempore quo Pierius potuit regere Scholam Alexandrinam ad hoc reducuntur, quod legenti satis patuerit, ut ostensum sit nullatenus deesse in hucusque nota præfectorum serie intervallum quod Pierii præfecturæ attribuatur. At illud sane non sufficit, ut probetur eum revera hoc munus exercuisse neque ulterius progressi sumus a conclusione enuntiata in fine num. 15, nimirum non deesse quædam indicia quibus innuatur Pierius Catechetarum scholæ præsedisse, sed argumenta quæ rem plane evincant præsto non esse. *Acta Sanctorum*, Novem. Tom. ii pars prim., pg. 260.

the beginning of the third century solicited them to the front, and prompted them in the interests of truth and salvation to put on what Saint Paul characterizes as "the armor of light." The result was a period of marvellous growth and activity in the Church, and the almost instantaneous creation of a generation of apologists and controversialists hardly equalled and certainly never surpassed before or since. The writings of Saint Pantaenus, which are lost, though we are told they were voluminous, and those of Clement and Origen, which have survived, will more than bear out the truth of this statement. It was a phase, then, a transition, and nothing more natural than that it should yield to the broader and fuller policy ushered in by the first Christian Emperor, Constantine the Great, in the year 313. Before passing to the consideration of his reign and the world-wide transformation which it effected in the educational status of the Christian Church, for with that alone are we concerned, let us pause to remark that the school development of the century and a half that had preceded was by no means confined to Alexandria or the numerous schools of which it was the admitted and honored parent. The facilities which it afforded were not within the reach of all. Hence it was that, stimulated by its brilliant example, a kindred zeal had taken possession of the guardians of the flock elsewhere, and the interests of education were steadily advanced. Rome had its Christian school; and that religion had espoused learning there, the names of Apollonius, Tatian and Justin Martyr abundantly attest. Athens had its school and its scholars also, who, like the Great Apostle, had hurried thither to announce to the inquisitive Greek the wonderful works and ways of the "unknown God." Carthage had its school and could furnish its quota of erudite and zealous Christian teachers, as the names of Tertullian and Cyprian sufficiently prove. Nor was this zeal for the diffusion of Christian teaching confined to the East. There were many in the West who, in the matter of schools, were emulating the work of the Alexandrians. To the names already mentioned we may add those of Minutius Felix, Arnobius and Lactantius, all of them of the anti-Nicene period (A.D. 325). In accentuating the work of the Alexandrian Academy and its connections, therefore, we would not be understood as insinuating that all this while the faithful elsewhere were comparatively idle. Far from it: But the condition of public affairs in other quarters, for one reason or another, was so unsettled as to render anything like organization for corporate and continued educational purposes out of the question. In Rome, for instance, it was an almost unbroken persecution on the part of

barbarous emperors, who, when they did not attack religion, found vent for their iniquity in the wholesale assaults which they made upon scholarship and scholars. Tacitus in his "*Agricolæ Vita*," years before, had lamented the decline and almost complete extinction of literary endeavor, owing to the inhumanity and immorality of men in power who could not understand, much less appreciate, the mission of science and literature as elements of growth in the evolution of a nation's life.¹ And the same continued to be more or less the case long after his time. Alexandria alone seemed to combine the available conditions. The intellectual life focussed in her University; the high order of scientific speculation which had been in progress there for centuries, aided and encouraged by the beneficent generosity of its rulers; the sharp competition bound to follow as a consequence of so many bright minds coming together, all this and more made it a veritable hive of activity where the truth could work marvels if it could only declare itself at the hands of proper interpreters and upon the most judicious lines of presentation. That it did so we have seen—though we have also seen how checkered was its career, even in a soil so promising. Thus as early as the third century, thanks to the enterprising spirit of the Alexandrians, whatever learning there was that was worth the having was within reach of the Christians. In consequence, the intellectual qualifications looked for in a Christian gentleman of those days were neither mean nor few. They are thus summarized by the accomplished authoress of "*Christian Schools and Scholars*": "In addition to the elements of education," she says, "we see that at the beginning of the third century Christians were expected to teach and study the liberal arts, profane literature, philosophy, and the biblical languages. Their teachers commented on the Scripture, and devoted themselves to a critical study of its text; positive theology, as it is called, had established itself in the schools, together with a certain systematic science of Christian ethics; and, we may add, many branches of

¹ At mihi nunc narraturo vitam defuncti hominis, venia opus fuit; quam non petissem, ni cursaturus tam sæva et infesta virtutibus tempora. Legimus, cum Aruleno Rustico Pætus Thræsea, Herennio Senecioni Priscus Helvidius laudati essent capitale fuisse: neque in ipsos modo auctores, sed in libros quoque eorum sævitum, delegato triumviris ministerio, ut monumenta clarissimorum ingeniorum in comitio ac foro urerentur. Scilicet illo igne vocem populi Romani et libertatem senatus et conscientiam generis humani aboleri arbitrabantur, expulsis insuper sapientiæ professoribus atque omni bona arte in exilium acta, ne quid usquam honestum accurreret. Dedimus profecto grande patientiæ documentum: et sicut vetus ætas vidit quid ultimum in libertate esset, ita nos quid in servitute, adempto per inquisitiones, et loquendi audiendique commercio. Memoriam quoque ipsam cum voce perdidissemus, si tam in nostra potestate esset oblivisci, quam tacere. *Agricolæ Vita*, c. ii.

physical science also. It matters very little that these latter were but imperfectly known; the real point worth observing is that every branch of human knowledge, in so far as it had been cultivated at that time, was included in the studies of the Christian schools; and considering that this had been the work of scarcely more than two centuries, and those centuries of bloody persecution, it must be acknowledged to have been a tolerably expansive growth."¹ And this picture which she draws of the condition of things at the opening took on deeper colors and a more perfect delineation as the century advanced, in despite of endless obstruction. All that was needed for the perfect development of Christian education was an uninterrupted peace for the Church, and in the Providence of God its coming was to be no longer delayed.

Naturally enough, the entrance upon office of Constantine the Great, in the year 306, and the new policy which he inaugurated, augured well for the future of Christianity. The kindly feelings which he had manifested prior to his accession to the throne had filled the Christians with hope. Nor were they doomed to disappointment. In the year 313 he issued from Milan his decree of toleration, the effect of which was to put them upon a social and political level with their whilom pagan persecutors. And whatever his defects as a man or a prince, one thing is certain: his authority, exercised in its fulness and perseveringly, broke the fetters which had hampered the free development of Christian education, and set it upon a basis from which neither the traditional prejudice of paganism nor the malicious antagonism of men in power, such as Julian the Apostate, was able subsequently to shake it. "I wish my century," he wrote to Optatianus, "to afford an easy access to eloquence, and render a friendly testimony to serious studies." With this object in view, he threw open for the accommodation of all, irrespective of creed, the public schools of the Empire, using his authority freely in the endeavor to render them as efficient as possible. Christians were even allowed to teach in them, and some, perhaps many, availed themselves of the privilege, notwithstanding the opposition manifested in certain quarters to the practice. A word upon their history. Public schools had made their appearance in the state as early as the days of Julius Cæsar, B.C. 60, when at least thirty could be counted. They were not at the start a recognized civil institution, but private enterprises, conducted in the interest of individual pedagogues or Grammatici. Their curriculum embraced simply the

¹ *Christian Schools and Scholars*, p. 10.

elements, though there are evidences that in some cases they were more pretentious. It was not until the time of Vespasian, A.D. 69, that what were known as the imperial schools or "Auditoria" took their rise in Rome and in many of the provincial towns of note. They were of royal foundation, and were intended for the pursuit of higher studies. At least a two years' course in fundamentals was presupposed to admission. Confined at first to rhetoric and grammar, they gradually enlarged their scope until philosophy, medicine, jurisprudence, Latin and Greek, literature, astrology, and whatever was known of other sciences, were included amongst the branches taught. Their professors were appointed by the emperors, were well paid for their services, and, in view of their dignity, enjoyed various immunities and emoluments. Amongst the most celebrated of these schools may be mentioned those at Besançon, Arles, Cologne, Rheims, Treves, Toulouse, Clermont, Narbonne, Vienne, Bordeaux and Lyons. Those at Marseilles and Autun seem to have been the earliest, having been established by Greek colonies at some very remote and unknown date. Both Cicero and Tacitus allude to their antiquity. The most famous of the imperial schools, a sort of metropolitan university, with regard to all of them, was the Athenæum or Schola Romana, established by the Emperor Adrian, A.D. 117—A.D. 138. It flourished until the time of the Christian Emperors. It was built in the capital, and its whole conception seems to have been suggested by the Museum or University of Alexandria, already mentioned. It had "ten chairs for Latin grammar, ten for Greek, three for Latin rhetoric, five for Greek, one—some say three—for philosophy, two or four for Roman law; professorships of medicine were also added. . . . Under grammar were included knowledge of language and metre, criticism and history." The studies of a Roman youth began with elements at the age of seven. Having completed his primary course, he was sent at fourteen to the Athenæum or other public academy for the cultivation of oratory, mathematics, philosophy and law. At the age of twenty he was supposed to have finished his studies, though even that time was prorogued for five years in favor of those who desired to pursue letters or jurisprudence as specialties. As a result of the facilities which these institutions for higher education afforded, multitudes of students, when they had completed their studies in the provincial districts, flocked to Rome in quest of its exceptional advantages. They hailed from Spain and Gaul and Africa; and not a few of them, foreigners though they were, have by their immortal writings shed a glory upon the history of Roman

literature. Thus from Spain came the two Senecas, Lucan, Martial and Quintillian. From Gaul, Ansonius and Sidonius Apollinaris. From Africa, Arnobius, Lucius Apulius and Aurelius Victor. The massing together of so many young men at one point was, of course, fraught with great danger, moral danger especially, to themselves and no end of annoyance to public authorities. Accordingly we find that the legislation regarding them was both plentiful and stringent. They were required to bring from the provincial governor of the locality from which they came proper testimonials of introduction and recommendation. They were to be under constant surveillance during their stay at the metropolis, and, in case of flagrant misdemeanor, were to be publicly beaten with rods and sent home. They were amenable to the civil officers, who were required to furnish the Emperor with monthly reports, giving all necessary information regarding the number of students in attendance, their homes and condition, their progress, their conduct, with the names of the latest arrivals, as also of those who, their time having expired, were to be sent back whence they came. The rules governing the professors were equally strict. To the advantages which these schools afforded, many a Christian champion, like Tertullian, Jerome, Basil, Augustin and Gregory, owed the brilliant classical training which they brought with them into the Church. This system of imperial schools lasted until the end of the seventh century in Gaul, Italy, Spain, and in every part of the Roman world. "In Italy," says Ozanam, "till the eleventh century, lay teachers pursued their course side by side with the ecclesiastical schools, as if to unite the end of the old imperial system to the origin of that of the universities, and especially to the University of Bologna, which, in spite of difference from one another and from the old schools of the Empire, perpetuated the public methods of antiquity through a privileged professoriate and an universally accessible system of instruction."¹

When Christianity became under Constantine the religion of the Empire, these public schools were opened to Christians, though they still retained "the old methods, subjects of instruction, and, to a very considerable extent, the old spirit." Paganism was not to be so easily dislodged, and in spite of the efforts of Christian Emperors, notably Constantine, Valentinian, Gratian, Honorius and Theodosius, the old civilization, with its admixture of good and evil, still clung to its ancient haunts. Its struggle for a more protracted life against Christianity, which it viewed as an intruder,

¹ *Civilization in the Fifth Century*, vol. i., p. 195.

manifested itself nowhere more violently than in the class-room. Hence the animated controversy which arose amongst the rulers of the Church as to the advisability, not to say permissibility, of allowing Christian children to attend such institutions where a threefold danger seemed to threaten them—the paganism of the text-books, of their companions, and of their teachers. As we follow the discussion, and it is well worth the following, since it was a typical “battle of the giants,” we are reminded that school controversies, even within the Church, are by no means an exclusive product of nineteenth century inventiveness. So far removed from the environments of those days, it were impossible for us to pass upon the absolute merits of the case. There must have been valid reasons on both sides, since we find Saint Chrysostom and Saint Augustin in opposite camps. Saint Jerome, though brought up in similar schools himself, and although it has been said of him that “he read Cicero while he fasted and devoured Plautus whilst he bewailed his sins,” was at first opposed to the idea, and denounced it in no very measured terms. Subsequently, however, he seems to have veered, and, notwithstanding his resolution to eschew pagan literature and its cultivation, we find him in his old age teaching the classics and making his monks copy the “Dialogues of Cicero,” while, as we also read, he carried with him on his journey to Jerusalem a copy of “Plato,” so as not to lose time on the road. Saint Chrysostom, who had every facility for acquiring a full knowledge of the character of the schools in question, and would certainly have been the last to underrate literary accomplishment, sums up his views in an eloquent passage, whose appositeness at all times will be our apology for quoting it at length. “If you have masters amongst you,” he writes, “who can answer for the virtue of your children, I should be very far from advocating your sending them to a monastery; on the contrary, I should strongly insist on their remaining where they are. But if no one can give such a guarantee, we ought not to send children to schools where they will learn vice before they learn science, and where, in acquiring learning of relatively small value, they will lose what is far more precious, their integrity of soul. . . . Are we, then, to give up literature? You will exclaim: I do not say that, but I do say that we must not kill souls. . . . When the foundations of a building are sapped, we should seek rather for architects to reconstruct the whole edifice than for artists to adorn the walls. In fact, the choice lies between two alternatives—a liberal education, which you may get by sending your children to the public schools, or the salvation of their souls,

which you get by sending them to the monks. Which is to gain the day, science or the soul? If you can unite both advantages, do so by all means; but if not, choose the most precious."¹ Golden words, truly, from a golden mouth! "If you can unite both advantages, do so by all means," furnishes us, likely, with the keynote of the situation as it was in actual practice. It was not the intention of either party to forego the benefits accruing from the study of pagan classics when that study was conducted with due caution. That they were at one on the subject properly understood was made apparent when Julian the Apostate, A.D. 362, issued his decree inhibiting to Christians the study of pagan authors even in private, hypocritically observing that since they cared nothing for the divinities and precepts of paganism, they could spend their time much more usefully in the perusal of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. Forgetful for the nonce of their own differences, the Christians rallied to a unit in their opposition to it, with Saint Augustine, Saint Basil, and particularly Saint Gregory Nazianzen, who had been a classmate of Julian's, in the forefront. So crushing was the antagonism developed that Valentinian, a successor of Julian, was driven to revoke it. As long as it was in operation the early fathers and doctors, in their zeal for classical instruction, wrote imitations of the Greek and Latin models for school purposes, that youth might not be altogether deprived of the advantages which only the classics could afford. Gregory Nazianzen alone, we are informed, wrote 30,000 lines of verse for class exercise. This speaks for itself, and, to say the least, may be assumed as a qualification of Hallam's statement that the decline of Latin literature in the fourth and fifth centuries was largely due to the fact that "a dislike of pagan learning was pretty general among Christians." Such a statement will meet with little credence from those who recall the galaxy of classical scholars who figured in the Church during the period in question, and who have taken their position in the world of letters, to be read and heralded long after Mr. Hallam and his attempts at history have been forgotten. Gregory of Neo-Cesarea, Basil of Cappadocia, Athanasius and Cyril of Alexandria, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianzum, Jerome, Chrysostom of Antioch and Augustin of Hippo are a few of the luminaries who shone in that age in which we are asked to believe that Christians were hostile to the cultivation of the classics. We are not unaware that they did oppose the study of pagan literature in schools, and that the

¹ *Chrys. Op.*, vol. i., pp. 115-122, Ed., Gaume. Quoted from *Christian Schools and Scholars*, p. 19.

Church even formulated adverse decrees upon the subject ; but the teaching so antagonized was such as had no safeguard or saving quality, a fact which, like many another fact, Mr. Hallam and his set too readily overlook. Thus, though the public schools afforded new opportunities for the acquisition of secular learning, and in many ways were a benefit to the early Church, and as such were frequented and defended by many of her most renowned children, yet, as they were tainted with paganism and remained so until their final extinction in the sixth century under Justinian, or maybe later, it is impossible to trace through them the line of direct Christian educational development. Accordingly, we must seek for it elsewhere.

While the schools of the Empire fell a prey to the universal decline and destruction which swept everything before them, or lived on, as some will have it, in the case of a few, through the turmoil of centuries as a scarcely discernible link in the chain of historical occurrences, the Episcopal and Monastic schools, which had arisen under very different auspices and had quite other missions in the Providence of God, continued to thrive—at first in secret and later in the broad light of day, and always in close touch with the widening conditions of human life and affairs. We have seen how the earliest bishops of the Church, and even the Apostles, converted their houses into schools for the education of aspirants to the ministry. The custom, far from becoming obsolete, was universally prevalent during the first centuries, and some of the most venerated names of Christian antiquity are those of men who had been brought up after this fashion. Saint Chrysostom, Saint Cyril and Saint Athanasius may be mentioned as cases in point. The earliest authentic decretal, that of Pope Siricius, issued in 385, as well as later pronouncements by other Pontiffs, alludes to them, and leaves no doubt that they were conducted under proper ecclesiastical supervision. The introduction, in the fourth century, of the monastic life from the East, where it had long flourished, into the West, added new features to the already existing Episcopal or Cathedral schools. The community life which they practised assumed a more regular form. The bishop's residence became a sort of monastery in this sense, that the students who made his house their home and school were brought up on strict and well-defined lines of religious discipline. The bishop taught them in person. Where that was not possible he employed a substitute, usually a cleric. When the number of scholars in attendance became unwieldy, as sometimes happened, the Church was devoted to class purposes, the students still continuing to reside under the

same roof with the bishop. Saint Augustine at Hippo; Saint Ambrose at Milan and Saint Eusebius at Arles had flourishing Episcopal schools of this description, which became renowned in history for the excellence of their training and the general patronage which they commanded. With time their curriculum, meagre at first and limited to ecclesiastical studies, was extended until it embraced not merely such branches as were needful for the state of life contemplated, but such others, also, as went to make up a liberal education as then understood. Everything, in fact, that was taught in the municipal schools was included in their program as far as it was at all available for Christian use. For instance, the famous school attached to the Cathedral of Seville and established by Saint Leander, the bishop, and perfected by his brother and successor, Saint Isidore, A.D. 630, had a staff of Latin, Greek and Hebrew professors, and, in imitation of the imperial schools, taught mathematics, law and medicine. Yet, whatever may have been their number, whatever may have been their proficiency, like the civil schools, they fell preys to the vicissitudes of the times and disappeared. Difficult, nay, impossible as it is to trace their history in unbroken sequence through the turbulent period of the fourth and fifth centuries, when the process of universal social and political disintegration had set in, yet the occasional glimpses which we catch of them through the intervals of gathering gloom are more than sufficient to assure us that they were still at work in the cause of learning, and that at a juncture when all seemed hopelessly lost. In these Episcopal institutions we behold the germ of what was to become the Seminary of later days. At what precise moment after their re-establishment they began to be formally recognized and legislated for as seminaries by the Church is wholly uncertain. The first intimation of any decree on the subject seems to be that of the second Council of Toledo, issued A.D. 531. Its provisions are detailed and ample, so much so that we cannot but believe that Episcopal schools, even anterior to that date, had been looked upon as seminaries, in our modern understanding of the term.¹

¹ We will give, even at the risk of anticipating, Cardinal Newman's brief *resumé* of the subject in hand: "As seminaries," he says, "are so necessary to the Church, they are one of its earliest appointments. Scarcely had the New Dispensation opened, when, following the example of the schools of the Temple and of the Prophets under the Old, Saint John is recorded, over and above the public assemblies of the faithful, to have had about him a number of students whom he familiarly instructed; and as time went and power was given to the Church this school for ecclesiastical learning was placed under the roof of the Bishop. In Rome especially, where we look for the pattern to which other churches are to be conformed, the clergy, not of the city only, but of

Simultaneously with the development of Episcopal or Cathedral schools founded for clerics, we notice another growth in progress, namely, that of the monastic schools for the laity. Even the first solitaries of the desert at times received for instruction children committed to their training; and from the very birth of monasticism under Saint Anthony and Saint Pachomius provision had been made for the education of the young by the institution of what were known as the interior and exterior schools—the former intended for such as aspired to the monastic life, the latter for those who entertained no such idea, but could not or would not, because of the danger, avail themselves of the advantages of the State Schools, or of the private “Adventure Schools,” of which there were many. Saint Basil, like Pachomius before him, allowed children to be received into the monasteries to be educated, and laid down rules for their proper government. The passage just cited from Saint Chrysostom shows that monastery schools were common in his day, A.D. 344, and in high repute. When monasticism passed from the East to the West, among the traditions which it retained was that of schools. This transition dates from the advent of Saint Athanasius to Rome, A.D. 340. Having been frequently exiled by Constantine and Constantinus because of his stanch defense of the Divinity of Jesus Christ against the Arians, he spent much of his time in the Thebaid. There he met the early Cenobites, and familiarized himself with their practices. Coming

the province, were brought under the immediate eye of the Pope. The Lateran Church, his first Cathedral, had a seminary attached to it, which remained there until the Pontificate of Leo the Tenth, when it was transferred into the heart of the city. The students entered within the walls from the earliest childhood; but they were not raised from minor orders till the age of twenty, nor did they reach the priesthood till after the trial of many years. Strict as a monastic novitiate, it nevertheless included polite literature in its course, and a library was attached to it for the use of the Seminarists. Here was educated, about the year 310, Saint Eusebius, afterwards, in Arian times, the celebrated Bishop of Vercelli; and in the dark age which followed it was the home from childhood of some of the greatest Popes—Saint Gregory the Second, Saint Paul the First, Saint Leo the Third, Saint Paschal and Saint Nicholas the First. This venerable seminary, called anciently the School of the Pontifical Palace, has never failed. Even when the barbarians were wasting the face of Italy and destroying its accumulations of literature, the great Council of Rome, under Pope Agatho . . . could testify, not indeed to the theological science of the school in that miserable age, but to its faithful preservation of the unbroken teaching of revealed truth and of the traditions of the Fathers. In the thirteenth century we find it in a flourishing condition, and Saint Thomas and Albertus Magnus lecturing in its halls. Such a prerogative of perpetuity was not enjoyed elsewhere. Europe lay submerged under the waters of a deluge, and when they receded schools had to be refounded, as well as Churches.” *Hist. Sket.*, vol. iii., p. 241. The baneful effect which the establishment of the Mediæval Universities, long years after, had upon the Seminaries, and the legislation of the Council of Trent regarding them, will be a subject of later remark.

to Rome, he circulated a report of what he had witnessed in the desert, and wrote the life of Saint Anthony, with whom he had conversed.¹ The Romans, weary with centuries of bloodshed and dissipation, listened with anxious avidity to the recital, and multitudes, even of the nobility, embraced the life which he had been the first to proclaim in their midst. The idea grew, as fruitful ideas must, and ere many years had elapsed Italy teemed with monasteries, whose erection was largely due to the zeal of Eusebius, Bishop of Vercelli, who, like Athanasius, had been exiled from the East for his bold advocacy of the truth. Inspired by the writings of Athanasius, and burning to emulate him, Saint Martin of Tours introduced monasticism from Italy into Gaul, A.D. 360, by the establishment of the Monasteries of Ligugé and Marmontier, in which latter retreat the Apostle of Ireland had his lips cleansed with the coal of fire which kindled the faith in the land of Saints and scholars. Germanus and Lupus in Britain, Ninian in Scotland, Patrick in Ireland, Cassian in Marseilles, Honoratus in Lerins, are all suggestive of the rapid dissemination of monastic life in western Europe, and, by inference, of cloistral schools, its invariable accompaniment, and that even prior to the time when educational work in the West fell entirely into the hands of the Church. It is not difficult to perceive that the monastic schools were the real channels that preserved intact the truths of Christianity, and a vast improvement, at the moment of their all but total extinction, upon anything that had preceded. They effected with less brilliancy but greater security what the Alexandrians had accomplished, but were unable to perpetuate the fusion of Christian learning with pagan lore. How they would have prospered had they flourished in tranquillity and peace it were difficult to say; but, like everything else, they were doomed to suffer from the stress of the times.

The fifth century was drawing to a close. The transfer of the seat of government from Rome to Byzantium years before, A.D. 330, had furnished the wild hordes of the North with the opportunity they had so long awaited. It weakened the Western Empire, and the barbarians who for centuries had been prowling upon the confines of the Roman domain realized that their hour had come, and in numberless legions streamed in upon the fair fields of central and southern Europe. Two centuries had not elapsed from their first eruption before they had ravaged Thrace, Panno-

¹ It is to this life that Saint Augustine so feelingly alludes in his *Confessions*, B. viii., c. 6.

nia, Gaul, Spain, Africa and Italy. First came the Goth, next the Hun, and finally the Lombard. What one spared the other devoured. Everything perished on their march. Art, science, literature—in a word—the rich inheritance of Greek and Roman splendor, the accumulated dowry of ages of toilsome industry, all were swept away. The municipal and imperial schools were destroyed, the Episcopal schools disappeared, and the cloistral schools were all but annihilated. The evil, with no force to check it, increased until the overthrow of the Emperor Augustulus, A.D. 476, by Odoacer, chief of the Heruli, announced the downfall of the Western Empire. The hour of midnight had struck, and whatever random light still flickered in the firmament of letters only emphasized the darkness while hastening to its own speedy and ominous setting. As we gaze upon the desolate situation, and contrast the widely different fates of the pagan and Christian schools, we are reminded of the words of M. Guizot, spoken of the two systems in general: "The activity and intellectual strength of the two societies," he says, "were prodigiously unequal. With its institutions, its professors, its privileges, the one was nothing and did nothing; while, with its simple ideas, the other incessantly labored and seized upon everything."¹ Yes, the Church seized upon whatever learning remained, and kept diligent watch over it throughout the carnage and confusion which followed. Her monastic schools, though many had been destroyed and all were jeopardized, continued their work. Like the bird which flees before the gathering storm and seeks refuge in the quiet and retired depths of some leafy covert until the clouds are dissipated and it can once more preen its wings for another and more auspicious flight, what was left of education took shelter in the monasteries, which were now scattered up and down the length and breadth of Europe—in England, in Ireland, in Germany, in Wales, in France, in Spain, in Italy, in Scotland—everywhere—there to await the glad summons of its resurrection to a broader and more efficient field of enterprise. How it fared throughout its centuries of retirement, and what promises it held in deposit of that future civilization of which we are to-day so boastful, will be the purpose of a subsequent paper to describe.

REV. EUGENE MAGEVNEY, S.J.

SAINT IGNATIUS COLLEGE, Chicago, Ill.

¹ *History of Civilization*, vol. i., p. 361 et seq.

A PRECURSOR OF MARQUETTE.

DURING the middle part of the seventeenth century there perished in the forests of what is now Wisconsin a Jesuit priest who was distinguished, even among illustrious associates, for his missionary zeal and noble enterprise.

Just as Francis Xavier yielded up his life at the very threshold of China, where he had longed to labor for the salvation of souls, so did Père René Ménard die in the country south of Lake Superior, where dwelt the Huron Indians, a lost flock, fugitives from the wrath of the dreaded Iroquois. Francis Xavier died of a fever. Ménard lost his way in the wilderness and probably died of starvation.

High among the brave men, men like Brebeuf, Bressani, Jogues and Gabriel Lalemant, men who in the seventeenth century made every sacrifice and faced every danger to labor for the redemption of the savages of North America, and who made illustrious in our land the name of Jesuit, stands Père Ménard. He was the pioneer missionary of the Lake Superior country. In that region he preceded the famed Claude Allouez by five years. Twelve years before Louis Joliet and Père Marquette launched their frail bark canoe in the waters of the lower Wisconsin River, on their way to the Father of Waters, Ménard had ridden upon the upper Wisconsin for scores of miles; indeed, the bones of this good old bearer of the Cross had been whitening in that wild valley for five years before Marquette first set foot upon American soil.

The archives of the Society of Jesus record the birth of Ménard at Paris on September 7, 1605. In 1624 he entered the Jesuit novitiate at Paris. Two years later he was sent to the college at La Flèche, where he studied philosophy and the sciences for three years. During the following three years he taught Latin at the College of Orleans. Then, after four years devoted to the study of theology at Bourges, he taught belles-lettres at Moulins for a period of three years. Having distinguished himself in theology, in philosophy and belles-lettres, he spent the final year of probation in the city of Rouen.

He was ordered to America almost as soon as he had taken his last vows. He took passage at Dieppe late in March, 1640, and after being detained in the roadstead off that port by storms which raged for a whole month, he, on July 8th, reached Quebec, which at that time was nothing but a frontier hamlet, consisting for the

most part of log houses. The fleet consisted of three ships, and their arrival at Quebec was the occasion of a solemn *Te Deum*.

In order to equip himself for missionary work among the natives, Ménard applied himself to the study of the Algonquin language. In 1641 his active missionary career was begun. He was sent to the country of the Hurons, between Georgian Bay and Lake Simcoe; and at the Huron missions, or in connection with them, he labored for eight or nine years, until the memorable incursion of the Iroquois, those bitter, unrelenting foes of the Hurons. It was at that time that the Iroquois killed the heroic Brebeuf, the gentle Lalemant, and other French missionaries. Ménard was not caught in the slaughter-pens, although he was near the scene of danger. He finally returned in safety to the settlements on the St. Lawrence.

After being stationed at Three Rivers for a few years, Ménard, in 1656, was sent with other missionaries, and with a number of French colonists, to the country of the Onondagas, one of the Iroquois nations not far from the present Onondaga Reservation in New York. A short time afterward Ménard was detailed to establish a mission among the Cayugas, another Iroquois nation, among whom he was in constant danger of being murdered. The savages often ran after him, brandishing knives and hatchets. It was a common sight for him to see captives burned and devoured. But these scenes of terror and of horror seemed only to increase the priest's zeal. With death threatening him at every turn, he wrote a brave, even joyful, letter to his superior, informing him that he alone had baptized 400 of the captives held at the Cayuga village.

Soon came the discovery of the Iroquois plot to kill all the French missionaries and colonists. To save themselves, they resorted to strategy. Boats capable of navigating amid floating ice were secretly made within the mission buildings, and one night, after they had feasted the Indians until the latter fell asleep, the priests and their protectors silently departed. When their flight was discovered, the Indians, having only bark canoes, which were of little use in waters filled with floating ice, were unable to pursue them. The white fugitives reached Montreal in safety early in the spring of 1658. Ménard became superior of the residence at Three Rivers.

In a letter dated October 29, 1660, Laval, vicar apostolic of New France, afterward the first bishop of Quebec, wrote as follows to Pope Alexander VII. :

"This summer a priest of the Society of Jesus left for a mission more than 500 leagues from Quebec. That country is inhabited by innumerable nations, who have never even heard of the Catholic faith. Seven Frenchmen joined this apostle; they to buy castors, he to conquer souls. He will surely have to suffer a great deal, and has everything to fear from cold, hunger, disease and the savages. But the love of Jesus Christ and the zeal for souls conquer all."¹

The Jesuit priest whom the letter mentions was Ménard. His destination was the wilderness south of Lake Superior. He had seen the snow of fifty-five winters, and in many ways was an old man. Hardship and privation had bent his form, whitened his hair and undermined his health. But his soul was lofty, his heart stout, his faith steadfast, inspiring. A letter to a reverend friend which he wrote at 2 o'clock in the morning of August 27, 1660, only a few hours before his departure for an unknown country from which he was never to return, shows his unfaltering courage as well as his gentle spirit. This is what he says:

"I write you probably the last word, and I desire it to be the seal of our friendship unto Eternity. . . . In three or four months you may put me into the Memento of the dead, considering the manner of living of these people, and my age and weak constitution. Notwithstanding all this, I have felt such a powerful attraction, and have seen so little of nature in this undertaking, that I cannot doubt that I should have had eternal remorse had I missed this opportunity.

"We were taken a little by surprise, so that we were unable to provide ourselves with clothing and other necessary things. But He who feeds the little birds and clothes the lilies of the valley will take care of his servants. Should we happen to die of misery, that would be for us a great happiness."

It was on August 28, 1660, that Ménard left Three Rivers upon this journey. With him were Charles Albanel, another Jesuit father, who, however, was destined to go overland to Hudson Bay before seeing any part of the West; Jean Guérin, a noted *donné*² of the Jesuit order, and for years the devoted follower of Ménard, and seven Frenchmen. They went in the company of a large flotilla of Ottawas, who had reached the settlements only a few days before, and whose haste to return to the upper country was the reason why Ménard had had so little time to prepare for the voyage.

The course lay up the Ottawa and Mattawan Rivers, across Lake Nipissing, down the French River, along the northern shore of Georgian Bay and Lake Huron, past Sault Ste. Marie, and thence into the greatest of inland seas.

¹ *Archives of the Propaganda*, vol. 256, p. 24, quoted by Père Rochemonteix in *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France*, published at Paris in 1896.

² *Donnés*, who were peculiar to New France, were pious laymen who gave their services to the Jesuit order. Other noted *donnés* were René Goupil and Guillaume Couture.

Up to that time the Sault was the farthest point west which had been reached by Christian missionaries. Starting from the Huron missions, Fathers Isaac Jogues and Charles Raymbault had in the fall of 1641 made a flying visit to the Sault, but, so far as there is any record, they did not pass up into Lake Superior. Fur traders had penetrated much farther, however. In 1659 two daring Frenchmen named Pierre-Esprit Radisson and Médard Chouart des Groseilliers,¹ who have been mistakenly credited with the discovery of the upper Mississippi River about fifteen years before the famous voyage of Joliet and Marquette, had actually reached the head of Lake Superior, and had explored much of the wilderness of Northern Wisconsin and Northeastern Minnesota. They had returned to the French settlements on the St. Lawrence with the very flotilla with which Ménard started for Lake Superior.

Before Ménard was a journey of more than a thousand miles, toilsome, tedious and dangerous. It was a great undertaking for so old a man, especially when its inherent difficulty was augmented by the pangs of hunger and by brutal treatment at the hands of his Indian guides. Albanel, indeed, was compelled to disembark at Montreal and to return to Quebec. The Indians made Ménard, who continued in their company, carry heavy packs over portages and to paddle nearly all the time. They even, from superstitious fear, threw away his breviary, thinking that he was working some spell by means of it. He was fortunate enough to find another one in his baggage.

Once, in order not to be left behind, he had to make his way over frightful rocks and precipices, and in doing this he hurt one of his legs, which become swollen and sore, but nevertheless he received no consideration from the savages.

The supply of food soon gave out. Indians and Frenchmen appeased their hunger by chewing moose-skins and eating a black, sticky broth made out of a kind of moss growing upon rocks.

While the flotilla was meandering the southern shore of Lake Superior, the canoe containing Ménard and three Indians was broken by a falling tree, and they were abandoned by the rest of the party. For six days, as Ménard himself records, they lived on offal which they scraped up around an abandoned lodge and

¹ See *American Historical Review* for January, 1896; *Proceedings of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin* for 1895; and *Parkman Club Publication, No. 2*, the last published at Milwaukee, Wis., for critical accounts, by the writer, of the careers of these two men.

on soup made of bones which they pulverized. They would have perished had not some passing Indians thrown them a few slices of meat as one would throw a bone to a dog. Finally some Indians, who were kinder than the others had been, carried them to the rendezvous, which was Keweenaw Bay, near the little modern town of Baraga, which is named in honor of the famous Catholic missionary who labored among the Indians of Lake Superior nearly two centuries after Ménard had passed away.

The word Ottawa was used indiscriminately by the French to describe Indians from the Upper Lakes who went down to Quebec to trade with the French. The Ottawas at Keweenaw Bay were really Chippewas. Ménard arrived at their village on Keweenaw Bay on St. Theresa's Day—October 15th—in 1660, and there he spent the winter. His abode was a hut of fir-tree branches, and his food during most of the time consisted of acorns, the remains of fish, and the bark of birch and whitewood. Worst of all, to Ménard, the Indians proved to be a vicious, obdurate race, although he baptized a number of infants and converted fifty adults.

Duty soon called him farther into the wilderness. When the storm of Iroquois wrath had broken upon the Hurons some time before, the Tobacco Hurons fled in terror to Mackinac, thence to the Mississippi River, and thence, partly retracing their steps, up the Black River of Wisconsin to its source. Among these fugitives were some who had been baptized in their own country, and these, when they heard of the presence of the "black gown" at Keweenaw Bay, sent messengers to Ménard imploring him to go to them. He promptly decided to do so, but he took the precaution, before going himself, to send three young Frenchmen to the Hurons, in order to learn their condition. His scouts returned to Keweenaw Bay about the middle of June, 1661. They had found the way difficult and dangerous, there being many rapids, waterfalls, portages and precipices, and food being scarce. They endeavored, but in vain, to dissuade the priest from undertaking the journey.

Ménard set out on July 13th,¹ accompanied by one Frenchman—an armorer or blacksmith. The late Dr. John Gilmary Shea and other writers have fallen into the error of stating that this French-

¹ The *Relation* of 1663 says June 13th, but this is clearly a misprint, as the three young Frenchmen had hardly returned from the Huron village by that time; as Ménard's last letter, written at Keweenaw Bay, is dated July 2d, and as the *Relation* quoted says that Ménard, who had reached Keweenaw Bay October 15, 1660, left for the Huron village just nine months later, which would be about the middle of July.

man was Jean Guérin, the donné. The only original authority upon this point is the "Jesuit Relation" of 1663, which states that no sooner had Guérin "learned of the death of the priest than he desired to leave the Ottawas, among whom he had been left, to go in search of the missionary's body. But God had other designs for him."¹

The clause "among whom he had been left" is of itself sufficient to show that Guérin was not Ménard's companion on the journey to the Huron village. Again, Guérin "learned of the priest's death" and wished to go in search of his body, whereas it is stated positively in the same "Relation" that the Frenchman who was with Ménard discovered that the priest had gone astray in the forest—not that he had died; the armorer sought the live priest, not for his corpse. Moreover, the same "Relation" states that Ménard's companion, when he finally reached the Huron village, could not speak that language well enough to make the Indians understand so simple a fact as the father's getting lost in the woods, whereas the same "Relation" says that Guérin had served in the original Huron missions, in Canada, where he must necessarily have acquired knowledge of the Huron tongue, at least sufficient familiarity with it to be able to use it to announce that his companion had got lost.

It is interesting to learn that the "Journal of the Jesuits," under

¹ The entire passage relating to Guérin reads as follows in the old French: "C'estoit un homme de Dieu, d'une éminente vertu, et d'un zèle très-ardent pour le salut des âmes; il s'estoit donné à nous afin de coopérer par ses services à la conuersion des Sauvages. De fait, apres avoir accompagné nos Pères presque danstous les quartiers du Canadas et dans tous nos Missions, soit aux Iroquois, soit aux Hurons, aux Abnakiuiois, et aux Algonquins, dans de grands dangers et de grandes fatigues, donnant partout des marques d'une sainteté très-rare; enfin ayant esté donné pour compagnon au Père Ménard en ce dernier voyage (the journey to Lake Superior), il est mort dans ce glorieux employ, suivant son bon Père dans le Ciel, apres l'avoir suivy si loing sur la terre; car il n'eut pas plus tost appris sa mort, qu'il ne songea plus qu'à quitter les Outaoïak (Ottawas at Keweenaw Bay), parmy lesquels il avoit esté laissé, pour aller chercher le corps du Père. Mais Dieu avoit d'autres desseins sur luy: il l'establit comme Missionaire en chef de cette pauvre Eglise, qui n'avoit pas pu iouir de son Pasteur; ce fut par le Baptême qu'il y conféra à plus de deux cents enfans qu'il envoya bientost apres dans le Ciel, pour y couronner le Père d'un beau Diadème de ces petits predestinez, au salut et à la recherche desquels il étoit mort. Apres qu'il eut ainsi bien employé un Hyver, comme il faisoit un voyage avec quelques François, la pluye les obligeant de mettre à terre, et faire une maison de leur Canot, le renversant sur eux; lors qu'ils estoient dessous, un d'eux remüant un fusil, le declin lascha, et alla droit donner dans le costé gauche de ce bon Frere, qui, pour lors, étoit en contemplation de la Passion de Nostre Seigneur. Ce sont les paroles de ces François qui en ont fait le rapport, et qui le nommoient Frere à cause qu'il s'estoit consacré a nostre service; et puis ils adioustent, que d'étoit son ordinaire d'être tousiours absorbé dans Dieu. Il tomba roide mort du coup, sans rien dire que le nom de Jesus, avec lequel il expira."

date of August, 1663, announces the return to the French settlements of the seven Frenchmen who had gone west with Ménard and Guérin. Among them, of course, must have been Ménard's companion during the journey into Wisconsin.

We come to three mooted points in Northwestern history, as follows :

1. The location of the Huron village in 1661.
2. The route that Ménard took to reach it.
3. The place where Ménard became lost in the woods and died.

1. Nicholas Perrot, who spent many years in the territory now known as Wisconsin, states in his "Memoirs"¹ that after leaving the Mississippi River country, where they had become embroiled with the Sioux, the Hurons ascended the Black River to its source, where they established a village. They had left the Mississippi River when, in the winter of 1659-60, Radisson and Groseilliers, the two nameless Frenchmen of whom the "Relation" of 1660 tells us, were in the Lake Superior country, and it is certain that it was not until after Ménard's death that the Hurons went on to Chequamegon Bay, where, just across from the site of the modern city of Ashland, toward the northwest, Père Allouez found them in 1665; for if they had been on the shores of Chequamegon Bay when Ménard went to seek them, he would have followed the shore of Lake Superior in order to reach their village, instead of doing which he, according to the "Relation" of 1663, descended a river for a number of days in the attempt to visit them.

The source of the Black River, where Perrot says that the Hurons established their village, is near Chelsea, in Taylor County, Wisconsin. The air-line distance from Ashland to Chelsea is only 100 miles, but the early explorers estimated the distance that they actually travelled²—not distance as a surveyor or cartographer would measure it. They travelled by land over Indian trails, moreover, and Indian trails were laid out to avoid obstacles to travel, and to pass good camping-places, where fish or game, or both,

¹ "Ils avouent un connoissance d'une rivière qu'on nomme la Rivière Noire; ils enterrent dedans, et, estant arrivé là où elle prend sa source, les Hurons y trouvèrent un lieu propre pour s'y fortifier et y établir leur village."—Perrot, *Moeurs et Coûtumes*, Tailhan edition, p. 87.

² "Our means of estimating distances," says Schoolcraft in the appendix to his narrative of the expedition of 1832 to Itasca Lake, "was by time, corrected by reference to the rapidity of water and the strength of wind, compared with our known velocity of travelling in calm weather on the lakes." The *Jesuit Relations* abound in illustrations of measurements of distances in a similar manner.

could be depended upon. The actual travelling distance from Ashland to Chelsea was about 150 miles, according to expert woodsmen who know the country, the old Indian trails, and the habits of the Indians. We learn from the "Relation" of 1660 that the two nameless explorers who returned to Quebec from the Lake Superior country during that year had found the Hurons at six days' journey from Chequamegon Bay. An average day's journey for Indian or *courreur des bois* would be 25 miles, so that the total ground covered in six days would be 150 miles. This view is fully borne out by the statement in the same "Relation" that the distance from Lake Superior to the Huron village was 60 leagues, which would be about 150 miles, a French league comprising 2.52 miles. "Six days' journey" and "60 leagues," therefore, mean one and the same thing.

Radisson, in his "Voyages,"¹ speaking of his journey of 1659-60 to Lake Superior, says that the Huron village was "five great days' journeys" from Chequamegon Bay. By making 30 miles a day, the distance between Ashland and Chelsea, which is 150 miles by trail, could be made in exactly five days. Radisson's statement, therefore, corresponds to the "Relation's" "60 leagues" and "six days' journey."

There is another point of view open to us, and from it we get the same result. The "Relation" of 1663 states that the length of Ménard's journey from Keweenaw Bay to the Huron village was 100 leagues, which would be 252 miles. This is within a very few miles of the actual travelling distance between Keweenaw Bay and Chelsea by the easiest and most direct route open to Ménard. Furthermore, the time that it took Ménard's scouts, the three young Frenchmen, to return to Keweenaw Bay from the Huron village is the time that it would take modern woodsmen to go from Chelsea to Keweenaw Bay in June, under the conditions that confronted the Frenchmen. And proof to the same effect is furnished by the time that it took Ménard and his companion to reach the place, near the Huron village, where Ménard got lost.

Thus the evidence that the Huron village was near Chelsea is abundant, harmonious and conclusive. It is not too much to say that this evidence is equally strong in disproving any and all of the other theories which have been advanced in regard to the location of the Huron village.

2. His destination being established, it becomes easier to solve

¹ The original MSS., now in the Bodleian Library and the British Museum, were reproduced by the Prince Society of Boston in 1885.

the question of the route taken by Ménard to reach the Hurons. His course lay by trail from Keweenaw Bay to Lac Vieux Désert, which is situate on the line that divides Wisconsin and Northern Michigan; thence it followed the Wisconsin River for many miles, and thence, taking a trail again, it trended westward to the Black River. This is the "easiest and most direct route" which we have already mentioned. Lac Vieux Désert is where the Wisconsin River rises, and Keweenaw Bay is nearer to Lac Vieux Désert than is any other part of Lake Superior. There was communication between these two points at an early day, Anglo-Saxon pioneers finding a trail that led from the north shore of Lac Vieux Désert to Keweenaw Bay. It was to Keweenaw Bay, over this trail, that the Indians of Lac Vieux Désert went, in the first half of the present century, to visit Father Baraga, the great modern Catholic missionary in that region.

We have already said that Ménard's journey, according to the "Relation" of 1663, was one of 252 miles, and that this estimate tallies almost exactly with the distance from Keweenaw Bay to the headwaters of the Black River. It is 70 miles from Keweenaw Bay to Lac Vieux Désert; 165 miles from Lac Vieux Désert, down the Wisconsin River, to the natural crossing-place to the headwaters of the Black River; and 25 miles along this crossing-place to the source of the Black River, making 260 miles in all.

In this connection, some of the details of Ménard's last journey are interesting. The "Relation" of 1663 states that the Hurons who set out from Keweenaw Bay with Ménard and his companion soon abandoned them, promising, however, to send them succor; that for fifteen days the priest and his follower waited at a lake for the promised Hurons, who did not come, and that they found at the lake in question a canoe in which they continued their voyage. They were still descending a river, but had nearly reached their destination when Ménard went astray at a portage.

It is clear that the Hurons abandoned them at or near Lac Vieux Désert; that it was at this lake that they waited fifteen days for the Hurons to send help to them; and that it was in the Wisconsin River, rising out of Lac Vieux Désert, that they launched their canoe and continued their journey.

The same "Relation," that of 1663, states that the three young Frenchmen, Ménard's scouts, had had "to go up the river in returning, whereas they had gone down the river in going to the Huron village." The larger portion of the journey each way was therefore by river. By the Wisconsin River route two-thirds of the journey would be by river, down stream in going and up stream

in returning. No other route to the source of the Black River from Keweenaw Bay answers to this description. There is also significance in the fact that the three young Frenchmen, in returning to report to Père Ménard previous to his departure for the Huron village, stopped a day to make a new canoe when they found that their craft had been stolen. They had undoubtedly hidden their canoe near the point where they left the Wisconsin River to go by trail to the headwaters of the Black River. If it had been stolen at the Huron village, they could easily have procured a new canoe there, instead of being compelled to stop a day in order to make one. The fact that they did go in their canoe to the Huron village shows the necessity of their walking the last stage of the journey—which would be from the Wisconsin River to a point near Chelsea. Right in line with this evidence is the experience of the Frenchman who was with Ménard when he got lost. After searching in vain for the priest, he started for the Huron village in order to get help, but he himself went astray, which would not have been likely to happen had he been navigating a river at this stage of his journey. He went beyond the Huron village, and an Indian whom he met accidentally led him back to it. He reached it the second day after Ménard's disappearance. Thus the character of the Wisconsin River route corresponds to the description and the circumstances of Ménard's journey.

3. Now to determine the place where Ménard became separated from his companion and wandered off into the forest. The fact that the Frenchman, notwithstanding his delays and mishaps, reached the Huron village the second day after the disappearance of the priest, shows that the accident occurred near the place of crossing from the Wisconsin River to the headwaters of the Black River. As early as the last century, it is known, a trail left the Wisconsin River at the mouth of the Copper River, which empties into the Wisconsin where the latter bends to the west and approaches so near to the headwaters of the Black River. The trail crossed the Black near Chelsea, and it was laid out along the natural crossing-place between these two rivers. It undoubtedly was a very old trail.

The "Relation" of 1663 states that it was at "the end of a portage around a rapid" that Ménard was missed by his companion, and it makes a clear distinction between rapids and waterfalls. The statement in the "Relation," that the two men became separated and that the rapid was "difficult," indicates that only the priest took the portage trail, and that the Frenchman "ran" the rapids. On this point Perrot, who is more explicit, says:

“One day he [the Frenchman] found himself in a rapid, which carried him along in his canoe. To help him, the father took some of his baggage out of the canoe, and did not take the right path to get to him. He got upon a trail made by animals, and, in endeavoring to get back to the right path, he got entangled in a labyrinth of trees and went astray. The Frenchman, having passed the rapids with great difficulty, awaited the good father, and, as the latter did not come, he determined to go in search of him.”

Here are statements that Ménard and his companion were still descending the river; that the rapid could be “run,” though with difficulty; that a boatman caught in the rapid could effect a landing before the most dangerous part of the descent had been reached, and that there was a portage trail around the rapid. Distinctive features, these, when taken together, and they show the exact spot where Ménard got lost. For between Whirlpool Rapids, which are above any possible crossing-place to the headwaters of the Black River, and above Mosinee, which is below any possible crossing-place to the headwaters of the Black River, there is only one place on the Wisconsin River which corresponds to the description so plainly given to us, and that place is Bill Cross Rapids, five or six miles above the trail from the Wisconsin to the headwaters of the Black River. The trail around this rapid is twenty-five miles long. It runs now, as it probably did in the seventeenth century, along the west bank of the river, which is low, the east bank being high. When pioneers of Northern Wisconsin first saw these rapids, the surrounding country was heavily timbered with pine and hemlock. In such a place, a few steps in the wrong direction and one was lost.

Perrot says that a kettle which Ménard had taken out of the canoe was afterward found in the possession of a Sac Indian, and that some of his vestments were discovered in a Sioux wigwam. These remarks, together with the statement in the “Relation” of 1663 that a young Huron sent out to search for the missing priest came back to the village with a cry of “the enemy,” probably meaning the Sioux, have been advanced to support a theory that the priest was murdered. But both Perrot and the “Relation” of 1663, speaking of the manner of the priest’s death, assert that he was lost in the woods. Death from starvation and exhaustion would be the almost inevitable result of the going astray in that wilderness of a man so old and feeble as he was. Even if the Sioux, for instance, had encountered Ménard, they would have been likely to treat him with great consideration, as Indians generally did so treat the first white men with whom they came in contact. It was only after some experience with the invading white race that the Indians began to wield the tomahawk against them.

Such was the life of this polished scholar, this zealous missionary, this gentle hero; a life begun in the high civilization of France, continued amid great privations far beyond the frontier of New France, and finally laid down in the wilderness a thousand miles from any any white men's settlement.

And had he not high honor?—
The hillside for a pall!
To lie in state while angels wait
With stars for tapers tall!
And the dark rock-pines, like tossing plumes,
Over his bier to wave,
And God's own hand, in that lonely land,
To lay him in his grave!

HENRY COLIN CAMPBELL.

THE EARLY MISSIONARIES OF CENTRAL AMERICA.

IT is strange how little is known by the ordinary reader of the work of the older Spanish missionary priests. The story of Spanish conquest and settlement on this continent has been made familiar to the public by numerous writers, but, with a very few exceptions, no attention has been given to the distinctive work of Catholic priests and monks in organizing and ordering many of the most important points in that settlement. Why it is that slavery found so little place in the greater part of Spanish America, and how it comes that the native Indians, who form the largest part of the population from the borders of these United States to the Straits of Magellan, are nearly all devoted, if sometimes ignorant Catholics, are questions which find little explanation in the conquests of Cortez or Pizarro, as told by Prescott and other American writers. Both facts are patent. Since the separation of the American colonies from Spain there have been many instances of Indian champions trying to set up distinctively Indian governments, but none, that we know of, of Indians turning spontaneously away from the Church. The faith seems as firmly rooted among the descendants of the Aztecs and the Incas as among the most Catholic populations of Europe, even after all the political revolutions of the present century.

The political dominion of a Catholic nation like Spain alone cannot explain the reason of this strong attachment of the Indian races to the Catholic Church. They recall the political rule of Spain with strong dislike, and very often they retain a strong antipathy to the whole white race. There are or were in Mexico a few years ago numerous Indian communities, more or less civilized and organized, which would not permit whites to live among them, but an exception was always made in favor of the Catholic clergy. The most devoted supporters of the Church's rights against so-called "Liberal" assaults on them were the pure Indians. The conquest of Mexico by Cortez, which founded the modern Mexican nation politically, is not regarded with any feeling of satisfaction by the majority of Mexicans, but it is very different with their feelings towards the Catholic Church, in spite of the hostility of politicians.

The real facts, well known to every close student of Spanish American history, are, that in the occupation of the American soil

by the Spaniards the work of the clergy was not only distinct from, but often actively opposed to, that of the soldier conquerors. Las Casas was the most energetic opponent of every aggression on the part of his own countrymen that they had anywhere to encounter, and Las Casas is but one in a long line of devoted men who spent their lives in the work of converting and protecting the native races. Their work should be made known for the honor of human nature. Men like Zumarraga and Betanzos, Peter of Ghent and Martin of Valencia are more worthy of remembrance than the whole race of conquerors. The social problems of our own country to-day, the growing tendency to strife between rich and poor, between capital and labor, and the possible means of reconciling these conflicting interests are occupying the minds of thinking men with vague doubts and fears. The work which occupied the lives of the early Spanish missionaries was full of similar problems. The "resources of civilization" had made a small number of fierce and fearless soldiers absolute masters of millions of Indians, whose lives they regarded little more than a hunter values his game. The missionaries, allies of the conquerors by race and civilization, stepped in as protectors and defenders of the conquered race in the name of that Christian faith which is common to every people and every land. They upheld the rights of common human nature against the lawless might of their own countrymen, and that their efforts were not fruitless the millions of Indians in America to-day are the best proof.

The West Indian islands were the first Spanish conquests, and the destruction of the natives there by the reckless tyranny of the European gold-seekers early aroused the consciences of the more thoughtful minds among the Spanish people. The Home Government endeavored to check the excesses of its subjects beyond the Atlantic, but, as far as the islands were concerned, to little purpose. The natives of Hayti, of Cuba and Puerto Rico disappeared in a couple of generations as completely as the tribes of our own country passed away before the Puritans of New England or the Cavaliers of Virginia a century or two later. The decrees of the Spanish Government were practically powerless among the bold adventurers who were spreading in every direction through the New World in search of fortune and empire; and thoughtful men in the early part of the sixteenth century looked forward sadly to the disappearance of the whole American race at no distant date.

That the coming together of civilized and ignorant races of a common human nature should result in the extermination, not the

improvement, of the weaker race, is a terrible illustration of the strength of the brutal instincts in man's nature when left to its own will. It has, unfortunately, been shown but too often in our own day. The fate of the Tasmanians and New Holland blacks is a striking instance. But in the Spanish occupation of America there were higher moral forces brought into play, by the influence of the Catholic Church on men's minds, than any that can be called up by the civilization of England or any other merely material one. In every Catholic population which is really such, God never fails to call chosen spirits to the full observance of the Christian law and precepts at the sacrifice of all merely human motives, and, if need be, of life itself. Spain was Catholic in faith in the sixteenth century, and such men were found among her people, as well as the greedy adventurers and reckless soldiers, whose faith was dormant when the passions came into play. The latter were quite willing that the Indians should be made Christians, but they were determined on enslaving them for their own profit in any case. The missionaries, on the other hand, held the souls of the natives at the highest price, and were ready to sacrifice every temporal advantage to themselves or their country for that end. "Don't think of imposing tithes on the Indians," wrote a bishop of Guatemala to Charles V. ; "they have more than enough to do to pay their masters." The true spirit of the Spanish missionary finds expression in these words.

A distinguished writer, Arthur Helps, in his "Spanish Conquests," has stated that of all the territories included in this sphere none offers so representative a history as the comparatively small district of Guatemala. Lawless raiding by individual adventurers, military invasion by disciplined troops, civil colonization and organization by the conquerors, and heroic self-sacrifice on the part of missionary priests all appear within a few years in the history of Central America. Names like Cortez and Las Casas figure there each in his own work. The Spanish soldier and the Spanish missionary are both typically represented on its soil, and the land was in a way divided between them, so that for the first time the Christian monk was allowed to organize a Christian population among the natives of America, unharassed by the violence of soldiers or gold-seekers. The brief heads of the story alone can be given here.

The occupation of Guatemala followed quickly the Conquest of Mexico. Cortez sent one of his officers, Pedro Alvarado, with three hundred soldiers, to establish a colony there, and, after many battles with the native chiefs, the city of Santiago was formally

founded in 1524 near the Pacific coast. It received the regular charter of a Spanish town, with alcalde, elected council and magistrates, like any self-governed community of Europe, and grew in wealth and population like an American frontier town. Alvarado, as the deputy of Cortez, was the governor of the whole province until such time as the Central Government in Spain should otherwise provide. The Spanish settlers and soldiers were protected by their officials, but over the million or more of natives Alvarado's power was as irresponsible as an eastern sultan's, and often used as savagely. After some fierce fighting, the chiefs of Utatlan, the capital of the civilized Guatemalans, had professed submission, and subsequently the Spaniards had been attacked again. Alvarado invited the chiefs to his camp with gifts and promises, and his action is described in his own account of the conquest: "And as I knew that they bore no good-will for the service of his Majesty, and for the *good and peace* of the country, I burned them, and ordered the city burned." To enslave the population was, in his eyes, a simple right of war, and the Indians were parcelled out by grants of so many heads among the Spanish settlers at the discretion of the governor.

Alvarado may be regarded as a type of the pioneer soldiers of Spain. With all his cool indifference to the lives of Indians, he was generous, good-humored and polite among his own followers, brave to rashness, and with a knack of winning friends among men. He roved, with or without any authority from home, from Guatemala to Honduras, to Panama, to Peru, and finally to Spain, where he contracted a brilliant match, and came back as royal Governor to Guatemala. A few years later he planned an expedition to California, a land yet unvisited by the Europeans, and on his way there was mortally wounded in a skirmish with some wild Indian tribe. He lived long enough to confess and profess contrition for his ruthless deeds, and to order the liberation of those whom he confessed he had lawlessly enslaved; but his rule while in power was scarcely less merciless than that of the destroyers of the Indians in Cuba and Hayti.

That the Guatemala Indians, after their conquest, escaped a similar fate was mainly due to the Dominicans who had been sent to Mexico after its capture. Twelve Franciscans and as many Dominican priests and lay brothers came from Spain in 1524. The change of climate was very trying to the first missionaries. Of the Dominicans, five died, and four were so broken down that they had to return to Europe within a year. Two lay brothers and a single priest, Francisco Betanzos, remained alone in Mexico for two

years. The mortality among the pioneer missionaries had no effect in lessening the number of volunteers to take their places. Seven Dominicans came to Mexico in 1528, while twenty, under Father Montesinos, who years before had raised his voice against Indian slavery, were sent to Venezuela. Alvarado passed through Mexico that year on his way to Europe, and there he met Father Betanzos, and was fascinated for a time by his influence. He confessed himself, it must be hoped sincerely, though the impression seems not to have been very durable, and he begged Betanzos to visit Guatemala and found a monastery in his new city. On his return from Spain he renewed the same request, and in 1529 Betanzos set out for Guatemala.

As Alvarado may be taken as a type of the Spanish soldier, so may Betanzos of the Spanish missionary of the sixteenth century. Born of wealthy parents in Leon, in 1486, he had studied at the University of Salamanca as a layman. There he formed a close friendship with another student, Pedro d'Aconada, and the two began a life of self-denial and charity of a remarkable kind. They were in the habit of visiting hospitals, and feeding poor persons in their own rooms in the manner of many saints, and their conduct became so well known that Betanzos decided to leave Salamanca to avoid the danger of vanity. He wished to become a hermit, and agreed with his friend to try the experiment, and afterwards to return and give the result of his experience, in the hope that Aconada might join in the same life. He left Salamanca secretly, and travelled on foot to Rome, living on the way on alms. There were two or three hermits living on the barren island of Ponza, near Naples, and there Betanzos, at twenty-four years of age, took up his abode. His dwelling was a cave, and he cultivated a patch of soil for a frugal support, giving the rest of his time to prayer and study. Within a year his hair grew white from his self-imposed austerities, but he was thoroughly satisfied with his lot, and, after another year, he resolved to return to Salamanca, and try and bring his friend to share his privations. On his journey, which, like the first, was made on foot, he passed his wealthy father's house, and was about to knock at the door, when his father rode up, and failed to recognize his son in the gray-haired mendicant. He simply told him to go to work, for a worthless tramp, and Francisco took the command silently, and passed on. At Salamanca he was equally unrecognized, but he found that his friend had joined the Dominican Order in the monastery of San Estevan. Francisco took his place one day at the monastery gate among the poor who came there for food, and was recognized by the lay

brother who conducted the distribution. He at once told the fact to the community, and Aconada and the others rushed out, and brought Betanzo into the monastery. After a few days, the arguments of Aconada convinced Betanzos that the life of the Dominicans was his true vocation, and he was received into the community gladly. He made his novitiate, and was ordained within three years, and then he begged to be sent to the distant American missions. He was sent to Hispaniola in 1514, and twelve years afterwards he was sent to the city of Mexico, where the death or return of most of his community left him for over two years the only Dominican priest. The arrival of new colleagues left him free for new work, and so, in 1529, he set out with a lay brother for distant Guatemala.

The Dominican rule was observed in its primitive rigor in Mexico. Meat was never, and fish rarely, eaten, and seven months of the year were given to various fasts, similar to Lent, during which a jar of water and a morsel of bread was the only exception to one meal a day. The bedding of all the community was a mat and two blankets, their dress a robe of serge, and their work incessant. Betanzos made the journey of fifteen hundred miles through the barrancas and forests of tropical America on foot, with no food but wild fruits and a little bread. It is strange to find among the Spaniards of the sixteenth century in America such lives as his, but they must be known to understand the conversion of the Indian population. Nor was there any lack of either mental powers or business ability in Father Betanzos with all his austere piety. Cortez, in his will, left Betanzos one of his four executors, and during his residence in San Domingo it was his advice which had led the great Las Casas, already famous in Spain as the adviser of Ximenes and Charles V., to become a Dominican friar. It may be a shock to Protestant notions to learn that the same Betanzos was head of the Inquisition in New Spain, yet such is the fact. It may be said that the Indians never felt any antipathy to that tribunal, whose supposed terrors were unknown to them in practice, and whose head was the foremost advocate of their own rights as men as well as Christians.

In Guatemala Father Betanzos was well received by the Spaniards, though his sermons were, in a great part, directed against the slavery unjustly imposed on the Indians. The Spanish proprietors, while respecting his zeal, held that his doctrine on this point was only a private opinion, and slavery still continued. Betanzos would only accept a small portion of land for his monastery, which was built of adobe, and in a few months he was re-

called to Mexico by his superiors in religion. He shut up his monastery, leaving the keys with the local priest, and he begged two of the settlers to build a few cells of adobe and complete the inclosure of the garden during the interval that must pass before other Dominicans could come to occupy the place. It was six years, in fact, before they came, but when they did it was to do a work which had an abiding effect on the whole history of Spanish America. Las Casas was to take up the work begun by Betanzos.

The name of Las Casas is world-wide, but the true story of his life is scarcely so well known. He had come, a priest, to the West Indies, and had for some years lived in Cuba in that capacity. He had received a grant of land and Indian slaves like others, and for some years he found nothing repugnant to his conscience in thus using the labors of others. It was during a Lent, while preparing for the Easter solemnities, that his eyes were first opened to the injustice of the whole matter of Indian slavery; but once convinced of that, he, without hesitation, devoted his whole energy to the task of its abolition. He was then past forty, and highly respected in Cuba, by the Governor, as well as by the Spanish colonists. He gave up his office, resigned his grant of Indians, and started to Europe to bring before the Spanish Government the iniquity of the treatment of the Indians. He won over Cardinal Ximenes and the young Charles V., and with their authority he tried to found a colony of peaceful farmers and missionaries on the coast of Venezuela. The project failed through the misconduct of his assistants and the hostility of the Spanish settlers already established in the West Indies. Some of the missionaries were killed by the Indians, the colony was abandoned, and Las Casas, at forty-seven years of age, returned to Hayti alone. There the persuasion of Father Betanzos made him join the Dominican Order, in which, for eight years, he disappeared from public life, though never abandoning his great object. His pen was busy on his "History of the Indies," and other works, which were one day to have weighty effect on the fate of Spanish America; but, for the time, his labors in favor of freedom seemed to have ended in utter failure. His first appearance in Mexico was on the occasion when Father Betanzos was recalled from Guatemala, as has been just told. The Convent in Hispaniola was the chief Dominican House in America, and the Mexican Dominicans desired a separate administration, for good reasons. A chapter was called to settle this question in the city of Mexico, and to it both Betanzos and Las Casas were called. It was some years later, however, before Las Casas took up the work of Betanzos in Guatemala.

His first task was a mission to Peru, then newly discovered. He went there with two companions, Fathers de Minaya and Pedro de Angulo. They carried to Pizarro a royal decree forbidding the enslavement of the Indians, but they did not remain there. It is quite likely that their presence was not very welcome to the conquerors; but, at all events, the three Dominicans returned. A diocese had been established by the Holy See in Nicaragua, and the Bishop urged Las Casas to remain with him, and found a monastery in Leon. They did so, and all three applied themselves to a study of the language of the country, though Father Angulo, who was familiar with the Mexican dialect, had little difficulty in teaching religion to the Indians. The Governor of Nicaragua, Contreras, was a merciless master for the Indians, and Las Casas and he were soon in conflict. The fearless Dominican succeeded in stopping an expedition of Contreras, which was in reality only a slave hunt. The soldiers, after hearing Las Casas, flatly refused to take part in the work, and the project had to be abandoned. The newly-appointed Bishop of Guatemala, at this conjuncture, begged Las Casas and his brethren to come to his diocese, which they did, and, after six years, the monastery of Father Betanzos was occupied again.

The companions of Las Casas were all to be afterwards well known. They were Luis Cancer, Pedro de Angulo and Rodrigo de Ladrada. All shared the sentiments of Las Casas, to which he had lately given further publicity by his remarkable treatise, "On the Only Way to Convert." This was written in Latin, but also translated into Spanish, and widely circulated in all the colonies. Its first proposition is that men can only be made Christians by conviction, not by force; and the second, that infidels cannot justly be attacked in war for the sole reason that they are such. Both, but especially the latter, were direct impeachments, before God and the Catholic world, of the practices of the majority of the Spanish conquerors of America, and especially of the rulers of Guatemala. The Bishop strongly supported the views of Las Casas, and their combined influence began to tell on the public. Alvarado had gone to Spain, and a temporary Governor, Maldonado, was sent to take his place in 1536. The colony, meanwhile, had an Indian war on its hands. The more civilized Indians had been easily conquered, but in the mountains to the north several wild tribes scattered through the forests defied the arms of the Europeans. Three expeditions from Guatemala had been driven back with loss, and the province bore the significant name of "Land of War." That those Indians would have finally to

succumb to the military power of Spain there could be scarcely a doubt, but at the time they were in possession of full savage freedom.

Here was a chance for Las Casas of proving practically that the Indians could be converted by purely spiritual means, without conquest, a proposition which was laughed at by the Spanish slave-holders. The Governor, Maldonado, agreed to let the Dominicans try at their own risk. In May, 1537, a formal compact was made and duly registered between Maldonado in the name of the King and the three Dominicans, Las Casas, Ladrada and de Angulo. The Governor pledged himself that if the latter could induce the Indians of the Land of War, or any part of them, to acknowledge the royal supremacy, and pay any small tribute as a sign of the same, they should forever be freemen personally, and that neither they nor their lands should ever be given to any private Spaniard. It was further provided that, except the Governor himself, no European but the missionaries would be allowed to enter the Indian country for five years from the date of the agreement. Las Casas, in his first attempt at colonization, had bitter experience of the mischiefs arising from adventurers following in the path of the missionaries from base motives. This agreement with Maldonado carefully guarded against this risk, and its terms became the basis of future mission work during the whole subsequent duration of Spanish rule in America.

The Dominicans began their work by a fast and novena, and, after long meditation, a plan of action was devised. They had all learned thoroughly the Quiche language of the country, the bishop being especially skilled in it. With his aid the chief doctrines of Christianity, as the creation and fall of man, the redemption, the life and death of our Lord, and the final state of man after death, were told in Quiche verses. The work, though Las Casas could not know it, closely resembled that of Caedmon, the poet-monk of the old Anglo-Saxons. The Dominicans were not satisfied with versifying the Catechism, but they also set their verses to music adapted to the rude instruments used by the Indians, taking special care to give the vocal parts a higher pitch than the deep-toned drums of the natives.

To open communication with the Indian country was the next step. For this, four converted Indians, who were in the habit of trading in the Land of War, were engaged, and taught the versified Catechism by heart. These Indians entered heartily into the task, and within three months from the agreement with Maldonado they started on their journey to the village of the greatest chief of

the Land of War. Arrived there, the Christian traders set up their tent and sold their goods as usual the first day. When the sales were over and the Indians seated for their evening meal, the traders asked for a drum (teplanastle), and began to chant their verses to its accompaniment. The wild Indians were alike surprised and pleased with the new entertainment and the new doctrines. The chief insisted on a repetition the next day, and for seven days afterwards. And meantime he questioned closely the traders on the meaning of their words. The latter cautiously answered that they sang what they had heard from certain padres who instructed the people of Guatemala. The chief asked what kind of men those padres were, and if they were like the Spaniards, who had already come to ravage his country. The messengers painted pictures of monks in the Indian fashion, with their robes, tonsures and rosaries, and described their mode of life. They were not married, they ate no flesh, they took no gold nor other wealth, they prayed much by night and day, and were kind to all, white and Indian alike, and taught freely. They added that if the chief would ask, those remarkable padres would certainly come and teach him fully the meaning of all they had repeated.

The Indian, with natural caution, decided to first send his brother back with the traders and get his report. The ambassador was directed to note especially whether the padres had gold in their houses, like other Spaniards, or any women residing with them. He came to Santiago, and was joyfully welcomed by the Dominicans. At his request, Father Luis Cancer accompanied him back to the Land of War, to begin the conversion of its people. He brought with him a copy of the Governor's agreement to respect the rights of the Indians, and also the four traders, who might properly be called lay teachers, as they continued the work of chanting their lessons every day and collecting the wild natives for instruction.

The chief received Father Cancer with honor and built a church for him, where the former said Mass daily. The Holy Sacrifice made a deep impression on the Indians, whose own priests were used to besmearing themselves with blood for the sacrificial rites practised by them. The chief professed his belief in the new doctrine after some instructions, and at once began to preach it himself to his people. He pulled down and burned the tribal idols. His example was widely followed, and after a few weeks, Father Cancer returned to his convent with the welcome news of these conversions.

Las Casas and Father de Angulo at once started on foot for the "Land of War," and found the Indian chief steady in his faith. He had received much opposition from the medicine-men, and also from a neighboring chief whose daughter he had married, but he persevered resolutely. The Indians crowded around the Dominicans, who traversed the country in every direction, explaining religion and assuring the natives of protection against violence from their Spanish neighbors. These Indians lived in small rancherias of three or four families each, scattered through the woods. Las Casas, with the eye of a statesman as well as a missionary, advised the chief to gather several of those rancherias into villages, so that the people might be more easily instructed, and at the same time might enjoy the social benefits of living together. Though necessary for the civilization and improvement of the natives, this measure was highly distasteful to many, and it was only by the utmost tact and the intelligent co-operation of the Indian chief that they could be brought to agree to it. Las Casas founded a settlement at Rabinal, which subsequently grew into a thriving city, though remaining for centuries wholly Indian in its population. Las Casas got a hundred families together there, and the experiment made a sensation among more remote tribes. From Coban, a remote district, an embassy came to ask a visit from the padres, and there their teaching was as well received as by the first converts. Father Cancer remained at Rabinal, and diligently continued the instruction of the natives there.

Las Casas now induced his Indian friend, who had been baptized by the name of John, and was known as Don Juan, to visit the Spanish city, where Alvarado was again governor. In spite of his cruelty at times, Alvarado was favorably impressed by the spectacle offered to his view. He took off his plumed hat and placed it on Don Juan's head as a mark of esteem, and showed him great attention during his visit. This disposition of the reckless Alvarado secured effectually the Indian missions from Spanish invasion. Las Casas returned to the Land of War, and the Indians of the whole province flocked to him for instruction. He was only left a short time to give it, for in May, 1539, eighteen months after his first arrival among the Indians, he was called back to Santiago by the bishop. It was necessary to send both to Spain for more priests and to Mexico to attend the Chapter of the Dominican Province, to be held there in August. Very reluctantly all four Dominicans had to leave their young mission and their convent in Guatemala. Fathers Cancer and Angulo

went to Mexico, Las Casas and Ladrada to Spain, after a final visit to Rabinal and Coban. The convent was again left in charge of a layman, with orders to keep the church open for prayer, and the missions were left for awhile to the zeal of Indian catechists to maintain in the faith.

They were not abandoned, however. Father Angulo returned the next year, with six other Dominicans; and Las Casas, in Spain, where he busily worked alike among his religious brethren and with the government for the spiritual and earthly welfare of the Indians, procured numerous royal orders for the protection of the converted Indians. Letters of thanks for their conduct were sent by the emperor himself to the chiefs of the converted tribes; and their country, while guaranteed its self-government, received the official name of True Peace, Vera Paz, which it still bears. Thus secured from the usual violence of Spanish conquest, the Indian province continued to thrive. A century later it contained seventeen towns, besides the capital, which had a population of twelve thousand, while Rabinal had four to five thousand. An English traveller, Gage, in 1630, described it as a "Town of Indians of eight hundred families, which hath all the heart can wish for pleasure or life of man. The Indians are much like those of Chiapa for bravery, for feasting, for riding, and showing themselves in sports and pastimes." The work of Las Casas was no fleeting one. As a civilizer, the monk had surpassed the soldier and lawyer in Guatemala.

The success of the Dominicans in the conversion and civilization of the Land of War had a marked effect on the subsequent destinies of the whole of Spanish America. It furnished Las Casas with the strongest practical argument against Indian slavery, which was definitely condemned by the Spanish Government in 1542. The terrible slave raids which had decimated the native Americans during the early part of the sixteenth century were finally put an end to, and through the whole continent the Indian race was allowed to live in peace at least. The mission system devised by Las Casas and his colleagues became, with some modifications, the model for nearly every subsequent mission from Paraguay to California; and the protection of the natives from European violence, and their training in agriculture and the other arts of civilized life, as well as in religion, was recognized as the proper work of true missionaries. We need only compare the fate of the Indian tribes on our own soil with that of the tribes of South and Central America to see how deep a debt humanity owes to the Dominicans of Vera Paz, and how strong is the protection

even in this world which the Catholic Church provides for the weak of the earth.

A few words may be said of the principal persons who figured in this work of conversion. Luis Cancer, the first to venture among the hostile Indians, subsequently met death in Florida at the hands of another tribe, to whom he was bringing the same benefits as he had done in Central America. The Florida Indians could not distinguish the Spanish monk from the Spanish soldier, and Father Cancer's noble life was thus ended. Las Casas, who was sixty-three when he learned the Quiche language, before beginning the mission of Vera Paz, continued to labor with almost undiminished vigor for thirty years more. He was made Bishop of Chiapa, near Vera Paz, and resigned the diocese to return to Europe, where he had just arranged a difficult business for Guatemala, when he was carried off by pneumonia on his journey from Valladolid to Madrid. Father Angulo was ultimately made bishop, but died almost immediately afterwards, in 1556. Father Betanzos remained in Mexico, teaching, writing and preaching, till 1549. His greatest wish was, at sixty years, to devote himself to the conversion of China, and only the express command of his provincial kept him from embarking. The first Bishop of Mexico, Zumaraga, had joined in the project of Father Betanzos, and sought release from his diocese for that purpose at an equally advanced age; but, like him, his zeal was disappointed. Betanzos then obtained permission to make a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and reached Seville on his way. From Seville he commenced his long journey on foot, but at Valladolid a burning fever seized him, and his life's work ended in the Dominican monastery of St. Paul.

BRYAN J. CLINCH.

THE IRISH COLLEGE, PARIS.

DURING a period of more than two centuries after the Protestant Reformation the difficulties in the way of receiving education for the priesthood in Ireland became so great that numbers of students left their homes to be educated in the universities and schools of the Continent. In every Catholic country to which they came they were received with welcome and treated with kindness and generosity. Aided by fortune or guided by Providence, they met with success altogether exceeding their expectations, and the numerous colleges which they possessed fully attest the ample provision which they were enabled to make for the spiritual wants of the people at home. At one time they owned six ecclesiastical colleges in France, viz. : Paris, Bordeaux, Lille, Toulouse, Nantes and Douai. An Irish college was founded in Rome which still belongs to their countrymen, and an Irish college at Salamanca remains to testify the bonds that existed between Catholic Spain and Catholic Ireland. There were Irish colleges in Madrid, Lisbon, Seville and Louvain. Besides these distinctively Irish establishments and the houses of religious, there were little scattered groups of Irish students in many other seats of learning on the Continent.

Of all these institutions, the most important was the Irish College in Paris. More than three-fourths of all the priests who were educated on the Continent came from France, but chiefly from this College. Its history was very much chequered during the great Revolution, and its life somewhat romantic; but revolution after revolution passed away, shaking religion to its foundations, condemning priests and religious to death or exile, yet the Irish College remained unmolested. Side by side with this institution were an English college and a Scotch college, but the English and Scotch colleges are gone and the Irish College remains. Of all the great religious institutions that once made the Latin Quarter famous this place stands alone. Nay, of all the ecclesiastical corporations in the whole of France it is the only one that has preserved its corporate existence and rights through the Revolution, and it stands to-day a flourishing institution in the heart of the Latin Quarter, and sends forth every year priests as zealous and as self-sacrificing as in the Penal Days.

In the year 1571 Fr. John Lee arrived in Paris, and brought together into one body all the Irish students that were in the city in

that year. As no separate establishment had yet been founded for the education of Irish ecclesiastics they were obliged to live in other colleges, of which there were many at this time. One of these was the College de Montaigu, which seems to have had much varying fortune, but after a long struggle for existence it suddenly rose, under the able administration of Jean Standone, Regent of the Faculty of Theology of Paris, above all the other colleges of the Latin Quarter. The house set apart in this college for the Irish students was called the Seminary of Irish Clerics. St. Ignatius, the founder of the illustrious Order of the Jesuits, and the famous scholar Erasmus, spent some time in the Collège Montaigu. The discipline of the college under Standone was of a most rigid kind and the fare scanty, but in their public disputations the students of the Collège Montaigu were distinguished above all the other students of the university. The education of those days was clearly different from that of ours, because on one occasion the other colleges witnessed with admiration a three days' public disputation carried on in Greek by the students of the Collège Montaigu.

From this college the Irish students passed to the Collège de Navarre, the most important college of the University, and for a long time the school of the royalty and nobility of France. At one time there were together in this college the princes Henry III., Henry IV., and the Duke of Guise. Besides the enjoyment of a college nobly endowed, the Irish students had the advantage of a very complete course of studies and association with some of the most saintly and learned ecclesiastics in Paris. One of the rectors of this famous institution was the great Gerson, who is considered by some to have been the author of the "Imitation of Christ."

Among the numerous friends of the Irish in France, few were more earnest or more devoted to their interests than the Baron de Lescalopier, President of the Parliament of France for many years. This excellent nobleman, about the year 1620, rented a house for the Irish exiles in the Quartier St. Germain, Rue des Sévres, into which the more advanced ecclesiastics passed from the College of Navarre. It was his intention to found an Irish college with a fixed yearly revenue, but this project was frustrated by his death. Of his kindness and generosity towards the Irish students we have ample testimony in the following extract from that rare and valuable work, "Florilegium Insulæ Sanctorum," by Dr. Thomas Messingham, first Rector of the new establishment:

"The Baron was great in authority, profound in humility, mer-

ciful to the poor, kind to strangers, the father of the needy and the orphan, the true friend of students—in fine, he was all to all. Of these virtues, his assiduous kindness and great liberality to our Seminary is no small testimony—a kindness which we should never, and can never, forget. We remember, too, what delight it afforded this most religious president to live with us poor exiles for the faith, and what pleasure he seemed to take in our conversation. He even humbled himself to that excess that he, who was wont to sit in the supreme council of France, amongst the nobles of the land, would not unfrequently place himself last at the table of the Irish exiles. He would remain with us many days together; and he often said, if he survived his wife, he would remain always amongst us. His conversation, free from every tincture of vanity, always breathed piety, for he scarcely ever, except in cases of necessity, spoke of anything but God, the saints, the conversion of heretics, the salvation of souls, the founding a Seminary for us with a fixed yearly income, which he long since would have done had not death anticipated his designs. When the priests of our Seminary had completed their studies and were about to return to their country to break the bread of life to the famishing people, and draw from the Sacred Scriptures the waters of sound doctrine to refresh their parched souls, this pious and provident nobleman, fearing lest the ignorance of the pastors might entail the loss of the flock, sent them to that holy man, Father Bientus, of the Society of Jesus, to be examined; and to those who were found duly qualified for the pastoral duties, this most liberal friend presented a suitable outfit and a sufficient provision for their journey; and thus prepared he presented them to the Cardinal de Retz, Archbishop of Paris, that from him, as a public personage, they might receive authority for their mission. These things, although truly rare and wonderful, nevertheless are true and have often been witnessed by me.”

The Irish ecclesiastical students continued to reside in the Rue des Sévres till the year 1677, when Louis XIV. granted them an establishment which still remains in their possession under the name of the Lombard College. The Collège des Lombards was founded in the year 1330, for the benefit of Italian students who frequented the University of Paris, but for a long time the building had been allowed to fall into decay. Two Irish priests, Patrick Maginn, first chaplain to Henrietta, queen of Charles II. of England, and Malachy Kelly, chaplain to Maria Theresa of Austria, made application to the King to have the college restored for the use of the Irish, who were every year becoming more numerous

in Paris. Louis XIV. always showed in a marked degree his appreciation of the Irish exiles in France. He knew that many a gallant officer and soldier shed his blood in the national defence and brought renown upon the army of the Great Monarch. The King generously granted the request made on behalf of the Irish students. They were, besides, endowed with full corporate powers. Contributions towards the restoration of the building poured in from their countrymen, who were at this time very numerous in France. In this charitable work they were generously seconded by their many friends throughout France, who were eager to show a welcome to the strangers and contribute towards their education. The building was in a short time restored, and the Lombard College remained the home of Irish ecclesiastics for more than a century.

A generous patron of Irish ecclesiastics in Paris deserves more than a passing notice here. The Abbé Guillaume Bailly was born of a wealthy and ancient family in Paris, in the year 1621. In his youth he was presented by the King to the Abbey of St. Thierry. Through humility he would not receive the holy order of the priesthood, but remained all his life in deacon's orders. The work of his life was the care of the Irish who were exiles for their faith, and especially of Irish ecclesiastics, on whom he bountifully lavished his rich patrimony. Besides contributing largely to the Lombard College, he established and endowed at his own expense three smaller communities of Irish in Paris, one in the Rue d'Enfer, a second in the Collège Ste. Barbe, containing fifteen students, and the third in the Collège Montaigu, containing twelve in number, all reading the Philosophy or the Theology course. These three houses he united into one in the Hotel St. Michel, Rue Traversine, from which came forth many zealous missionaries, bishops and Doctors of the Sorbonne. He also founded a college in Kilkenny, in Ireland, in the reign of James II., which was very soon afterwards suppressed by William of Orange. Everything Irish was the object of his solicitude. One day, seeing a man cruelly beating a dog, he interposed, saying: "Do not treat this poor animal ill; perhaps it came from Ireland." He died in the year 1692, in the 72d year of his age, bequeathing his heart to the College, that it might remain forever among a people whom he loved.

It is difficult to estimate the number of Irish students in Paris during the eighteenth century, but there is good reason to believe that they were considerably over two hundred. In the year 1776 there were one hundred and sixty in the Lombard College alone:

Of these, one hundred were ordained priests before the completion of their studies, and attended lectures in their own college; the other sixty students attended the lectures of the Sorbonne in the ordinary course. It is impossible to overrate the importance of the Lombard College towards the preservation of the Catholic faith in Ireland throughout the eighteenth century. Of the men whom it sent forth we know but little. Their lives were spent in obscurity, in labor, in self-sacrifice for their flocks in Ireland; but the Lombard College, although too small to accommodate the number of students at the date mentioned, remains still in the possession of the Irish, an enduring monument of the good and great work done for their country.

The institution now known as the Irish College was built by Dr. Laurence Kelly, in the Rue de Cheval Vert, in the year 1777. This excellent priest, with extraordinary energy, collected the necessary funds for the building of a large and commodious college, which he saw completed; but the anxiety and labor entailed by so great a work brought him to an early grave in 1777, deeply lamented by his children, for whom he had made so many sacrifices. His remains lie buried in the chapel under the high altar. The Irish were now in possession of two important colleges, the Collège des Lombards and the Collège des Irlandais. The street in which the latter college is situated was changed into Rue des Irlandais, in honor of the Irish, by the municipal authorities of Paris. All the Irish priests who were at this time studying in Paris remained in the Collège des Lombards, while the younger students passed into the Collège des Irlandais. Both communities lived side by side till the year 1792, when they were dispersed during the Reign of Terror.

It required more than ordinary capacity to preserve both institutions in safety through the troubled times of the Revolution; but at this critical juncture they were in the hands of two devoted Irish priests, who for years braved danger, and even death, to guard the sacred care entrusted to them. Dr. Walsh had been appointed Superior of the Irish College, Nantes, 1779, but was transferred to the Lombard College by the Archbishop of Paris, at the request of the bishops of Ireland, in 1787. He remained in Paris throughout the Revolution, and on more than one occasion saved the Irish property from certain destruction. At a time when priests fled from France in hundreds he was assisting the Vicar-General of Paris in his arduous duties, and was entrusted with spiritual interests of the highest kind in the archbishop's council. Dr. Kearney was appointed Superior of

the Irish College in the Rue des Irlandais, from which place, he declares, he was pursued on one occasion with unexampled fury by the excited mob, and narrowly escaped with his life.

Every student of French history has heard of the Abbé Edgeworth, who assisted Louis XVI. in his last moments on the scaffold. His life, so noble, so self-sacrificing, so full of thrilling incident and hair-breadth escapes from the fury of the Revolutionists, is even at this day very interesting reading. His zeal for the spiritual interests of the King was so great that he had engaged with his countryman, the Abbé Kearney, Superior of the Irish College, that both should assist the unfortunate Louis at the scaffold. After this tragedy the Abbé Kearney spent three years in the Temple, and after his release was frequently thrown into prison; but amid all his trials he never flinched in his resolution to guard the Irish property entrusted to his care.

In 1790 a decree was passed by which all ecclesiastical property in France was confiscated. Dr. Walsh, at this crisis, drew up an able document on behalf of the Irish, English and Scotch colleges, claiming exemption on the ground that they were British property. The petition was heard, and a decree passed in the National Assembly by which the Lombard College and the Irish College were saved.

In the year 1793 the property of nations at war with France was ordered to be sold, a law which was sternly executed in most cases. The fate of the Irish colleges seemed to be sealed. This time, however, an exemption was claimed, probably on the ground that they were of French origin and under French protection. The exemption was granted, and the Irish colleges were once more saved from destruction.

Any reference to the great Irishmen who, by their brilliant talents and military genius, added lustre to the French army in the eighteenth century would be out of place in the history of an ecclesiastical college. One, however, deserves notice, as being a student of the Irish College who subsequently entered the military school of St. Cyr. This young man was a brother of General Corbett, whom he had followed into France in boyhood. Out of five hundred students who competed for high military position from the school of St. Cyr, he obtained first place.

The Irish College remained closed to Irish students from 1792 to 1800. It was opened, indeed, in 1794, amid circumstances that must be considered strange for an ecclesiastical college.

For some time the Abbé McDermott had conducted an academy for the education of young men in St. Germain-en-Laye, which was afterwards removed to Paris. In this academy were numbered sons of the most distinguished families in France—Eugene Beauharnais, Jerome Bonaparte, Champagny, afterwards Duke de Cadore ; one of the Perigaux, whose sisters married Lafitte and Marshal Marmont. The Abbé McDermott was permitted to carry on his academy in the Irish College, which served for a long time as the scene of gaiety and pleasure and festive cheer. To preserve any kind of discipline in this lay academy in troubled times was beyond the power of the good Abbé. "If, however," says one who was there, "we were not devout or spiritual in our studies, we distinguished ourselves as gentlemen. The College was the centre of elegance and gaiety. Twice a week we gave balls, at which we were honored with the presence of the highest and the most celebrated women of the day. Our festivities were graced by Josephine, the good, the amiable, the excellent, the kind-hearted ; by Madame Recamier ; by Madame Tallien, afterwards Princess of Chimay, and other celebrities, as well as by the pupils of Madame Lemoine, whose establishment for the education of young ladies was the most distinguished in Paris. Vestris was the director of our balls. It was a jolly time, but could not last forever."

Such were the scenes enacted in the Irish College for more than five years, when at length Dr. Walsh obtained a decree from Napoleon, then First Consul, re-establishing the Irish College as an ecclesiastical institution. At this time the funds of the English and Scotch colleges were so reduced that the students of all three nations lived in the Irish College from 1803 to 1815. Dr. Walsh was appointed Superior of the *Établissements Britanniques*. The improvements effected by Dr. Walsh in the Irish College were such that it was considered one of the most respectable institutions in France. On account of the war it was impossible for Irish students to come to Paris, whereupon Napoleon invited some of the old Irish families in France to send their sons to occupy the vacant bourses, while at the same time some of the old French nobility sent their sons as pensioners. After the return of Napoleon from Rome twenty priests were released from imprisonment, some Irish, some Italian, and were sent to the Irish College, where they were kindly received. Thus students and priests of various nationalities fraternized within the Irish College, and things went on smoothly, when an event occurred which threatened to have serious consequences. This was the appoint-

ment by the *Bureau de Surveillance* (Committee of Superintendence), acting for the Minister of Public Instruction, of an unworthy administrator of the Irish property in Paris in the person of the Rev. Mr. Ferris. This man had followed Napoleon in his Italian campaign, and was seen on the field of battle, not administering spiritual consolations, but as a captain urging his men to the conflict. He was, during his life, more of a combatant than of a peacemaker, more a soldier than a priest. He had challenged the Minister of Public Instruction, Hely d'Oissel, himself the son of an Irishman, to a duel with swords; but in answer to this challenge he soon found himself suddenly transported fifty leagues from the metropolis. This was the man appointed to the office of administrator of the Irish foundations in France at a time when the Irish hierarchy could not be consulted. Being well aware of his unpopularity with the Irish students, he did not reside in the Irish College, but took up his quarters in the English College, and appointed as his substitute Dr. Patrick MacMahon, a medical doctor, who lived in the Superior's rooms in the Irish College. In 1814 the Irish hierarchy sent out, as their administrator, Dr. Long, President of the lay house, Maynooth; but in the following year, after Napoleon's escape from Elba, Mr. Ferris, by his intrigues, procured his own appointment and the dismissal of Dr. Long. He was, however, obliged to retire after a few months. In the year 1820 Mr. Ferris comes upon the scene again, and is appointed administrator for the third time; but in the same year he suddenly disappears, never to be heard of again in connection with the Irish College.

In 1818 a royal decree was issued declaring that the Irish and Scotch Colleges should no longer exist, on the ground of insufficient funds. This decree, which was passed without any intimation being given to the Superiors of these institutions, caused great sensation. Dr. Walsh at once prepared an able statement, signed by the Superiors and students of all three colleges, proving the adequacy of the funds, and containing a touching appeal on behalf of these venerable institutions that had escaped amid so many reverses of fortune. The appeal was heard and the royal decree reversed, and thus the Irish College was a third time saved from destruction.

The long period of tranquillity that followed has been attended with the best consequences for the Irish College. Some of the most prominent members of the hierarchy in Ireland have been professors or students of the Irish College within these years. His Eminence, Cardinal Logue, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate

of all Ireland, was Professor of Theology in that institution for many years, during which he acquired that profound knowledge and wisdom which have distinguished him in his exalted dignity. The great and patriotic Archbishop of Cashel was some fifty years ago a student of the Irish College. Two of its *alumni* were consecrated bishops within the last year—Dr. Kelly, Bishop of Ross, and Dr. MacSherry, bishop of Port Elizabeth. The learned Bishop of Killaloe, the late Bishop of Elphin, and the Bishops of Ross for several generations, were educated within its walls. Separated from these by long intervals of time, we read some great names. For example, the Irish historians Keating and MacGeoghegan; O'Halloran and Messingham; the author of the "Florilegium"; the learned Morus, Superior of the Collège de Navarre and Rector of the University of Paris, profoundly versed in Hebrew, Greek and Latin, and considered by Pope Clement XI. as the most learned man of his time; Malachy O'Queely, Archbishop of Tuam; the famous Dr. Maginn, coadjutor Bishop of Derry, and Dr. Plunkett, Bishop of Meath. Since the year 1858 the administration of the Irish College has been given by the Irish hierarchy to the Irish Fathers of the Congregation of the Mission, whose zeal and ability in the direction of the college are producing the best fruits. Since that time the number of students has been considerably over one hundred, but in recent years, owing to temporary demands upon the college, the numbers have decreased. The course comprises two years' philosophy and four years' theology. All the professors are Irish priests of the Congregation of the Mission, with, generally, one or two secular priests. The first rector under the new administration was Dr. Lynch. He was consecrated bishop in 1866, and ruled the united dioceses of Kildare and Leighlin for over thirty years. Dr. M'Cabe was rector for a year and a half, when he was appointed by the Sovereign Pontiff to the See of Ardagh. To him succeeded the Very Rev. Thomas MacNamara, the author of many works of the highest value to ecclesiastics. When Fr. MacNamara retired in 1889 the Irish bishops appointed the present rector, the Very Rev. Patrick O'Boyle, C.M., to whose great ability and profound learning the Irish Church is indebted for the wise government of this time-honored institution.

"The students educated in Paris," writes one who knew them well, "have been remarkable for their purity, and many amongst them have been, and still are, distinguished members of the episcopate. The little colony still possesses the house their countrymen built a hundred years ago, and still inhabits the Quartier Latin,

which gave them such a hospitable reception amidst the troubles of the sixteenth century ; and if they feel any regret in their present habitation, it is to see the venerable institutions of this portion of the city rapidly disappear from around them. The *Montagne Ste.-Geneviève*, which from the twelfth century was the seat of all the learning and piety of Paris, and which was formerly covered thick with the different colleges and monasteries which composed the University, is now the most abandoned portion of the city. All the monasteries were destroyed at the Revolution, and many of the colleges have since been pulled down. The celebrated Abbey of St. Victor, where the University of Paris may be said to have commenced, where Abelard held his famous discussion with William of Champeaux, and where St. Thomas of Canterbury and many other saints resided when they came to Paris, has been demolished to make room for the great wine stores, the 'Halles aux Vins.' The venerable Abbey of St. Geneviève, which is in part standing, has been transformed into one of the government schools of Paris, the Lyceé Napoleon. The great Carmelite Abbey, whose pious inmates labored hard to sanctify the students of the University and secure them against the dangers of the metropolis, has disappeared, and its site is occupied by a new market, 'Halles des fermes.' The well-known monastery of the Jacobins or Dominicans, where the royal family of France sought their confessors for over three hundred years, and whose modest, unpretending church, where St. Thomas often preached, possessed more royal tombs than the Abbey of St. Denis, is now no longer to be found. It is with difficulty we can discover even the site. All these hallowed abodes of learning and piety, with many others besides, were close to the Irish College ; and as we visit these ancient localities, and pass along the narrow streets, with their rough pavement, we feel that we are treading the very ways where passed Saint Bernard and Saint Louis, Saint Bonaventure and Saint Thomas, Saint Francis Xavier and Saint Ignatius, Saint Francis de Sales and St. Vincent de Paul. But even these old streets are fast disappearing to make room for the modern boulevards, and soon the old Quartier Latin will have lost all its peculiar features. It is a strange circumstance that, while of all the religious communities which dwelt here when Father Lee and his companions arrived in the sixteenth century not one now remains, the little colony of strangers alone should have held its ground."

It would be ungenerous to close this brief account of the Irish College without testifying the gratitude due to the great country

which for three centuries and a half received Irish exiles with welcome and kindness, and helped to educate priests for Ireland during a long and cheerless period in her religious history. Even in the evil days of her sorrow and affliction, France showed consideration for Irish ecclesiastics which was denied to many. France, whether royalist, revolutionist, or republican, has been the undying friend of Ireland. The Catholic children of Erin, whether at home, in America, or any other part of the globe, will never forget how much they owe to that great and glorious nation.

Such is a brief history of this old establishment. The Alma Mater of so many devout and heroic children has survived all the sister institutions that once formed the greatest university in Christendom. Even the most sanguine of her children could scarcely have anticipated, in the days of her trials, that her career should be so blessed and prosperous. She is still full of the hope of youth, exulting in her glorious past, ardent with the hope of a great future.

THE RESTORATION OF CATHOLICITY IN GENEVA.

THE well-known writer, François Coppee, in an article recently published in one of the more literary French dailies, has given a sketch as *spirituelle* as true to nature of a certain visit once paid by him to that strange mixture of pleasure and gloom known alternatively as *Genève la jolie* and *the Protestant Rome*.

"It is in winter," he writes, "beneath a sad and sombre sky, that the Calvinistic Rome reveals its true self; and they do not really know it who have but passed through, as travellers, in the tourist season. What memories, indeed, can they retain of it? A glitter of lake and mountain, sumptuous lake-side hotels, a row of tempting shops in the 'Corraterié,' a crowd of cosmopolitan passengers on the way to Lausanne. That is about all. The memory of Calvin has nothing attractive about it. Few travellers feel tempted to trace the footsteps of the terrible Sectary through the narrow byways of the old town, or beneath the arches of St. Pierré; and the traveller brings away with him only a kind of superficial impression of a fine city situated in a lovely country.

"To feel the cold, intense poetry of the ancient Citadel of Reform one should be there in the very heart of the winter, when the *ryoni* of its temperature is in accordance with that of its local morals, and *when the 'vise' blows as bitterly as a controversial discussion*. Lake Lemman hides itself under a fog, as though its too voluptuous blue might offend Huguenot prudery, and the bare boughs of the surrounding trees are as dry as a theological sermon. That is the time to climb those dark and narrow streets of the 'old town.' Here and there one comes upon some grim, dreary, deserted little square, where, on the stone parapet which ends some rude staircase, one may, with but a slight effort of the imagination, picture to oneself John Calvin himself, with the big clasped Bible under his bony arm, muttering under his pointed beard some malediction levelled alike at libertines and heretics. Here, too, are to be found the Rue des Granges, the Genevan Faubourg St. Germain, where in ancient family mansions dwell rich old men, who all the years through *font des prières et des économies*, say prayers and save money coincidentally.

"Then, if one goes down towards the more modern portion of the town, and joins the active crowd along the more commercial

streets, one recognizes, at least on many faces, the same characteristics of savage austerity. The women, muffled in furs and veils, seem to hide their beauty as if a source of scandal, and at the entrance of the Exchange one observes grave men passing solemnly to and fro, who in reality are bankers discussing the rise and fall of the funds, but who might easily be mistaken for theologians discussing the interpretation of a text."

He goes on to relate how, awaking as usual to a morning of fog and gloom, "une atmosphère de désespoir et de suicide, un abominable brouillard qui sentait la suie et qui pénétrait jusque dans les appartements," a friend comes in with the words, "Would you like to see the sun?" and how, accepting the proposition, the two friends journey out to "la Salève," a mountain at some distance from the town, where sunshine reigns.

The description sounds far-fetched; but we who have had the experience know that it is not so, and that, apart from the somewhat effortful festival of the December "Escalade," the winter home-aspect of Calvin's city is as gloomy as its creed.

Did the sun shine more brightly into its streets, one wonders, when Geneva was *Genève la jolie*? When the chimes of its sevenfold parish bells called the faithful to Mass and Vespersalm, when white-robed Dominican and black Benedictine, sedate Augustinian or humble Franciscan, passed to and fro along her streets, or portioned the alms of a loving Christian charity among its beggars at chapel or hospice door, in the days when city enclosure and fortified walls were not, and the town, or its environs, stretched countrywards at will? It was the "Reforming" Government which, in double defence against Catholic and Savoyard attacks, razed the straggling, sunny suburbs, and enclosed their town in gloomy ramparts and high walls, much at the same time as they introduced—by violence, as is now historically proved—the principles of Zwinglius and Calvin. For, contrary to the generally received impression that the Genevan people spontaneously embraced Protestantism, we now find that, to quote the words of one modern authority, "their resistance was so stubborn that, to overcome it, the town had to be reduced one-half, the more obstinate of the inhabitants expelled, and a large importation of strangers introduced to take their place. These were for the most part adventurers, the very scum of Europe; and even so the town was so deserted, and the number of empty houses so great, that it was difficult to find occupants for them."

The soldiery of Berne sacked, pillaged, destroyed churches, monasteries and private chateaux alike. No less than 140 of the

latter, round Geneva, were burned; so that at the present time no country in Europe is so destitute of any monuments or traces of the past as is the Canton of Geneva. Then, on the track of the "blood and fire" of the gendarmerie and soldiers, came John Calvin, with his rigid laws and inquisitorial "Consistory"; a body of men, part lay and part ecclesiastic, whose emissaries, scattered over the town like spies, had as their mission to watch, to note, to introduce themselves secretly into families and report to the Consistory the sayings and doings of suspected individuals, from servant to master, to note each abstention from sermon or "*cène*"—the test-act of Protestantism—and to denounce all practices savoring of adherence to the ancient faith.

Page after page of the secret annals of the Consistory are filled with reports of recusancy or Catholiding; of women who escaped from time to time to hear Mass at Annecy; of the dying who, in despite of ministerial adjurations, persisted in calling on "Jesus-Maria"! of the *cièrges vénis*, or blessed candles, which the people would cling to and place in the hands of the dying; and of the mothers who carried their children to Catholic parishes for baptism, or to the shrine of some saint to be healed.

Little by little, under the double influence of persecution and worldliness—that self-interest and love of material prosperity which, as in the France of to-day, has over and over again proved more fatal to the faith of the nation than fire or sword—Catholicism in Geneva died out. It was succeeded, gradually but surely, by two inevitable supplanters—immorality and irreligion; so that, towards the middle of the seventeenth century, libertinage and the grossest violation of morals were rife and rampant before the eyes of Europe.

But though Geneva had become, not only by profession but in reality, a thoroughly Protestant city, there still were to be found here and there a family or group of individuals who remained true to the ancient faith. Those who write of this question and period divide the so-called Catholics of that time into three several classes—those who remained inexorably Catholic and refused any participation whatever with Protestantism; those who tried to evade the penalties of non-compliance by a certain outward acquiescence in the existing order of things; and then the larger majority of those who conformed, through fear, to the new religion, while secretly regretting the old. Hard indeed it was for any to escape apostasy. The ministers sent by the Consistory visited each house and inmate, examined all as to their beliefs, and insisted on at least the outward act of participation in the

"*cène*" or communion. Meanwhile the curés of the neighboring villages, and some religious orders, notably the Capucins and the Jesuits, penetrated over and over again into the city, in disguise, and carried on as best they might their holy work of encouraging and supporting the remnant of the faithful. The Bishops of Annecy, Bishops of Geneva as they still held title to be, watched anxiously and prayerfully over their separated flock, dealt cordially and encouragingly with such as from time to time sought counsel from them, from the oft perplexed and wavering laymen to the still more doubting Calvinistic ministers who from time to time would come half to argue, half to question or seek light.

Many conversions are recorded from time to time ; and not a few records, full of interest, remain, of religious vocation or courageous rescue from the ranks of heresy, although not only the presence of a priest and the saying of Mass, but even the sale of a cross, a crucifix, a rosary, a Catholic book, were forbidden within the precincts of the town.

The advent of a French diplomatic resident—appointed by Louis XIV. of France in 1679, in place of the Swiss representative or consul, as we should call it now, who had hitherto acted under French orders on behalf of France—gave a further impetus to Catholicism among the Genevans, as the first to hold that post, a certain M. de Chauvigny, established an Embassy Chapel immediately on his arrival, and insisted on its being thrown open to the public, in spite of the indignant protestations of the Genevan Government.

For one hundred years this chapel—where Mass was first publicly said on November 30, 1679—continued to be the sole representative of Catholicism in Geneva, and was a centre, on the one hand, for all the scattered Catholics of various nationalities who now found themselves enabled to attend Mass and frequent the Sacraments openly, though not altogether unmolested, as we read of stone-throwing and other insults freely indulged in by the populace at the expense of the little Catholic congregation, and, on the other hand, of a constant irritated watchfulness on the part of the town authorities, who vainly issued orders to their subordinates to "prevent the townspeople from going to the sermons *chez M. le Resident.*"

Long after the establishment of the Resident's Chapel the Genevan Consistory continued to take note, by their spies, of the number of those who frequented or even entered it ; and we are told that on one occasion two, and on another three, hundred persons were seen leaving the chapel after Mass, while at one Christ-

mas Midnight Mass "there were a number of people, notably several washerwomen belonging to the town."

Towards the end of the eighteenth century, the Court of Turin, following the example of that of France, sent also an Official Resident to Geneva; a measure which involved the opening of a second chapel, and more facilities still for Catholic worship. Such was the state of things when, in 1792, the storm of Revolution burst over Europe; Geneva, already imbued with revolutionary ideas, and under the protectorate of France, was incorporated into French territory, and passed under the sway of the Directory on the 15th of April, 1798.

Thirty-nine years before that date, in a little village lying at the foot of that very mountain of "la Salève" to which the writer quoted in our opening pages was invited by his friend to "come and see the sun," a fourth son among six children was born to a humble but comfortably circumstanced peasant family of Collonges-sur-Salève. The father, Jacques Vuarin, kept a small shop, and, without being an educated man himself, had a great reverence for education and learning, and was much esteemed by his neighbors both for probity and intelligence, while his wife, Antoinette, was quoted as the model of a Christian wife and mother. "Happy the men who possess such mothers!" exclaims her son's biographer; and in the light of recent theories which trace from the mothers of great men their many hereditary aptitudes, one cannot but ascribe to her who placed "duty before all things" some share in the future virtues of her son's grand apostolate.

Jean François Vuarin, then, was born on the 10th of June, 1769; the birth-year of Napoleon, of Chateaubriand, and of Cuvier; a coincidence which in after life he would sometimes recall in conversation. Together with his elder brother François, he was early destined by his father for the priesthood, and after receiving some first lessons from their village priest the two boys were sent to a Josephite college at Nantua. We are told that François was considered to possess more talent than his younger brother; but a certain difficulty of speech hindered to some extent his advancement in life, and he lived and died in obscurity as curé of a remote Savoyard village. Jean François, on the other hand, was a lively, excitable, somewhat petulant boy, so "impetuous" as to alarm his father for his future. Their good priest and preceptor, however, consoled the parents by pointing out that the boy was recollected and devout in church, loved prayer, and had a perfect horror of sin. It is told of him, indeed, that on one occasion he insisted upon his father dismissing a servant who was

in the habit of swearing ; and, again, that when, one day, he was driving a flock of sheep, he treated them so roughly that his father asked him "whether, when he became a priest, he would treat his flock thus harshly"? "Oh, don't be afraid," replied the boy ; "when I am a priest I shall know how to lead men"! And so in truth he did.

On leaving the Josephite college, the brothers passed two years at that of La Roche, and then went through a course of philosophy at Annecy. Here, in an atmosphere still fully charged with the sanctity of him whose spirit has for three hundred years been the life of the Church in Savoy, young Vuarin drank deep of the secrets of the inner life, and was judged to be so promising a student by his superiors that they urged him to pass a term at the Sorbonne in Paris. Thither he accordingly went, lodging at the famous Seminary of St. Sulpice, and following the courses of lectures at the Sorbonne, where he soon rose to the front rank among the students, and was chosen, as one of their best men, to sustain two public scholastic disputes, choosing as his subject the Incarnation. He duly passed his degree as licentiate in Theology, and then returned to Annecy, where he received deacons' orders on the 22d of September, 1792, the very day on which the invading French army crossed the frontier of his country.

For the storm was about to burst ; the Revolution had begun, and the Reign of Terror was at their gates. Savoy was invaded, and converted, by force of arms, into "the eighty-fourth department of France, under the name of Mont Blanc." Those Savoyards who refused to take oath of allegiance to the constitution,—the well-known writer, Joseph de Maistre, among them,—were fleeing into voluntary exile, and priests were hunted, altars thrown down, churches destroyed, in the path of the invaders as they advanced. The infamous oath of allegiance was exacted from such priests as fell into the hands of the revolutionists, and some few, as in France, became *prêtres constitutionnels*, only to receive the further insults of their captors to add to the scorn of the faithful ; but for the most part the Savoyard clergy stood faithful, and chose but between exile and the guillotine, or a penal servitude almost worse than death, in the galleys at Cayenne.

Our young abbé Vuarin had, with some other priests, taken refuge in Geneva ; and having as yet received only deacons' orders, he turned his comparative safety to account by undertaking a most dangerous mission—that of acting as messenger and intermediary between the refugee ecclesiastics in Geneva and their brethren in hiding in Savoy. He devoted himself spontaneously,

too, to an even more delicate mission—that of visiting and bringing back to the fold the unhappy apostates, or “*prêtres assermentés*,” whose moment of weakness had caused their fall; and his superiors noted with approbation the discretion, prudence and zeal with which the young deacon accomplished his task. He wandered over Savoy in various disguises—as a merchant, a traveller, or an official—and rode so well, and bore his republican cockade and military cloak with such a swagger, that none suspected in the lively young soldier a humble village deacon. His presence of mind, too, stood him in good stead; as on one occasion we learn that as he was riding through the Chablais district, in soldier’s uniform, as usual, he stopped at an inn at Douvaine to rest awhile. Presently up came two gendarmes, and he guessed, with truth, that they were in search of himself; so, calling gayly to one of them as he prepared to mount, “Citizen,” said he, “will you do me the service of holding this animal while I mount? He is as wicked as the devil”! The horse in fact happened to be a specially wild and ungovernable one. The good-natured gendarme sprang to the bridle, the *republican soldier* vaulted into the saddle and was off like an arrow, leaving the pair standing to gaze after that fine soldier and accomplished horseman whom they had helped on his way. Then, remembering their own business there, they turned to the landlady of the inn, and asked if she could tell them where to lay their hands on a certain *calotin* called Vuarin, whom they had been sent to arrest. “But yes,” she answered, “it is the very man whom you have been helping to mount”!! Needless to say that by this time the *beau cavalier* was far out of sight. In after life M. Vuarin was wont to relate this little episode with great gusto, as one of his “narrow escapes.”

But we must give a word of explanation as to the ecclesiastical organization of this troublous period. Monseigneur Paget, titular Bishop of Geneva, and residing at Annecy like all the Genevan Bishops since the “Reform,” had, on the invasion of Savoy, retired to Turin, whence he administered the affairs of the diocese as best he might, by correspondence, and provided a retreat for such of his exiled priests as could avail themselves of it.

While the French Convention abolished the ancient Savoyard Bishoprics, and established a “See of Mont Blanc,” into which they introduced one of the unhappy schismatic “Evêques Constitutionnels” who were the scandal of the Church in France, the laity, almost with one accord, kept faithful to their ancient Faith, and that sad yet touchingly beautiful period in history which has, perhaps, never been sufficiently portrayed, began, in which, in

the absence of their pastors, the most respected among the old men, or the more pious and learned laymen in each parish, presided over the meetings of the faithful, held in secret, in some remote barn or farm-building. Here these "elders of the people" read prayers, or part of the Ordinary of the Mass, and gave out the approaching feast or fast days and other notices, while the bravest youths in the parish stood on guard, like sentinels, ready to give notice at the approach of the persecutors. Sometimes, but on rare occasions, some hunted priest would appear among them, and pass from house to house saying Mass or administering the Sacraments, while the *prêtres assermentés* were left to their empty churches, and covered with deserved ignominy.

To return, however, to the Swiss portion of the diocese, as we may call it. One of the three Vicars-General appointed by Mgr. Bigex to administer in his place took refuge at Lausanne, and, joined by some of his confrères, devoted himself to the work of directing, sheltering and assisting the devoted missionaries—for such they were—who wandered in disguise throughout the country to administer the Sacraments to the faithful; and it was under his guidance, and in aid of his apostolic work, that the young abbé Vuarin rode hither and thither, in various disguises, to bear orders, give directions, bring news, recall the wandering sheep of the flock, and generally act as spiritual aide-de-camp to his superior, M. Bigex.

After Robespierre's fall, and when the extreme virulence of persecution had a little relaxed, two more Vicars-General were sent to Savoy, and one of them, M. Dubouloz, immediately entered into relations with the young deacon-abbé, whom he made his secretary. In 1795 the exiled Bishop sent, from Turin, a most touching pastoral, said to recall in its language and spirit that of early Christian times, in which he divided his diocese into twenty-five districts, to be visited in due order by missionaries and supplementary lay workers; and this pastoral it became M. Vuarin's duty to "colporter," or carry about secretly, and deliver it in safety to the scattered priests in hiding all over Savoy.

One of the objects which the good Vicars-General had most at heart was the conversion of those unhappy men whom ambition or fear had caused to become *prêtres assermentés*, or juring-priests; and an example of our young deacon's energy in this respect is too typical to be altogether omitted. The "Constitutional" Bishop of Mont Blanc—as the title ran—was at this time a certain M. Panisset, formerly curé of St. Pierre-d'Albigny, a man whose somewhat Jansenistic opinions in the first place, and his morose

discontent over some want of advancement in the second, had rendered an easy victim to the flattery or arguments of the government officials. He had received, from three unauthorized bishops, a sacrilegious ordination, and, installed upon the very throne of St Francis of Sales, at Annecy, fulminated pseudo-pastorals and literary pamphlets against the exiled hierarchy.

One of his former, and still faithful friends, M. Perrin, a Canon of Chambéry, in exile at Lausanne, thought, however, that traces of remorse were to be found in the private letters which he continued to exchange with the apostate bishop, and conceived a bold plan for his conversion, in concert with the new Vicar-General, Dubouloz. M. Panisset was invited by letter to a conference with M. Bigex (chief Vicar-General at Lausanne), to take place in the Château of the Marquis de Sales. He accepted, and MM. Dubouloz and Vuarin repaired there, disguised as oil merchants, to meet him. M. Panisset arrived at the rendezvous dressed as a layman, and was received most respectfully and genially by *the two oil merchants*, who handed him a letter from M. Bigex, expressing regrets that on account of some new laws he could not cross the frontier into Savoy, and begging M. Panisset to come as far as Plainpalais (on the outskirts of Geneva) to meet him. The bishop demurred, but his visitors urged compliance, and a ready-saddled horse was brought up, on which M. Panisset reluctantly mounted. The little party set out, Vicar-General in front, M. Panisset behind him on horseback, and M. Vuarin in the rear, giving a sly cut at the legs of the episcopal steed whenever its rider slackened speed and looked backwards irresolutely! Finally they arrived at Plainpalais, tired, and covered with mud, only to find another—prearranged—letter from M. Bigex, to the effect that the Genevan Government having just forbidden any Catholic priest to enter its territory, M. Bigex conjured his visitor, in the name of God, to come on *just as far as Lausanne!*

More hesitation on the part of M. Panisset; more entreaties and persuasion from the two priests; and finally the three crossed Lake Lemman and arrived at Lausanne. Here an imposing group awaited them. MM. de Thiollaz and Besson, Vicars-General of Annecy, M. de Belmont, Vicar-General of Nimes, M. Perrin, the Chambéry Canon, and more than forty other priests, all exiles and confessors of the faith. M. Bigex addressed the newcomer in language which, though respectful and even affectionate, was "as energetic as that of St. Peter to Ananias"; and the unhappy apostate, falling at his feet, asked pardon of the Church, with tears and sobs, for his sins of usurpation and apostasy. His repentance

was sincere. He afterwards published a thorough and humble retraction of his errors, which was published and sent broadcast throughout Switzerland, Savoy, France, and Piedmont, and did all that lay in him to repair in every way the evil he had wrought. He finally became curé of a village in Lower Savoy, and made a good and edifying end. M. Vuarin never forgot this incident, and in relating it in after years was wont to speak of it playfully as "the rape of M. Panisset."

It was now felt that so earnest and so capable a worker in the sacred cause should no longer remain in the ranks of the diaconate, and accordingly on the 10th of June, 1797, Jean François Vuarin was ordained priest by the Bishop of Lausanne and Fribourg, in the Chapel of St. Michael's College in the latter town, popularly called the Chapel of Père Canisius (now beatified as B. Peter Canisius; S.J.). We need hardly say with what renewed zeal he left the long Retreat in which he had prepared his soul for that solemn moment, nor how ardently he set out again upon his missionary labors in the land of his birth. As he continued to act as M. Dubouloz's secretary and general aide-de-camp, he was attached to no special district, but journeyed to and fro, visiting, teaching, encouraging, from village to village, and from town to town. Towards the end of the same year, the bitter feeling of anti-Christian Revolutionists broke out in fresh and violent persecutions; and the diocese within which Geneva lay, whose priests had almost taken up a normal existence and were living there in great numbers, was particularly attacked. Within a comparatively short period no less than ninety-seven priests, in this one diocese alone, were imprisoned or banished. Many of them, first imprisoned at Chambéry and then drafted on to Rochefort or La Rochelle, were treated with the greatest severity; loaded with chains, half-strangled, dragged along the streets and roads manacled like convicts, insulted and exposed to every kind of outrage. We may judge of M. Vuarin's distress when his beloved master and friend, M. Dubouloz, was, after long search, seized at Thonon by the gendarmes and conveyed to Chambéry. He soon managed, in his ever energetic way, to resume relations with the saintly prisoner; and after in vain attempting to procure his release, he devoted all his energies to collecting money for the benefit of the various priests detained and suffering want in the prisons of the French Republic. His quest was a successful one, and he was enabled, during the continuance of the Reign of Terror, to pass on the alms of the faithful, all committed to his discretion for distribution, to the many suffering ecclesiastics in the prisons of Chambéry,

Grenoble and Bourg, Rochefort, Oléron, La Rochelle, Rhé, and the convict settlement of Cayenne. The island of Rhé alone, where his beloved M. Dubouloz was confined, received from him nearly 12,000 francs. This painful state of things came gradually to an end during the dawning of a new *régime*, the "Consulate"; and, some pardoned, some discreetly allowed to escape, the imprisoned priests returned one by one to freedom and friends again.

About the year 1799 it appeared to the religious authorities and ecclesiastical chiefs of the diocese that the time had now come for taking some steps towards the re-establishment of the Church in Geneva. As the French *émigré* priests in England helped to pave the way for the restoration of the hierarchy in that land by accustoming its people to the presence and gentle influence of these confessors of the faith, so Geneva the intolerant, erewhile breathing death and destruction to Catholic or ecclesiastic, had become, during the Reign of Terror, a place of refuge and a centre for correspondence to the exiled Savoyard priests. M. Vuarin himself had his *piéd à terre* there, and resumed important correspondence, under a feigned name, to this and that friendly address within the city.

As we have already remarked, there had always remained a certain number of Genevan families who were true to the ancient faith, and who had hailed with joy the advent of French and Piedmontese Residents which enabled them to hear Mass within the city, instead of being, as their enemies duly recorded, among that "multitude of people who escape on Sundays from Geneva and go to hear Mass in the neighboring Catholic parishes, notably in that of Monnetier"; but the Revolution, which had incorporated Geneva into French territory, had at the same time suppressed Residents and Residents' Chapels; so that after September 25, 1792, when the Piedmontese Resident left, and April 15, 1798, when Geneva was formally joined to France, its state resembled that of former times. Many and many an exiled priest, indeed, passed through, or even took refuge in, a city which had before been a centre for political and theological malcontents from many countries; and often, as we believe, must the Holy Sacrifice have been celebrated in secret within its walls by many a heroic confessor or future martyr.

When, then, persecution relaxed with the dawn of Napoleon's Consulate, the Vicars-General who ruled the diocese from Lausanne began to take steps for its reorganization, and to this end they designated a certain young confessor of the faith, lately escaped from his prison in the island of Rhé (where he had been

the companion of M. Dubouloz, M. Neyne by name, a man with "the heart of an apostle and the daily life of a saint," as was said of him, to become the first Missionary Priest of Geneva, and with him, as coadjutor, M. Vuarin.

To find a spot fitted for Catholic worship—to say Mass in public, amidst throngs of violent and unapproachable Calvinists, for the first time for more than two hundred years, unsupported by authority from without; to gather in a number of scattered, timid, wavering Catholics, and this without rousing the animosity of their fellow-townsmen—surely this was no easy task! M. Neyne and M. Vuarin set to work. They hired, first, a room in what is now called "the old town," the very heart and kernel of the city, and set to work to arrange it as an oratory. No sooner, however, had the landlord heard who were his tenants, and what they proposed to do, than he turned them out, promptly, and the two missionaries were forced to search elsewhere. Then they took a large room near the Place Molard, whose chief inconvenience appeared to be its extreme publicity; and here again, arranging a modest altar with a cross and some candlesticks, they prepared to open their oratory for public worship. The first Mass was announced for Christmas Day, and, when the morning came, lo! from every quarter of the town came worshippers, until not only the room itself, but the stairs, the road, the Place Molard, all were filled with an eager, pious crowd. But the landlord of this second chapel took alarm like the first, and requested his tenants to "move on." A third room was taken, not far off; and this time, while the faithful flocked joyously to their new place of worship, Protestant champions took fright, and incited the populace to attack the little chapel. One Sunday, as M. Vuarin was about to mount the altar steps, an infuriated crowd collected outside the building, pelted its inmates with stones and bottles, and threatened to throw the priests into the Rhone. The civil authorities had to be called in to restore order, and they advised, or requested, the two missionaries to retire temporarily from the town and to close their oratory. They accordingly left their present quarters and openly quitted the town, only to return in secret and set to work about a new oratory in a less conspicuous part of the town. A fourth room, and then a fifth, were successively hired, taken possession of, and wrested again from them, till any less persevering—we might almost say obstinate—men would have given up the affair in disgust. But M. Vuarin, at all events, was of too soldierly a mind ever to own himself beaten; and a sixth room was hired, in a building belonging to the Manège, or Riding

School, of the town, the proprietor of which ingeniously kept things quiet by taking upon himself to *close the doors* as soon as he considered that the apartment was becoming too full!

We should add that, besides this public oratory or chapel, Mass continued to be said in various private houses by passing or temporary missionaries up to the time when, chiefly through the exertions of M. Vuarin, the Genevan Government was forced to recognize the needs of its Catholic subjects, and reluctantly to hand over an ancient building—the now famous Church of St. Germain—for their use.

While these changes were taking place within the city, far greater ones were occurring in the political world without. Geneva was occupied by a French, and therefore Catholic, garrison, ruled by French Catholic authorities, and named *chef-lieu*, or chief town, of a more or less Catholic Canton. She was now to follow the fortunes of her conquerors in other wise. The Concordat of 1801 between First Consul Napoleon and the Holy See involved a radical change in church administration; the actual bishops were obliged to resign their sees, dioceses were remodelled and enlarged, and among them that of Geneva, which was merged in the Archdiocese of Chambéry.

But the cession—or rather restoration to its rightful owners—of the Church of St. Germain is too important a matter to be passed over in a few words. It was, as we have said, thanks to the French occupation of Geneva that the claim of its Catholic residents to a more fitting place of worship than some humble room in a back street of the city was thought fit to be considered; and France, still Catholic, even under the First Consul, spoke through her Prefect in demanding (at the instance of M. Vuarin) a fitting and decent place of worship for the Catholics of Geneva, both civil and military. A body called the “*Société Economique*” appears to have held supreme power over the ecclesiastical buildings of the city, and after infinite discussions and difficulties, and many tentative propositions, such as to build a new church for the Catholics on the one hand, or to relegate them to a sort of vault or wine-cellar on the other, the old Church of St. Germain was finally *let* to the Catholic body for a period of five years only, at a fixed rent. We may as well explain here that on the expiration of these five years, in 1808, the Society, to avoid further expenses of separation from the somewhat dilapidated fabric, handed over the church, rent free, to the Catholics, for “as long as they might require it, on condition that they kept it in good repair and paid the taxes.”

To return, then, to the year 1803. The Church of St. Germain was handed over in a completely empty and unfurnished state to the Catholic body in Geneva, and a small sum of money furnished by the government, to which the alms of the faithful—we note in particular a gift from the First Consul of France, of altar vases and ornaments—were added; enabling the Archbishop of Chambéry Mgr. Mérinville, to buy an altar from the former Carthusian Monastery at Ripaille, another, found somewhere as treasure-trove and left at the Genevan Prefecture, and various necessary objects; while the government presented some sacred pictures which apparently were going a-begging, having been offered to and refused by the Town Museum. A large marble *bénitier*, or holy-water stoup, found lying forgotten in one corner of a marble-mason's yard, was likewise bought and placed in the renovated building; after which humble preparations, the priest whom Mgr. Mérinville had named First Curé of Geneva, blessed and restored the building to Catholic worship on Sunday, the 16th of October, 1803. Some days later Mgr. Paget, the retiring and last titular Bishop of Geneva, paid a farewell visit to his former flock, formally blessed the church, and said Mass there—his last episcopal act ere retiring to the solitude of his native town, St. Julien, where, seven years after, he died.

While M. Lacoste, the first curé of Geneva, was setting things in order in his new parish, M. Neyne, the former coadjutor of M. Vuarin, being appointed his vicaire, the latter was summoned to Chambéry to fill the post of secretary to the Archbishop, a post for which he was singularly well fitted. He wrote quickly, clearly, and well, and his previous experiences had fitted him for dealing promptly, yet judiciously, with every variety of character. The sole complaint, in fact, ever made of the young secretary, was that at times he was slightly intractable; an amusing example of which is left on record. It appears that after the battle of Austerlitz the Prefect of the department notified the then Archbishop, Mgr. de Solle, that it was desired that the bulletins announcing the imperial victory should be read out by the various parish priests on Sunday in their churches. The prelate remarked on the impropriety of this profane announcement being made from the pulpit, but yielded to the request, and desired M. Vuarin to draw up a circular requiring all parish priests to read the Imperial bulletins at the door of their churches after service. On the following Sunday no communication was made by the various curés, and the Prefect laid a complaint before the Archbishop. The latter, sending for M. Vuarin, inquired whether he had not sent out the circular in

question. "No, Monseigneur!" "What have you done with it, then?" "For your honor and that of the Church, I have burnt it!" replied the indomitable secretary, coolly. The Archbishop appears to have let the matter rest, only remarking to some one, *à propos* of his wilful secretary, "It is a good thing that he is pious, otherwise he would be unmanageable!"

The task set before these first Archbishops and their secretaries was indeed too heavy a one to allow of much carping at trifles—four original dioceses to be merged into one (Savoy, Maurienne, Tarentase, Gex), priests appointed to every parish, the "constitutional priests" reconciled to the Church, parish registers and irregular records of important acts, such as baptisms and marriages, to be put in order, Canon Law harmonized with the new *régime*, churches, chapels, presbyteries to be rebuilt or restored; schools to be founded; in fact the whole mechanism of Church government to be put in working order. Mgr. de Mérimville had soon found his failing strength unequal to the task, and resigned his post, to which the Bishop of Digné, Mgr. de Solle, succeeded early in 1805; and only six days after the new bishop had taken possession of his See he found himself called upon to receive two illustrious visitors; first the newly-crowned Emperor, on his way from Paris, where he had been crowned, to Milan, where the famous Iron Crown of Lombardy was to be placed on his brow; then, four days later, the saintly Pope, Pius VII., rested likewise at Chambéry on his return from the coronation ceremony; and our youthful secretary had the supreme felicity of kneeling at the feet and receiving the blessing of the venerable Pontiff.

While the young abbé Vuarin was working, with his bishops, at the reorganization of the newly-found diocese, M. Lacoste, in Geneva, was growing gradually discouraged by the persistent hostility which he felt and saw around him. He was a holy and gentle priest, too gracious, too timid, perhaps, for the "vanguard of the army" which a priest in that "Protestant Rome" was virtually to hold, and before very long he placed his resignation in the bishop's hands. Mgr. de Solle knew well who was the one man to brave the difficulties of the situation, the ravings of Calvinistic ministers, the cold disdain of the laity, the open hostility of the Genevese aristocracy, and the half-hearted support of French officials. He named his own secretary, Jean François Vuarin.

As he knelt to receive his bishop's parting benediction, the young abbé bowed his head in fullest, humblest acceptance of the work which God, by the hand of His minister, was imposing upon him; and on rising he addressed the Archbishop with the words:

“In verbo tuo laxabo nete.” (At thy word I will let down the net.) And on bidding farewell to his closest friend and successor in the secretaryship he remarked, “My friend, when one is named Curé of Geneva, one goes, one stays there, and one dies there!”

As our apostle enters on his life-work, we may now pause for an instant to picture his “outward presentment.” What the inner man was, time and these pages will show. Exteriously, then, he was a tall, muscular, well-developed man, having all the appearance of health, although at times he suffered from ophthalmia, and extremely grave and dignified in his manner. Those who only knew him by reputation generally expected to meet a stern, severe ecclesiastic, but were sometimes surprised by the affability he could, when he chose, exhibit to his friends. His nobly-formed forehead, serene and smooth as that of a statue, bore witness to the lofty mind within; as did his dark and strongly-marked eyebrows and keen, searching eye, to the vigor of his intellect. Like flint on steel, one word of opposition would bring flashes of lightning-like anger to those speaking eyes, telling of the soul within which sought to bear down all obstacles by sheer force of will. Curiously enough, his voice had not the deep tone one would have expected from such an exterior, but was feeble almost to shrillness.

Those who know Geneva as it now is, will alone be able to judge of the vast area over which the new curé found himself set. His parish, which in truth had almost the proportions of a diocese, comprised 1st, the whole town; 2d, the commune of Plainpalais; 3d, the commune of Eaux-vives and part of Cologny; 4th, part of the commune of Petit-Sacconnex, that is, St. Jean, les Delices, Montbrillant, Chateau-Banquet, les Pâquis. Less than this area makes fine large parishes to-day. And in all this vast expanse, his Catholic parishioners were scattered and hidden. Some poor or sick, some non-practising, some led away by mixed marriages into Protestantism, how was he to reach the souls for which he was responsible? He promptly decided on calling the muster-roll of his parishioners by a house-to-house visitation; a work not only involving much labor, but almost unheard of at that time, and never practised as it is among the English-speaking Catholics of to-day. In the France of the present time the priest does not, as a rule, venture uninvited into the houses of his flock.

M. Vuarin has, in some autobiographical notes, left us a description of his method of procedure during the thirty-five days which he consecrated uninterruptedly to his pious task, accompanied by his *vicaire*, M. Magnin:

“In each visit I went to every door of every house, from the

basement to the top story. I asked, 'Are there any Catholics here?' and if the answer was 'No,' I passed on; if 'Yes,' I entered, and wrote down the names of each individual in the family, under the heads: 'Name, —; surname, —; age, —; place of birth, —; profession, —; name of street, —; number, —; floor, —; date of first communion, —; observations, —; if he can read, —; confessor, —.'

"I was very prudent as to questions of morality, taking care not to compromise husbands and wives towards each other or before their children; and I also noted the state of their temporal resources."

He made a point, during these visits, of distributing abundant alms, and making little presents, such as of a book, a crucifix, a picture, etc., which, in the comparative scarcity of such objects at that time, were probably much appreciated by the recipients. He notes that his expenditure in these small presents sometimes amounted to as much as 800 francs—we presume, yearly. Of course he encountered during his visitation the usual brutal ignorance and rude assaults; he was pelted with stones, covered with dirt, the door-handles of the houses which he was to enter made red-hot, and so on; but on the whole he was almost surprised at the civility with which he was received, at least among the better class of Protestants; and his Catholic parishioners welcomed him, of course, with open arms.

Unfortunately, the detailed list which he made after these visits is lost, but we are told that the numbers made out in it were: 3500 people of all classes, not counting the French soldiers; 942 children of Catholic marriages, and 225 of mixed marriages, most of them brought up as Protestants, and the remainder necessarily frequenting Protestant schools. A later table made out by him gave the Catholic population as 4035; the numbers of mixed marriages were 359, out of which 29 only had been made with dispensation. Out of 437 children resulting from these marriages, only 41 were brought up as Catholics, and the same proportion occurs again and again in later statistics. Small wonder, then, that our energetic priest should have entered on a vigilant and unceasing warfare against the perilous practice of mixed marriages, and that he should have entered on an untiring campaign to "move heaven and earth" in order to procure religious education for the children of his flock. The former danger, of course, will exist as long as society—and its necessary admixture of differing faiths—lasts; and the warnings of M. Vuarin are still re-echoed in the Catholic pulpits of Geneva to-

day; while the latter has become what we may call a Catholic campaign throughout Europe.

Finding the children of the poor—French workmen's families and other immigrants, for the most part—thus neglected, M. Vuarin began at once to work in earnest for their education. His great desire was to introduce some order of nuns—preferably the *Sœurs de Charité*—to tend both young and sick; but though he acted with the greatest circumspection, and managed to make the suggestion come from other and more influential persons than himself, the Municipal Council took alarm and negatived the proposal, actually naming a Commission of two Protestants and two Catholics to inquire into the circumstances and investigate as to the need for Catholic schools, and, on their report, voting a certain sum (1200 francs annually, and 200 francs for their installation) for their support; by which means they hoped to shelve the question of teaching Sisters. "The Reformation of the sixteenth century got rid of 'nuns' for us; we will not retrogress and get them back in the nineteenth," they said. So M. Vuarin took his subsidy, established a girls' school under a mistress, a boys' school (in the church, for want of a school-room) under a priest, and—was silent.

But his silence held a fixed purpose. He was not a man to relinquish lightly anything that he had once intended to acquire, but he carried out his plans silently, and with the greatest reserve. As an instance of his habitual prudent uncommunicativeness, it is said that whenever he quitted Geneva for a time (and he was constantly setting off on long journeys), he provided himself with passports for every capital in Europe, that no one might be certain in which direction he intended to go. So now, though outwardly acquiescing in the compromise of lay schools for his parishioners, in reality he continued to work for the advent of his "*Sœurs de St. Vincent*." For it was that order, and no other, which he had set his heart upon. Other orders had been proposed to him and had offered him assistance, while, on the contrary, the Superioress of *St. Vincent's* white-capped Sisters "regretted that the want of suitable subjects would prevent her from sending any to Geneva"; and arrangements had already progressed far towards the establishment in Geneva of another order, when one day he received the following unexpected communication from the Mother House of the *Sœurs de St. Vincent*: "Notwithstanding the paucity of our subjects, which has already forced us to refuse several other solicitations for new branches, . . . we promise to send you three Sisters, during the course of December, or at latest in January,

wishing to second the zeal which animates you, and to respond to the instances of M. Emery (a friend of M. Vuarin), who desires us to *give this pleasure to St. Francis of Sales.*"

Some practical difficulties disposed of, an agreement was drawn up between M. Vuarin and the Superioress, by which the former bound himself to supply a furnished house, an allowance of 450 francs yearly for each Sister, and a servant to do their rough work. One Sister was to take charge of the girls' school, the others, of the sick and poor; and in July, 1810, three good and capable nuns arrived in Geneva—the first of their Order to tread its hostile streets. We should here remind our readers that Geneva was at this time administered by, 1st, a French Prefect, who represented the Imperial authority of the Conqueror, supported by a strong garrison of French soldiers; and, 2d, the Mayor and Town or Municipal Council, who conducted the civil or communal portion of the government, and who were, of course, violently Protestant. There was also the "Conference," or ecclesiastical authority, so frequently referred to in these pages, an assembly of ministers which had inherited from Calvin's time (when they seemed as his mouthpiece) no inconsiderable influence and weight, even in political affairs.

When the three Sœurs de St. Vincent de Paul arrived in the town, their first care was to call upon, and present themselves to, the authorities. They were cordially received by the Prefect, who had already received recommendations from headquarters to serve them to the utmost of his power; but when they proceeded to pay their visit of ceremony to the Mayor, they received a far different reception. Not only did he receive them in the coldest way, but began roughly to question them as to "what they came to do in Geneva, since there were already a Catholic girls' school and a Maternity Society, and therefore their coming was not merely useless, but dangerous." Sœur Benoit, who was spokeswoman, replied by begging the Mayor's good-will and protection, in a judicious little speech, and concluded by presenting him with two letters of introduction, which, when he had opened, he found to be signed by — the Secretary of "Madame Mère," as the Emperor's mother was styled, and—the Emperor himself! Never was change more sudden! *M. le Maire* suddenly beamed with smiles, and heaped attentions on his visitors; Madame the Mayoress, who had *turned her back* on the nuns when they entered, now overwhelmed them with polite speeches, and they departed escorted ceremoniously to the head of the staircase by the Mayor, with effusive leave-takings.

For some time, until the good people of Geneva became accustomed to the sight of the Sisters, their appearance in the streets was the signal for a curious mob to follow them with interested and inquiring glances, as though they had been the denizens of another sphere. The Consistory inserted the following note in their official acts: "Arrival of some Sisters of Charity in Geneva, with recommendations from the Secretary of Madame Mère, and from His Majesty, to the Mayor of Geneva. It is said that funds are assured to them; that they are three in number; that the apparent object of their labors is the foundation of a Catholic house of education. The Consistory names a commission to give information in case they seek to make proselytes."

This first success made M. Vuarin eager for more, and he now cast about for means to supply his poor boys with the same religious education which he had bestowed on the girls. This time the Frères de la Doctrine Chrétienne were the objects of his pious covetousness. After much the same difficulties as had attended the coming of St. Vincent's Sisters, three Christian Brothers were invited to come from Lyons, not as "Frères," but as "French citizens," holding passports and exercising their rights of settling in any part of the Empire. They arrived on the 31st of October, 1813, and a perfect storm of protestation immediately broke out. How the news spread so quickly one hardly knows, but the fact remains that deputation after deputation poured in upon the Mayor, demanding to know "whether he would tolerate such a scandal," he, the last and only defender of his country's rights! The Mayor hastened to the Prefect to implore his intervention against this terrible invasion of three horrible Brothers. "If they stay in the town, I will not be responsible for public tranquillity," he declared, vowing that "their presence was an outrage on three centuries of Protestantism"! For the sake of public tranquillity, then, the Prefect requested M. Vuarin to send back his importation, and after *one day spent in Geneva* (All-Saints' Day) the three Christian Brothers returned to Lyons, doubtless marvelling at the intolerance of the Genevese.

As may easily be imagined, the Catholic population of Geneva formed a body of parishioners which, humanly speaking at least, might be characterized as unsatisfactory. Not only were they for the most part of the poorest class, but of that fluctuating description of which there must always be a certain proportion in every large or frontier town. Workmen from various countries, country-folk who came to "make their fortune," and very often only fell into more hopeless misery; the nondescript offspring of hundreds

of mixed marriages, utterly untaught, and still more utterly indifferent in matters of religion ; it needed high courage to meet and cope with so depressing a state of things, and that, too, surrounded by the active hatred of the better and official classes. M. Vuarin strove in vain to stem the incessant tide of undesirable immigration by writing to all the civil and religious authorities of Savoy, to the Bishops of Chambéry, and others, to beg them to prevent their people from emigrating, or at least to turn their steps elsewhere than toward Geneva ; but still the tide flowed on ; the everlasting procession of families, youths, women, malcontents of every description, who, like the Piedmontese of our own day streaming across the frontier to the various towns on the French Riviera, poured unceasingly on. Poor M. Vuarin was inundated with these indigent adventurers from morning till night, and toiled unceasingly for them, assisted by his *Sœurs de Charité*. Thanks to his orderly practice of keeping and rendering his accounts and other statistics, we learn that between the years 1810 and 1835 he distributed through the *Sœurs de Charité* 122,022 francs, besides his own personal almsgivings. His Protestant neighbors wondered within themselves over his generosity, and inquired whence came the vast sums which he expended, while they had the injustice to accuse him of bribing and inviting the poor Savoyards to come to Geneva to swell the number of his flock. All the charitable institutions of Geneva were in the hands of Protestants, and Protestants only were allowed to benefit by them, with the exception of the *Bureau de Bienfaisance*, which, originally instituted by French subjects on the French model, gave some sparse and grudging help to occasional Catholics.

One of the chief supporters and patrons of this Bureau, the Baron Capelle, finding M. Vuarin thus devoted to the poor, procured his nomination to its membership, as in France Protestant ministers as well as Catholic priests sat together on the board of relief ; but a storm of indignant protestation burst forth, headed by the Mayor, who went so far as to suspend its meetings, that M. Vuarin might not appear at them. Baron Capelle, however, persisted in his nomination, and to the horror of the "vieux Genèveis," the Catholic Curé took his seat amongst them.

But though the mere presence of M. Vuarin at the Bureau de Bienfaisance was a triumph for the Catholic cause, it was not from this source that he received much material aid for his flock. In point of fact, the vast sums of money already referred to, which he expended on his parish, were the result of the marvellously extensive and eloquent correspondence which he maintained with

influential personages in all parts of Europe. His papers are said to be a perfect museum of royal and illustrious autographs; popes, emperors, kings, cardinals, bishops, nobles, almost every wealthy family in contemporary history received his urgent appeals, and responded to them with more or less generosity. Two Papal Briefs, addressed to himself, as well as pecuniary assistance, testify to the interest he had awakened in the Holy See, to which he, on the other hand, had always shown the most devoted loyalty. As an eminent member of the Sacred College remarked on one occasion: "The Curé of Geneva loves the Holy See *passionately*." His love of order and of work has left its mark in the immense masses of papers of all descriptions he left behind him—notes, reports, letters, documents, all sorted and docketed, with *résumés* of their contents attached; all his parish rules, sermons, lists of parishioners, services, expenses, sick people, visits, in fact every detail of his forty years' ministry, including the letters from his converts and other penitents—all of which now lie in the ecclesiastical archives of Geneva. Count Joseph de Maistre, who knew him intimately, thus wrote to one of his correspondents (the Duchesse des Cans) who was going to stay in Geneva: "I hope that our venerable Curé of Geneva will please you much. He is an inconceivable person as to activity, zeal, and perseverance. When I see him at work, he gives me the idea of the Apostolic successes. But the number of such men diminishes daily, and they are my heroes. What good are all our fine discourses, which reduce themselves in the end to a 'yes' or 'no?' What is the use of fine talking? as someone said at your house. Talk to me of the men who *work*, and who persuade."

In the line of preaching, M. Vuarin was never very strong; possibly his thin voice was partly the cause of this deficiency; but he made up for it by procuring Advent and Lent courses of sermons for his parishioners from some of the best preachers of the day; as we find the Abbé de Maistre, brother of Count Joseph, preaching the Advent course of 1809 and the Lent of 1810 at St. Germain, while a name of Irish origin, the Abbé Macarthy, appears among a list of others, all well known in their day, who succeeded him year by year.

We have enumerated, among the papers which he left behind him, some letters from his converts; and these, though not many in number, as may easily be guessed in that violently Calvinistic centre, were in some instances singularly interesting in themselves, though space will not allow us to dwell upon them here. During the forty years of his ministry in Geneva, he received sixty abju-

rations, and there were a few whose conversion he helped in, but who were received into the Church elsewhere. Every one of these conversions is recorded in detail among his writings; their motives, their course of procedure, the letters concerning them, and, not infrequently, the autobiographies of their subjects. They would form, in themselves, quite an interesting volume.

T. L. L. TEELING.

IRELAND LOOKING BACK.

IT is the fashion for ordinary nations to celebrate victories. Sedan is still fought over again in mimic warfare in Germany; down to a quarter of a century ago the memory of Waterloo was kept alive in Great Britain by sham battles outside all the garrison towns. But Ireland is peculiar. It is her pride to celebrate, this year, a defeat in the field. The defeat was for the time being a crushing one, yet the fact that the Ireland of to-day feels pride in celebrating the date of the appeal to arms is a proof that that appeal was not in vain.

We cannot regard the rebellion of 1798 as a mere incident. The tragedy possesses more than a local interest. It was the culmination of centuries of battling for a twofold principle—a principle of nationality and a principle of antagonism to an alien class ascendancy. Questions of religion and international commerce entered into it also, but, more conspicuously still, the question of the success or failure of the new idea of democracy springing from the immense impetus given that principle by the events on this continent and in France. It was a wrestle between the monarchical system of Great Britain and this new-born infant Hercules within her own borders; and although the decision for the time being was adverse to democracy, the principle did not expire. When next it made its appearance it was on British soil, and it was triumphant as the result of the Reform agitation, the Chartist movement, and the massacre of Peterloo. It is a singular fact that every political and agrarian reform which the English people have won for the past half century has owed its impulse to an Irish beginning, while the English masses have proved stolidly indifferent to the obligation.

Attempts at a democratic movement had been made four years previously by English leaders such as Hardy, Horne Tooke and Thelwall, but the idea was strangled at its inception. Before the national convention called by these admirers of French methods could assemble, the leaders were arrested and prosecuted for high treason. English juries were not so complaisant as Irish ones when the Crown wanted convictions, however; the defendants were acquitted, and the panic-stricken Ministry put face to face with a real danger in the jury-box rather than an imaginary one in the press and on the platform. Hence it may well be imagined that the baffled Minister secretly welcomed the opportunity which the Irish trouble afforded of teaching a lesson of terror to the discontented in England through the fearful punishment he contemplated inflicting upon those whose share in the benefits of constitutional rule was never a matter of concern to English juries. Moreover, William Pitt was well aware, from the information furnished by his secret agents, that the plans of the United Society's chiefs on the Continent embraced a diversion in London and other English centres whenever the movement in Ireland was ripe for action in the field. The importance of this portion of the scheme appears to have been much exaggerated, but we may easily imagine, with all the terrors of the French uprising before their eyes, how easily the Crown and its counsellors could be led into dangerous hallucinations over such a subject. Attempts were being made by the agents of the movement, at the same time, to sow the seeds of disaffection in the navy. Seditious literature was distributed through the fleet, and the alarm created by the boldness of this attempt may be judged of from the frightful punishments meted out to seamen engaged in this perilous work. They were flogged until some died under the torture, imprisoned in irons, or sent away to penal settlements. How many suffered in this way cannot be known, but the court-martial proceedings published with regard to some showed that the number was considerable. A similar movement, there is reason to believe, was suspected in the army and the militia, and hence a transference of regiments in which any considerable number of Irishmen were enrolled took place before the military operations in Ireland were provided for.

It is impossible, therefore, in any retrospect of the course of democracy in Europe, to ignore or minimize the part which Ireland played in that mighty struggle. And it is equally impossible to enter upon an inquiry into the science of statesmanship without weighing the motives, the morality, and the results of Pitt's politi-

cal conceptions, as illustrated in his great effort to crush out democracy in Ireland and consolidate the empire. To the philosophical student the subject must present a profound fascination; to the descendants of those who fought and lost in that ill-matched struggle, its higher aspects, from the historian's point of view, must subordinate themselves to the agony of the immediate drama and the rankling memories which it dedicated to the survivors. And it may be the irony of history that those aspects of the episode which appear subordinate now may, in the ultimate result, prove to be the dominant factors ere the drama be worked out to a close.

Some of the Irish leaders imprisoned in Fort George were asked by the Government commission sent down to examine into their views what was the immediate cause of the insurrection in 1798. They had no hesitation in answering that it was the measures taken by the Government under the Insurrection Act—the system of picketing, *i. e.*, military torture, such as pricking with bayonets, and the horrible pitch-cap; the whippings, free quarterings, and outrages of the military on the female peasantry, and the burning down of the homes of the people. This answer was more applicable to the *means* by which the insurrection had been fomented; its *causes* must be looked for sixteen years earlier, when the formation of the Irish Volunteers and their patriotic declarations aroused the English Ministry to the existence of a danger never before suspected, as well as in the attitude of independence taken up by Grattan's Parliament. Powerless to resist the claims of the patriots backed by the bayonets of eighty thousand men, the English Government yielded, but only to brood over schemes of revenge. It was reserved to Pitt to give form and life to those visions of green-eyed jealousy and impotent chagrin, and he eventually did so in a fashion and upon a scale to which history is powerless to furnish a counterpart.

That profoundly philosophical observation, that from the moment a man is born he begins to die, might be most appropriately spoken also of the new nationality born of the Declaration of Independence. From the moment of its birth it was doomed, for it contained within itself the germs of disintegration. The wolfish eyes of jealousy were quick to perceive its vulnerable points, and no less swift to take advantage of them. There was a chasm of rivalry between the leading spirits of the Volunteers, soon destined to widen into an impassable gulf over a question of rival policies and theories of constitutional procedure. In the ranks there were divergences of opinion no less favorable to

the designs of the cunning plotters of mischief. Civil and religious freedom was the broad platform of the Dungannon Convention, but when the Convention met in 1783 to give effect to that generous principle, there was no unanimity as to the mode in which the theory could be reduced to practice. Nor was this uncertainty confined to the Protestants and Presbyterians who composed the Convention. The Catholic leaders were just as much unsettled as to the nature and extent of their claims and the opportuneness of pressing them just then. Every move on the board was being eagerly followed by the agents of the English policy, and when it became evident that the elements of difference were strong enough to be turned into factors of dissension, all the rest of the course was plain sailing. The plan of operations to break up the new national movement embraced a dual policy. To divide the Catholics among themselves, by means of conflicting counsels, formed the first portion of the programme; the second, and more important part, was merely to fan into fresh activity the smouldering flame of religious and racial differences, chilled and diminished by the new-born enthusiasm of Republican Ulster, but at no time wholly extinguishable in a province where the seeds of discord had been deliberately and with malice aforethought planted by the settlement of Scotch Presbyterian settlers and London Protestants on the territory of the O'Neills and O'Donnells. The Catholic leaders whom the Government flattered by empty compliments were utilized for the first of these purposes. In especial the services of the brilliant Franciscan priest, the Rev. Arthur O'Leary, were secured, and, it is painful to say, in such a way as to raise a doubt in the minds of many as to his integrity—a doubt which has not been absolutely dispelled down to this very day. Father O'Leary enjoyed the unique distinction of being the only Catholic priest in the realm with an annual stipend from the Government. He was granted an annuity of a hundred pounds a year because of the able pamphlets which he had written in opposition to the new ideas of democracy, but no satisfactory explanation is as yet forthcoming why this sum was subsequently increased to two hundred, nor has the most diligent search amidst state archives and private correspondence on the part of that most successful of literary seekers, Mr. W. J. Fitzpatrick, resulted in a solution of the question. Certain it is that overtures were made to him on behalf of the Government, and equally certain that he let the fact be known, together with his own indignant rejection of the temptation. This much is, likewise, certain, that he counselled postponement of the Catholic claims as inopportune, and that this

counsel, coinciding with a forged letter, purporting to be from Lord Kenmare, but really written, it would seem, by Sir Boyle Roche, had a fatal effect on the Catholic cause.

Down to the days of Pitt no step had been taken by any English Ministry to give definite shape to its feelings with regard to the consequences of the emancipation of the Irish Parliament from the tutelage previously assumed over it by the assembly in St. Stephens. But England beheld with unconcealed fury and dismay the constant progress of the Irish people under the fostering care of a Parliament legislating for the benefit of its own country, and not for that of its rivals across the Channel, as so-called Irish Parliaments had done for four hundred years previously without demur. It was not only that the pride of England was galled, but that very sensitive region, the pocket, was touched in a way that roused the commercial ire of the nation. The Irish Parliament had forced England to open her ports to Irish products on a free-trade basis; for previously a rigidly prohibitive tariff had been maintained against the staple products of Irish industry. This had been extorted from the Ministry under the menace of Napper Tandy's artillery, drawn up on College-green, each gun bearing the significant motto on its muzzle "Free trade, or else ——" Prosperity had followed in the train of independence. The eighteen years during which the country had felt the vivifying impulse of native government were marked by an advance in manufactures, the first essential in a nation's material well-being, a revival of individual industry, and a birth of arts and letters quite unexampled in the modern history of the island. The capital was the home of a resident nobility and aristocracy whose incomes were liberally expended in the erection and embellishment of palatial mansions whose imposing lines and architectural elegance still testify to the traveller of the taste and luxury of a caste which, though composed in great part of alien elements, took a pride in the land of their birth and confessed to the irresistible influence of the Celtic character over the very elements which had proved their superiority in the sterner field of conquest. Dublin rose rapidly in population, and still more so in the magnificence and number of its public and private residences; its clubs and coffee-houses were frequented by the choicest wits and men of fashion of which any European city could boast; its stage was occupied by actors and actresses who have secured a lasting fame; in one of the theatres the immortal Handel had given to the world for the first time, under his own leadership, his glorious oratorio of "The Messiah"; Mrs. Siddons, the Kembles, Spranger Barry,

Foote, Mossop, Macklin, and many others of hardly less note, shone as stars at this bright period for the drama in the city by the Liffey. But more incomparable far was the reputation of that stately Senate-house whose majestic peristyle and sweeping colonnades challenge the awe and admiration of the stranger who for the first time gazes on the desecrated temple of genius and patriotism. Here, indeed, the intellect and power of the Irish race had flashed forth in irresistible eloquence, and the orator's voice had caused the world to realize by what magic it was that Demosthenes was enabled to transform the peaceful citizen into the enthusiastic defender of his country's honor and independence. What a galaxy of brilliant figures rise before the mind's eye as it travels over the empty chambers of the Irish House of Lords and the fine hall where the clerks and scribes of the Bank of Ireland take the place of the men at whose magic invocation a nation awoke from a trance of death and shook the fetters of centuries from some, at least, of her limbs! Plunket, Burke, Malone, Burgh, Hardy, Newenham, Curran, Parnell, Foster, Parsons, Langrishe, and many another giant of debate, defile before us, until our eyes at last rest upon the face and figure of the man who seemed to embody all his country's passion and fire and soul in the one feeble but electric frame—Henry Grattan.

This historic Senate-house of Ireland was its glory in the transient period of the country's prosperity—but it was also its shame. It was never a representative institution, in the proper sense; it had been always the Parliament of the Pale. The majority of the Irish people—that is, the Irish Catholic population—had no part in it. They had no legal existence; they were under a ban more dreadful than that of fire and water. And though it had been composed of the *élite* of the privileged "Sassenach" class, down to this period it had been known to be corrupt and bore no especial reputation for enlightenment. Three-quarters of a century previously it had come under the lash of Swift:

"Not a bowshot from the College;
Half the world from wit and knowledge."

It trafficked with every Ministry for its "pocket-boroughs"; it had been the subservient tool of successive dispensers of the "corruption fund." It was not until the vivifying spirit of Grattan's patriotism was breathed into it that it dared to assert its power as a guardian of the rights of the privileged class which it represented; and even then the germs of rottenness impregnated it so sensibly as to give hope to the ever-vigilant enemy of national rights.

The nomenclature of modern thought has made us familiar with the phrase "social evolution." Writers of the stamp of Carlyle and Froude and Standish O'Grady have advanced the theory that the evolution of society in Ireland has been in accordance with the inevitable decree of what they call destiny; what has been was to be, and is for the best. O'Grady, one of the most seductive apologists of this school, paints pictures of the tribal society of Ireland, with its semi-feudal customs, intended to prove that it was a judgment of Providence that it should be shattered and give way to the superior civilization of the stronger power. But it is only necessary to read the literature of later days to be convinced that the breaking-up of the old Celtic fabric meant for the time being, and perhaps even still, a relapse into semi-barbarism and real feudal bondage. The pages of Sir Jonah Barrington give vivid pictures of the brutal order of things which supervened upon the destruction of the old Celtic aristocracy as a consequence of the Williamite campaign, and the hopeless slough of misery into which the masses of the people were plunged. We read of swinish orgies, protracted night after night, in the homes of the new aristocracy. Drunkenness, gaming, hunting and duelling were the lessons of civilization which they taught. The man who could not drink his sixteen bottles of wine at a carouse was not accounted a fit member of society; the greater the number of duels he had fought the more estimable was his character. The abduction of an heiress was a necessary concomitant to this sort of liberal education. The money wrung from the life-blood of the peasantry was squandered in the club-houses of Dublin, and the prolonged sederunt over cards and wine was frequently finished up by a duel in the backyard, with the occupants of the tenement-houses surrounding it as witnesses from their windows. The bucks and "bloods" at night converted the streets into a pandemonium, pricking the wayfarers with their rapiers, and under the appellation of Mohocks waging bloody war with the butchers of Ormond Market, the students from Trinity College, or the coal-laborers from the quays. Under the guise of fops and exquisites they carried the manners and instincts of savages. Such were the characteristics, generally, of the gentry of the Protestant ascendancy down to the period when the breath of liberty from these shores fanned the cheeks of the enslaved Irish people. It was no wonder they hailed the trumpet-blast of the Volunteers from Dunganon as a note of regeneration; and though their religion precluded them, under the law, from participation in the new military movement, they subscribed liberally towards the expenses of car-

rying it to a successful issue. But the Volunteer uprising was only a splendid delusion. By the dissensions of its chiefs and the machinations of the English Government its disruption was soon brought about, and the hopes of the people were changed into the lethargy of despair. It was at this darkest hour that the United Irishmen sprang into existence, and the people turned from a Parliament which had proved itself incapable of bringing permanent social relief to the promises of a brotherhood which drew its inspiration of democracy from the formula which had had so sanguinary a success in France—Liberty, equality, and fraternity.

There are many circumstances connected with the origin and growth of this famous organization which appear anomalous in the extreme to all who have not studied the social and political condition of Ireland thoroughly. In order to gain an elementary knowledge of the facts it is necessary, first of all, to divest our minds of the idea of a loyal Ulster, such as the northern province boasts itself to be to-day; for it is to be borne in mind as a primary fact that it was in Ulster the Society of United Irishmen first came into existence, and that its principal founders were Protestants and Presbyterians. A dozen Presbyterian clergymen were enrolled in its ranks, and three of these were among the Ulstermen who paid the penalty of their lives for their patriotism—one of whom was the grandfather of the present Judge Monroe of the Irish bench. The chief strength of the United Irishmen, in fact, was in the province of Ulster, where the number of enrolled members was said to be about a hundred thousand, and from whence thirty thousand stand of arms was taken when a search was undertaken under military law, on the eve of the outbreak. The men who formed the nucleus of the military party in it, and who drew up the new constitution on the Cave Hill, near Belfast, were three Protestants—Wolfe Tone, Samuel Neilson, and Thomas Russell. For several years before this event the society had been established on a moral-force basis merely. Its constitution was public property, and there was not a clause of it to which the most scrupulous politician of to-day could take exception. It aimed simply to secure a redress of grievances for the mass of the Irish people, together with complete civil and religious liberty for all. It was the Irish complement of the Great Charter and the Declaration of Rights, and the terms in which its purposes were stated were moderate and unaggressive. But an open constitutional movement was just as obnoxious to the government of that time as a secret revolutionary one—perhaps more so. It was about three years before the Rebellion that the turning-point came. Two very significant events in that

year presaged the coming storm. The first was the establishment of the Orange Society ; the second the recall of the popular Viceroy, Lord Fitzwilliam. This excellent nobleman had been dispatched to Ireland as the bearer of an olive-branch at a time when better counsels prevailed. The growing dread of revolutionary trouble in England, and the well-known antagonism between the Jacobin propagandists and the Catholics, inspired Pitt and his colleagues with the view that their best policy was to make friends of the Catholic subjects of Great Britain, especially in Ireland. Hence delegates from the Catholic Association were received by the King in the year 1792, and sent back to Ireland under the belief that Catholic grievances should soon have substantial redress. An instalment of justice was actually given, shortly afterwards, in the shape of the bill giving the elective franchise to the forty-shilling freeholders in rural districts, and to Catholics in towns the privilege of the municipal franchise. These slight concessions were bitterly opposed by the small knot of Ascendency adherents in the Irish Parliament, but they were easily carried. Small as they were, to the miserable Catholic people they were accepted as the rainbow after the Deluge. A harbinger they seemed of a halcyon period of justice and safety in the days to come.

We cannot but observe the mode in which this period of Irish history is slurred over by many chroniclers. Some, perhaps, are unacquainted with the real condition of affairs ; even the most fair-minded may be misled by the language of the pseudo-philosophers of the time. It was a day of dawning science. Speculation had stirred the depths of things in the supernatural, the metaphysical, and the social world. Theories of society were being set afloat and discussed, and, imperfect as the means of communication then were, there was danger of their reaching ears in the most remote and sequestered places. Arthur Young had been travelling through Ireland, observing the social conditions and rough-hewing the road for the feet of more scientific and perhaps less humane successors. The masses in England had found some palliation for the dreadful savagery of the uprising in France in the miseries entailed by the feudal system. The search-light was being turned on in England—and immediately under the search-light is the profundity of darkness. Arthur Young and every other inquirer into the state of the Irish peasantry either overlooks or gives insufficient value to the fact that, besides having no status as an individual before the law, besides being a more abject serf before his landlord than any Russian hind, besides having every instinct of nobility of manhood crushed out of him

by a system of superhuman ingenuity of contrivance, the Irish peasant was forced to support by his labor a religious institution which he hated, and had good reason to hate, called the Established Church. The system of tithes was one of the most powerful contributory causes to the Irish Rebellion, and it was the only one which survived its suppression to be victorious in its principle in the long run. Forty years later, that insulting and iniquitous system received its death-blow in the resistance of the peasantry at Carrickshock. It is by no means difficult to understand, then, why the mass of the people should have hailed the advent of Earl Fitzwilliam, with his promises of relief, as the aurora of a blissful morning after a long night of despair. Nor is it any wonder that the Viceroy, differing as he did from so many of his predecessors in notions of honor and liberty, should have spurned a post when there was no longer use for either quality. When he learned of the change of mind on the part of the Ministry he indignantly refused to continue in office with the reputation of a pledge-breaker. He had been authorized to promise relief to the down-trodden Catholics, and when he was told by Pitt that he must, for reasons of expediency, postpone the project, he acted as any honorable man who felt that he had been duped would act. "I refused," he says, in his own letters, "to be the person to run the risk of such a determination. I refused to be the person to raise a flame in the country that nothing short of arms could keep down." How prophetic was the presage, how memorable the warning!

The man who was selected to carry out the relentless policy spurned by the noble Fitzwilliam was one fitted by temperament and character for such a task—he whom O'Connell so scathingly denounced in the Magee trial as "the cold-hearted and cruel Camden." An examination of his character and the chief events connected with his administration in Ireland leave no doubt that the description was well deserved. Brought up to the profession of the law, in which his father, the English Lord Chief-Justice, was so distinguished an ornament, he inherited nothing but its cold and pettifogging spirit, and a special pleader's familiarity with all its resources of oppression in the shape of obsolete or half-forgotten statutes against Catholicism. His callousness and cruelty are abundantly manifested in his own official letters to the Duke of Portland. In several of them he speaks with great satisfaction of the cold-blooded massacres of Carlow and Kildare, where several hundred insurgents, who had surrendered on promise of immunity, were deliberately murdered by the English troops and yeomanry.

He was, in brief, a tool eminently suited by temperament and want of human sympathy for one of the most repulsive tasks ever intrusted to the agent of a tyranny since the time of Alva.

It would be impossible to portray the consternation and despondency which seized upon the body of the Irish people as soon as the true meaning of this ominous step was perceived. Nor was the depression by any means confined to the Catholic population. Through the unflinching exertions of Theobald Wolfe Tone and the North of Ireland leaders the great mass of the Dissenting body had been brought into thorough sympathy with the oppressed Catholics; and this generous feeling was shared in, it is but just to say, by a considerable proportion of the more liberal-minded Protestants. The measure of success which had attended the efforts at unification of all the people by the United Irish organization had been great beyond expectation. Such harmony was never erstwhile beheld at any phase of the nation's existence, and none can doubt that it was the deliberate design of the British Ministry to terminate the alliance as a bond that threatened the supremacy of English power. The policy of the Ministry was dictated by a selfish terror, unintelligible now, when we consider the relative strength of the two nations. When we contemplate the spectacle of a powerful, rich and well-armed individual addressing a feeble, struggling and defenceless stripling, and saying, in the words of Edmund Burke, "Sir, I find your liberty to be incompatible with my safety," how profound must be our abhorrence and contempt for such a craven policy!

It was not long ere the dismal apprehensions of the people began to find confirmation in the fruits of the change in policy. In the condition of Ulster the government found the most reliable basis for a campaign of disintegration. For several years a social and religious war of a ferocious character had raged on the borders of Armagh, Cavan and Derry, between the Catholic and Protestant inhabitants. Among the latter it had for its avowed object the extermination of their Catholic neighbors, and this atrocious purpose was sought to be effected by means of nocturnal raids by armed bands, in which murder was too often the concomitant of conflagration and the levelling of the peasants' cabins. Thousands of families were rendered homeless annually by these inhuman proceedings, and as the Catholic population had neither protection nor redress from the magistracy, who were Protestants and English sympathizers to a man, they had been forced to protect themselves by means of secret combinations. Under the name of Defenders they sought to shield their own people and

exact reprisals from the aggressors, their Protestant neighbors, who, banded together either as Hearts of Steel or Peep-o'-Day Boys, acted the part of Turkish bashi-bazouks while professing devoted adherence to a system of Biblical Christianity. A state of civil war had in fact existed in Ulster for some considerable time, and no steps whatever had been taken by the Government to quell it. Nothing could be more favorable to the secret designs of the Minister in whose dissembling mind the embryo of the Union was beginning to assume shape and organic life. The first decided symptoms of the form which that life was to assume was given in the transformation of the scattered bodies of the Hearts of Steel into one centralized, homogeneous organization, destined to leave a sanguinary mark in history, under the title of the Orange Society. The county Armagh was the place where this ill-omened association had its rise, and a local magistrate, one Thomas Verner, was the first "Grand Master" elected. In a pamphlet of the time, attributed to Arthur O'Connor, the terms of the secret oath taken by members of the Orange order are given as follows: "In the presence of Almighty God, I, ——— ———, do solemnly swear that I will to the utmost of my power support the King and the present government; and I do further swear that I will use my utmost exertions to exterminate all the Catholics of the Kingdom of Ireland." Time after time the authenticity of this version of the oath has been denied by the Orange body, but the conduct of its members has proved beyond all doubt that the murder and extermination of Catholics was the absolute purpose for which the society was started. Societies, like individuals, are judged of by their actions rather than their professions. Owing to its sanguinary misdeeds at Dolly's Brae, some years after the Union was accomplished, the Orange Society was condemned by the Government under whose patronage it sprang into existence, and its Grand Master, Lord Roden, deprived of the commission of the peace. On proof of a treasonable conspiracy to place the Duke of Cumberland on the English throne, instead of the Princess Victoria, the quietus was given to it as a secret society, and it was compelled to reorganize on an open basis. The serpent's nature does not change with the sloughing of its skin. No alteration in the Orange methods or principles has ever been witnessed, no matter what the form of the oath or the constitution of the society, since its inception down to this very day. It is a sort of Protestant Islamism.

Mr. Plowden, a contemporaneous historian not by any means partial to the claims of Irish nationality, or given to exaggeration

in his recital of the determining facts and motives of that melancholy time, has no second theory about the real beginnings of the struggle which culminated in 1798. The spread of union and fraternity was beheld with consternation. Then, says Plowden, "the gentlemen in place became frightfully alarmed for their situations; active agents were sent down to Armagh to turn the ferocity and fanaticism of the Peep-o'-Day Boys into a religious contest with the Catholics, under the specious appearance of zeal for Church and King. Personal animosity was artfully converted into religious rancor; and for the specious purpose of taking off the stigma of delinquency the appellation of Peep-o'-Day Boys was changed into that of Orangemen." The effect was soon made palpable in renewed atrocities against the Catholic peasantry, and a massacre called "the battle of the Diamond," in which many were killed and wounded on the Catholic side, put an end to the Defenders' hopes of a continuance of successful resistance, for the Orangemen were plentifully supplied with arms, while the most rigid precautions were taken, under the provisions of the Insurrection Act, specially passed for the occasion, that not a musket, pistol or powder-flask should be left in Catholic hands. The horrors of the ensuing year in the county of Armagh baffle description. It was one long chapter of midnight agony, when murder stalked ubiquitously over the country and the flames of the burning cabins illuminated the sky night after night. Seven thousand persons, it is calculated, were either slaughtered or driven by violence from their doomed hovels by the armed ruffians blasphemously banded together in the name of religion.

In this shocking dragonnade, as it may be called, the Orange banditti had the open sanction of the Government. From Armagh the terror was extended to other counties in Ulster, then over most of the Leinster counties outside of Dublin, and several portions of Munster. A crop of Orange magistrates suddenly sprang into view, and these everywhere issued warrants wholesale for the arrest of people without a shadow of foundation. The jails were soon full of men young and old, so that some trouble arose about providing for their maintenance and detention. The problem was quickly solved. Lord Carhampton, who was then commander-in-chief, came forward with a plan which he judiciously styled "a vigor beyond the law," and the principle of this atrocious panacea soon found embodiment in an Act of Parliament relieving magistrates and military men from responsibility either to Parliament or the civil tribunal for excesses committed against the law by themselves or the armed rabble under their command. The

mode in which Lord Carhampton proposed to relieve the congestion of the jails was ingenious. He caused a Government ship to be sent to Sligo Bay, and, having consulted with the local magistrates in various places, got their opinions about the most desirable among the incarcerated persons—against whom, in all cases, no charge could be legally made—to get rid of. These men were, therefore, without any more ado, sent off to Sligo and shipped on board the tender for transmission to the ships of the regular navy at Portsmouth, in order to be flogged into shape as British blue-jackets. The English fleet secured thousands of able seamen by this simple expedient of an Irish general, whose claims to distinction in the field of invention atoned for his lack of any in the field of glory.

The first legislative measures pressed by Lord Camden on the opening of Parliament in 1796 were an "Insurrection Act"—that is to say, a proclamation of martial law—and an Indemnity Act; in other words, a legislative license for the perpetration of outrage without check or restraint in the fear of consequences. One of the provisions of the Insurrection Act was that the penalty for the administering of an unlawful oath was death. The only association named by the Attorney-General was that of the Defenders; the name of the Orange Society was carefully excluded. Henry Grattan and the leading members of the Irish Opposition offered a determined resistance to these infamous proposals in Parliament. But the placemen and pocket-borough holders mustered in sufficient force, and the Government triumphed in its first attack on the principles of the British Constitution.

It may be usefully observed, here, that had the Irish Parliament been a really representative institution, the manifold disasters which overtook the Irish nation at this epoch never could have occurred. But it had never been more than the Parliament of the minority in Ireland. The only true Parliament of all the people, since the English power was established in Ireland, was that convoked in the short-lived Kingship of James the Second. In this assembly were representatives of the Catholic masses; but it comprised also a fair proportion of Protestant members—at least such were summoned to attend, though all did not respond. It should be remembered, to the credit of this really representative Parliament, that amongst its first enactments was one decreeing perfect religious freedom, while the succeeding Parliaments of King William the Third, who is spoken of as the assertor of the principle of civil and religious freedom, were long occupied in the enactment of ferocious penal laws against Catholics and Dissenters. Restricted and un-

representative as the Parliament of Grattan's period was, however, there cannot be the slightest doubt that, if left unhampered by the English Ministry, it would in time have established a system of equality in political matters for men of every denomination and worked out a scheme of Parliamentary reform calculated to satisfy any legitimate aspiration. Many bills and resolutions for the sweeping away of religious disabilities were brought forward in it from time to time, and many of these received generous support. Were the Catholics only agreed among themselves as to the terms of their demands, there can be no reasonable doubt that they would have been conceded; and, had this been the case, it is not rash to hypothetize there would not have been any rebellion. In how far the failure of the Catholics to secure their emancipation was due to the writings and counsel of the timid and temporizing leaders, especially the Rev. Arthur O'Leary, may never certainly be determined, but it must be confessed those influences were largely responsible for the collapse. Let us not put aside these speculations as useless. Influences of the same character are at work to-day, and are powerful in determining the problems of public life in Ireland. We do not for a moment mean to say that any ecclesiastics in Ireland are recipients of emoluments from the English Government, as the Rev. Arthur O'Leary undoubtedly was, but there are a few who believe there is more security for religion in the supremacy of the English Government than in that of the Irish people. The small section of Catholic "aristocrats" are especially obnoxious to Irish nationality by reason of their open adherence to this unpatriotic view. This narrow and exclusive section was represented in the earlier period by such men as Lord Fingall, Lord Kenmare, Viscount Trimleston, Lord Gormanstown, Lord Southwell, and several baronets of lesser note. It is also to be remarked that their ranks included the hypocritical attorney, Francis Macan, who succeeded so long in keeping his identity as the secret betrayer of Lord Edward Fitzgerald from the scrutiny of the historian.

There is another element in this painful problem which must by no means be overlooked. Not a few of the Irish bishops and clergy looked with alarm, if not with horror, at the idea of the spread of what were known then as "French principles." The Irish political leaders, on the other hand, were openly in favor of a French alliance. Looking back at the whole episode now, and surveying all the facts which led up to its bloody culmination, it may be safely concluded that the dependence of the Irish leaders upon this broken reed of a French alliance was the

one great fatal mistake which led to the overthrow of the Irish hopes and deprived it of that moral support which it must otherwise have received from many sections at home as well as some portions, probably, of the English democracy.

Too much reason, unhappily, had been given for the apprehension of the ecclesiastical body in Ireland, in the proceedings of the French "liberators" in Belgium, under the *régime* of the Directory. The religious feelings of the people were everywhere insulted by the infidel rabble quartered upon them under the pretence of delivering them from domestic tyranny. Is it to be wondered at that this knowledge, taken in conjunction with the prophetic warnings of Edmund Burke against the dangers of the new democracy, induced many of the bishops and clergy in Ireland to discourage by every means in their power the resort to French help? They acted for the best, and solely with the hope of preserving their flocks. But they little knew what horrors were preparing for the unhappy people as a consequence of their intervention, else it is but just to suppose that they would, for the most part, have adopted the more patriotic course of strengthening the people's hands to resist the demons of outrage and extermination, as many of the Wexford clergy eventually were compelled reluctantly to do by circumstances which made submission not only cowardice but criminality.

To the Irish leaders it is but just to say that those of them intrusted with negotiations with the French Government took every precaution to secure that the military help they bargained for should be that of auxiliaries, as in the case of Rochambeau's forces in the United States, and not as allies. The letters of Dr. Emmet, McNeven, and others, are very explicit upon this point. They also make it clear that Bonaparte at least entertained his own views upon this matter, and at one stage of the negotiations gave it to be understood that the French would not be satisfied with the *rôle* of auxiliaries, but would take over the control of things generally, once they were established in the island. But at no time during these negotiations, save in the case of Hoche's expedition, can the French be said to have acted with sincerity. They fooled the unhappy Irish people with false promises of support, only to desert them when they had in desperation taken the field themselves. Reliance on French help was the fatal flaw in the Irish programme.

The position which the Government had created gave it an irresistible advantage in dealing with the results as they successively developed themselves. While the Catholic clergy were for

the most part focussed into using their all-powerful influence for the repression of the national movement, on the other hand, everything was done to influence the passions of the Orange section to the point of abandonment of every principle of humanity; race hatred and sectarian animosity were blown into a white heat of murderous ravening. The fears of the Catholic gentry were stimulated by artful stories of the communistic designs of the peasantry. Unhappy Ireland was, in short, as a chess-board with both sides of the game in the hands of one player, the antagonistic pieces being moved toward the solution of one problem solely.

Among the Irish bishops and clergy over the rebellion or the Union, it is quite evident there was no concerted policy. Every bishop acted, as he undoubtedly had a right to act, according to the interests of religion in his particular see. By artful promises, directly from the Minister, or by secret agency conveyed, very many of the Irish hierarchy were led to believe that every just aspiration of the Irish Catholics would be realized provided they only stood loyal to the British Government. Nothing more artful was ever known than the means taken to impress this view. While that Government steadily operated in the Irish Parliament to prevent any real measure of relief for the Catholics from being passed there, the impression was being sedulously cultivated among the Catholic bishops that from an Irish Parliament it was hopeless to expect any such measure, and that only from a great imperial assembly was such a measure of large-minded policy to be looked for. What between the promises to the Catholics, the incitements to the Orangemen, and the appeals to the fears of the landed gentry, there never was witnessed a more masterly display of the fine art of unscrupulous government than that exhibited at this bifurcate pass in Irish affairs. All the time the engineer had his hand securely on the throttle-valve of the locomotive. So masterly were the measures taken for winning the race that not a single chance was overlooked. That system of venal corruption which won over French generals like Pichegru to lose battles in the English interest and honeycombed the French staff was depended on to work the ruin of the United Irishmen, and the confidence was not misplaced. At every secret meeting of the executive an emissary of the British Government sat as one of the sworn members, and the most important communications between the chiefs at home and their secret agents abroad were in the hands of the English Minister as soon—aye, sooner than they were in those to whom they were addressed. Money unlimited was

at the disposal of the one party ; only credulity unlimited the bank of the other. Is it any wonder who was the winner in this most unequal contest ?

It is not necessary to tell the story of the rebellion,—how it was prematurely forced upon the leaders by the goading of the people, and how it was stamped out with a ferocity never exceeded in the fever-heat of the Thirty Years' War. Every horror that has been charged against the Spaniards and the Free Companies in that frightful struggle was enacted on the soil of Ireland during the couple of years while the rebellion was being incubated and while the fruit of such hatching was justifying the care bestowed on it. It is necessary to asseverate, however, that the testimony of every witness entitled to speak proves that those who rose in rebellion were driven to it, because men like Mr. Goldwin Smith do not hesitate to lay all blame on the United Irishmen and the Irish peasantry, and to insist that the rebellion was not used by Pitt as a means of carrying the Union. Quite recently Mr. Smith wrote that the Union was not carried either by bribery or British bayonets, and that the English forces sent over to Ireland in '97 and '98 were not employed in putting it down. Against this may be put the statement of Mr. Gladstone during the discussion of the Home Rule Bill in the House of Commons. Colonel Sanderson had been boasting of the power of the Ulster Orangemen to put down the Catholics of Ireland as they did in '98, when Mr. Gladstone jumped up excitedly and exclaimed, "You could not do it ; you had to call in England." Nothing could be truer than this. It was twenty thousand English regulars who formed the *cordon* around Vinegar Hill when the Wexford insurgents made their last great stand, and English regulars who won the other engagements in which the untrained and unarmed valor of the peasantry succumbed to discipline and arms of precision. The Orange yeomanry were never conspicuous for anything but cowardly outrage wherever their numbers gave them the superiority over isolated bands and fugitive stragglers. The main facts of this memorable uprising are so well known, and so freely confessed by every reputable English writer, that it is amazing how Mr. Goldwin Smith could think of giving them any new gloss.

There is something more beneath this story than the villany of either bribery or bayonets, and Mr. Goldwin Smith does not allude to it. But it is necessary that the world should understand it, so that when the epithet of "rebel" is flung in the Irishman's face he may not be made to blush for shame, but rather to feel a

thrill of pride in those progenitors who, in all the inconsiderate rashness of unarmed vigor, flung circumspection to the winds and appealed to the Lord of Sabaoth. That shame which turns the coward's heart to steel was written everywhere upon the peasant's brow. By the institution of "free quarters," one of the first steps taken under martial law, dishonor was brought to every Irish hearth where the ruffian yeomanry were thrust upon the inhabitants as unwelcome guests.

Mr. Plowden disposes of this sickening subject in a few brief but pregnant sentences. He says :

"As to the species of outrage, which rests not in proof, it is universally allowed to have been on the side of the military. It produced an indignant horror in the country which went beyond but prevented retaliation. It is a characteristic mark of the Irish nation neither to forget nor forgive an insult or injury done to the honor of their female relatives. It has been boasted of by officers of rank that within certain large districts a woman had not been left undefiled ; and upon observation, in answer, that the sex must, then, have been very complying, the reply was that the bayonet removed all squeamishness. A lady of fashion, having in conversation been questioned as to this difference of conduct towards the sex in the military and the rebels, attributed it, *in disgust, to a want of gallantry in the Croppies.*"¹

The Hessian troops were remarkable for their outrageous behavior towards women, and some of them who had been taken prisoners were shot by the rebels for this reason, even though the women whom they had attacked were of the loyalist party. In this connection it is useful to remember that the British agents sent to the Continent to induce foreign governments to lend troops for service against the American colonists promised the Hessians, amongst other tempting baits, *plenty of indulgence for their passions*, and that the reputed watchword of Pakenham's army in the attack on New Orleans was "Booty and beauty."

So, too, with regard to the religion of the people. The miscreants who were sent to terrorize them were only too glad to get an opportunity of showing their detestation of "Popery" by destroying its temples. The country "chapel" was everywhere foredoomed to destruction on the slightest pretence of rebellion existing in the locality. About sixty "chapels" were given to the flames in the dioceses of Ferns and Kildare before a single blow was struck by the peasants. The Wexford priests did everything in their power to calm the people under these diabolical outrages, for in no place had a more determined stand been made by

¹ The rebels generally were called Croppies from the practice of the troops cutting the hair of prisoners very short, in order that they might be recognized in case they took up arms again.

the clergy against the principles of the United Irishmen than there. But human nature was too strong. The cup of suffering was filled until it could hold no more, and then the priest became the leader of his flock. By the light of his burning sanctuary and desecrated altar, Father Murphy rallied his parishioners at Boolavague, and bade them strike back in the name of God and honor. Many other priests followed his example, and who is here to-day to say that they did not do well? With their lives they paid the forfeit of their heroism, but in what holier cause could man give back his soul to his Creator than that of outraged religion and virtue?

There were humane and chivalric men among the English generals at that time, and they revolted at what they saw. Sir Ralph Abercrombie, who was commander-in-chief in Ireland at the beginning of the agony, would not go through with it. He resigned his command, alleging as reason something very remarkable. The army, he declared, he found a terror to everybody but the enemy. Cornwallis was often sickened with the stories of military atrocities. But no banditti of Marathon or Sicily ever approached the army's dreadful auxiliaries, the yeomanry, the militia, and the Hessian mercenaries. Long after the rebellion was suppressed hordes of these armed ruffians harried the peasantry, hanging, shooting, flogging, and outraging as they went. Tortured by the pitch-cap—a device which burned the head into the brain and often drove its victims mad—was a favorite amusement with some of the militia regiments—notably the North Cork. (The yeomanry and militia, it should be remembered, were entirely composed of loyal Protestants.) In Dublin itself the shooting and hanging were carried on daily in the streets, until the Lord-Lieutenant's wife, driving through Thomas street to the Viceroyal Lodge, one day, saw the gutters running blood and implored her husband to put a stop to the carnage,—which he did.

Simultaneously with the stoppage of this butchery by the military arm the machinery of the civil law was set in motion to finish what the soldier had left incomplete. Special commissions of judges were sent out, and these made quick work of the prisoners penned up awaiting their doom. The character of these legal processes may be inferred from the fact that at one assize over which the infamous Lord Norbury presided there were one hundred prisoners put forward on the capital charge, and all but one of these were sentenced to death. The sentence was carried out in ninety-seven cases out of the ninety-nine, and within a day or two after they had been delivered. Courts-martial had been co-operating in other quarters of the country, and several hundred persons

were executed under their findings in the four months which immediately succeeded the end of the rebellion. This fact is mentioned in Lord Cornwallis's "Memoirs."

With all this carnage, the thirst for blood displayed by the "loyal" party was not slaked. Lord Cornwallis was blamed by many for being too merciful. He defends himself from the charge in a letter to Major-General Ross, in this wise :

"You write as if you really believed that there was any foundation for all the lies and nonsensical clamor about my lenity. On my arrival in this country I put a stop to the burning of houses and murder of the inhabitants by the yeomen, or any other persons who delighted in that amusement ; to the flogging for the purpose of extorting confessions ; and to the free quarters, which comprehend universal rape and robbery throughout the whole country."

Ordinary warfare is horrible enough in its effects upon human nature. The taste of blood arouses all the tiger within the combatants, and for the time extinguishes the feelings of humanity in the breasts of many. But in wars of rebellion, wherein the one party is put outside the pale which international law has drawn around the lawful belligerent, horrors are accumulated upon horrors to the total eradication of all vestige of the angel in man, and the transformation of the soldier for the time being into the fiend incarnate. This is very often the case in the present day, when the world's sentiment leans in the direction of the mitigation of war's miseries. What must it have been in the past, when there was so little of this sentiment, and when the results of campaigns or battles might not be known generally for weeks after their occurrence, owing to the scanty means of intelligence? The horrors of this Irish rebellion of barely a hundred years ago were not fully revealed until many months after the end. Massacre after massacre of prisoners was perpetrated by the British troops upon bodies of insurgents who had surrendered. It is not surprising that these outrages had the effect of exciting bitter feelings of revenge, and yet only a couple of cases are cited by the historians of the Rebellion wherein this feeling was gratified. The one was the dreadful incident of the burning of Scullabogue barn, wherein about a hundred persons are said to have perished ; yet Mr. Plowden declares that it was little wonder that the insurgents were provoked into this act of reprisal, considering the many atrocities perpetrated by the other side. The other case was worse. It was the massacre of Wexford Protestants by a fanatical mob headed by a Captain Dixon, whose relative, a priest, had been murdered by the Orange yeomanry. This outrage was the direct result of the incitement to a religious war resorted to by the authorities, and

the great redeeming feature about it is the fact that it was by the action of a Catholic priest in throwing himself between the maddened murderers and their next intended victims that the butchery was stopped.

Supplementary to the burlesques of legal proceedings for treason and sedition set on foot before and after the insurrection, the Government had trained for this particular service a peculiar corps which was styled the "battalion of testimony." This squad of wretches was under the command of Major Sirr at the Castle, and its duty was to swear scientifically, so that no one against whom the fire of the battalion was directed could possibly escape. The character of these infamous hirelings and the state of terror which their presence produced all over the country were vividly portrayed by the fearless advocate, John Philpot Curran, whose life was at one time in danger in open court for the vigor with which he denounced the prostitution of the law by the judicial tools of the Government. His picture is unsurpassed, and it is worth presenting. He said :

"I tell you, therefore, gentlemen of the jury, it is not with respect to Mr. Orr or Mr. Finnerty that your verdict is now sought ; you are called upon on your oath to say that the Government is wise and merciful ; the people prosperous and happy ; that military law ought to be continued ; that the Constitution could not with safety be restored to Ireland ; and that the statements of a contrary import by your advocates in either country are libellous and false. I tell you these are the questions ; and I ask you if you can have the front to give the expected answer in the face of a community who know the country as well as you do ? Let me ask you how you could reconcile with such a verdict the jails, the tenders, the gibbets, the conflagrations, the murders and proclamations that we hear of every day in the streets and see every day in the country ? What are the processions of the learned counsel himself circuit after circuit ? Merciful God ! What is the state of Ireland ? and where shall you find the wretched inhabitant of this land ? You may find him perhaps in jail, the only place of security, I had almost said of ordinary habitation ! If you do not find him there, you may see him flying, with his family, from the flames of his own dwelling—lighted to his dungeon by the conflagration of his own hovel ; or you may find his bones bleaching on the green fields of his country ; or you may find him tossing on the surface of the ocean, and mingling his groans with those tempests, less savage than his persecutors, that drift him to a returnless distance from his family and his home without charge or trial or sentence. . . . I speak not now of the public proclamation for informers, with a promise of secrecy and extravagant reward. I speak not of those unfortunate wretches who have been so often transferred from the table to the dock and from the dock to the pillory. I speak of what your own eyes have seen day after day, during the progress of this commission, while you attended this court—the number of horrid miscreants who acknowledged upon their oaths that they had come from the seat of Government, from the very chambers of the Castle (where they had been working upon the fear of death and hope of compensation to give evidence against their fellows), that the mild, the wholesome and the merciful council of this Government are holding over those catacombs of living death, where the wretch that is buried a man lies till his heart has time to fester and dissolve, and is then dug up a witness. Is this a picture created by a hag-ridden fancy, or is it a fact ? Have you not seen him, after his resurrection from that tomb, make his appearance upon your table—the image of death and life and supreme arbiter of both ? Have you not marked,

as he entered, how the stormy wave of the multitude retired at his approach? Have you not seen how the human heart bowed to the awful supremacy of his power in the undissembled homage of deferential horror? How his glance, like the lightning of heaven, seemed to rive the body of the accused and mark it for the grave, while his voice warned the devoted wretch of woe and death—a death which no innocence can escape, no art elude, no force resist, no antidote prevent! There was an antidote—a juror's oath; but even that adamant chain, which bound the integrity of a man to the throne of eternal justice, is solved and molten in the breath which issues from the mouth of the informer. Conscience swings from her moorings; the appalled and affrighted juror speaks what his soul abhors, and consults his own safety in the surrender of the victim.

‘Et quæ sibi quisque timebat

Unius in miseri exitium conversa tulere.’

Informers are worshipped in the temple of justice even as the Devil has been worshipped by pagans and savages. Even so, in this wicked country, is the informer an object of judicial idolatry—even so is he soothed by the music of human groans—even so is he placated and incensed by the fumes and by the blood of human sacrifice.”

The late Mr. Froude, with characteristic rancor, endeavors to give a Titus Oates tinge to the motive of the insurrection. In his references to a mysterious visitor to Lord Downshire who came to sell the secrets of the United Irishmen he apologizes for his treachery by the following monstrous invention :

“He had discovered that the object of the Papists was the ruin and destruction of the country and the establishment of a tyranny worse than that which was complained of by the reformers; that proscriptions, seizures of property, murders and assassinations were the certain consequences to be apprehended from their machinations; that he had determined to separate himself from the conspiracy.”

Who this mysterious visitor was Mr. Froude could never discover, but the indefatigable author of “*Secret Service Under Pitt*” unearthed the solution. He was a member of the Irish bar named Samuel Turner, and it does not appear, from what Mr. Fitzpatrick discovered relative to his well-kept correspondence with the English Government, that there was a scintilla of foundation for the theory that there was any religious complexion about the Irish rising. It was an audacious invention of Mr. Froude's, pure and simple; for all the correspondence connected with the movement establishes this fact most clearly—that the leaders had no object so definitely in view as the keeping the movement free from the suspicion of sectarian bias of any kind. So, too, with regard to the plea of intended assassination as a means toward the end. Assassination *was* openly advocated at one stage of the movement, but it was in the pages of the publication controlled by Watty Cox, and there was strong reason to believe that Cox was in the pay of the Government. Those leaders of the United Irishmen examined by the Government commission indignantly repudiated any thought of such a sinister design as assassination and confiscation.

Considering the limited period of the rebellion and the very circumscribed area of the theatre of hostilities, the bloodshed which attended it was of appalling volume. Outside Wexford there were only a few small engagements, chiefly in Ulster, and the fighting was virtually over in Wexford within a month. Yet the numbers who fell on both sides was so great as to be out of all proportion to the actual magnitude of the affair. According to the War Office returns the total loss in all parts of Ireland was, on the side of the British 19,700 men, and on that of the insurgents 50,000, exclusive of women and children, great numbers of whom were slain, especially in the county Wexford. All this carnage, it should be remembered, took place within a couple of months. Never was a revolt stamped out with such remorseless cruelty, and never, it might be added, was a braver resistance made by an unarmed peasantry, pitted as they were against the best soldiery in the world.

Mr. Goldwin Smith has made some statements about the non-employment of any regular British force in this dreadful business. The following figures, taken from a Parliamentary report in the year 1799, show the forces employed in crushing the insurrection: Regular army, 32,281; Irish militia, 26,634; English militia, 24,201; yeomanry, 51,274; artillery, 1300; commissariat, 1700; total of all arms, 137,390.

Bribery, Mr. Smith further states, was not used to carry the Union; it was only compensation to Irish members for the loss of their pocket-boroughs. He is free to put any name he pleases on the transaction; the fact remains that the English Government paid seven million and a half of dollars to Irish Members of Parliament to efface their trust without asking the consent of the people through a general election. Many of those traitors, besides the money compensation, were raised to the peerage. Several millions more were expended indirectly and in secret service.

Lord Chief Justice Bushe, an authority as eminent for his learning as for his incorruptibility, thus characterized the Union after it had been effectuated, and the means by which it had been contrived:

“I forget for a moment the unprincipled means by which the Union has been promoted, and I look on it simply as England reclaiming, in a moment of our weakness, that dominion which we extorted from her in a moment of our virtue—a dominion which she uniformly abused, which invariably oppressed and impoverished us, and from the extortion of which we date all our prosperity. . . . The Union is a measure which goes to degrade the country, by saying it is unworthy to govern itself. It is the revival of the odious and absurd title of conquest; it is a revival of the abominable distinction between mother-country and colony which lost America. It is the denial of the rights of nature to a great nation from an intolerance of its prosperity.”

Time, which draws a tender veil over everything, when the wrongs and the passions of exasperating crises have mouldered away in the tomb—time has vindicated the character of many of the men whom the government of the day doomed not only to death but to the infamy of the “spotted rebel.” Not many years ago one of the most eminent of the Irish judges paid a warm tribute to the virtues and the heroism of Robert Emmet. And Lord Holland, a Cabinet Minister of the stormy period of the Rebellion, thus frankly referred to the motives and action of Lord Edward Fitzgerald :

“Many of my political opinions are softened, my predilections for some men weakened, my prejudices against others removed ; but my approbation of Lord Edward Fitzgerald’s actions remains unaltered and unshaken. His country was bleeding under one of the hardest tyrannies that our times have witnessed. The fact is incontrovertible that the people of Ireland were driven to resistance, which possibly they meditated before, by the free quarters and excesses of the soldiery, which were such as are not permitted in civilized warfare, even in an enemy’s country.”

It is remarkable that the social standing of the '98 leaders was such as to preclude all idea that they were men who took to politics as a means of livelihood. At the head of the movement was a member of the Leinster house of the Geraldines, a chivalrous and accomplished nobleman, who had served with much distinction in the British army—Lord Edward Fitzgerald. Arthur O'Connor, one of its most prominent leaders, was also a member of a noble Irish family. Landed proprietors, merchants, members of the legal and clerical professions, substantial agriculturists—every interest in the country that had everything to lose by an unsuccessful appeal to arms, in fact, was amply represented in the thronged ranks of the United Irishmen. Any attempt, therefore, to disparage the movement as a socialistic or desperate enterprise must be futile. It was as genuine an uprising of a country as an aggregate of all classes against an intolerable foreign tyranny as that of the American colonists a few years previously. The sole question which remains regarding its justification is that of probability of success before embarkation on the desperate course of war. We may be sure that the solemn consideration was well weighed by the responsible leaders. Looking at all the facts—at the immense numbers of men enrolled, the aid promised by France, the different circumstances as to transport and communication in military operations between that period and our own, we cannot accuse the Irish leaders of rashness or incompetency. When we consider the tremendous fight made by a single county, we can well imagine how difficult must have been the task of the English

generals had hostilities been deferred until the neighboring counties had been in a position to take the field. How accurately the Government had gauged this emergency may easily be estimated from the extraordinary steps they took to provoke the premature ignition of the torch of war, and the herculean efforts they immediately put forth in order to extinguish it when lit.

But the most remarkable fact, perhaps, in the whole tragedy is the suddenness with which the contest was begun by the Wexford people. The county was one of the worst organized in the whole of Leinster. Very little progress had the United Irish organization made there, because the Catholic clergy from the first had steadily set their faces against the movement. They even refused the sacraments to members of the society. But it was soon apparent that this forbearance was not of the slightest use to either priests or flocks. Flesh and blood could no longer endure the torture to which the innocent people were subjected, and the men who had been foremost in preaching peace to their flocks now became the boldest in the sacred duty of resistance. The bond of union which always existed between the Irish priests and their flocks was cemented, as it so often was in the bitter penal days, by the comingling of the life-blood of both on the sacred altar of the Irish soil. How tenderly Ireland holds the memory of those heroic martyr-priests language is only able feebly to portray. Only those who know Ireland and the meaning of "*soggarth aroon*" can form an estimate.

True to her traditional policy in such nefarious international transactions, Great Britain threw the monetary cost of her monstrous aggression upon the country which she had goaded into making it. Every shilling of the cost of the army, the yeomanry and the militia was charged to Ireland, and with a cynical indifference to justice and the opinion of the civilized world the same course was adopted subsequently when the bill for carrying the Union was totalled up. Ireland was not only asked to commit national hari-kari, but to pay out of her own depleted purse, to be still further depleted by the results of the Union, for the cost of the immolation. Twenty-one millions of pounds, Dr. Madden tabulates, was the sum which the dual operation of rebellion and Union cost, and every penny of this Ireland has had to pay. As O'Connell remarked, it was just as reasonable to ask Ireland to pay for the razor with which the instrument of the Union, Castle-reagh, committed suicide. And not only was Ireland made to bear this cost, but it has been conclusively shown by Mr. O'Neill Daunt, Sir Joseph Neale McKenna, and other expert statisticians,

that the figures upon which this cost was originally estimated were deliberately "cooked" by the British accountants, in order that Ireland might be the more effectively mulcted. This allegation was fully borne out, it is well to observe, by the evidence given before the late Royal Commission on Financial Relations.

We have seen that at its inception the United Irish organization was an open movement, and how the astute policy of Government at length forced it to abandon this position. Open agitation for the redress of grievances was either non-productive of results or put down by the strong hand, and the patriots were actually driven to what has been aptly styled the policy of despair, as an alternative to the total abandonment of the people's cause. This insured the ruin of the movement. Nothing more conclusively proved the futility of oath-bound precautions to preserve inviolate the counsels of political leaders, when pitted against the strength of a Government having unlimited monetary resources at its disposal and all the machinery of secret espionage which a power having its ramifications extended all over the globe always needed. This '98 movement, as well as the subsequent '65 one, showed that at every important council meeting, no matter where held, there was present a representative of the British power, who had taken the oath of secrecy like all the rest. Behind the unselfish patriot, wherever he bent his steps, there stalked, like a shape of doom, the stealthy informer in the guise of a friend and a brother-in-arms, ready to take another oath when the time came for the panoply of British vengeance in the form of law to step in and end the drama of perfidy and dishonor. Innumerable were the informers of '98, and so deftly did they do their work that it was not until they had lain many years in the grave, in several cases, that their baseness was discovered. The social position of some of these betrayers disarmed all suspicion of their treason, and all their lives they passed as respectable members of society and the best friends of the men whom they had sent to their doom. Reynolds, McNally, Macan, Higgins, Armstrong, Turner—the principal figures in this hideous game of hypocrisy—carried their dreadful secret for many years. Thanks, mainly, to the industrious labors of Mr. Fitzpatrick, we are now in full possession of their true character; and no more serviceable work can be studied by the Irishman who would play the winning game in the contest for liberty than his story of the "Informers of '98," and "Secret Service Under Pitt."

It is not an exaggeration to describe the great drama of the Rebellion and the Union as the greatest political crime of which we

have authentic record. They were the correlative parts of the one transaction, the one deliberately planned and carried out in order that the other might the more easily be effected. The principle we find enunciated in this masterpiece of governmental policy is that, in order to effect what is considered beneficial to the ruling nation, it is permissible to employ every evil agency for the accomplishment of a given end. The commands of religion and the laws of morality may be alike disregarded; respect for human life and the liberty guaranteed under the civil constitution—respect for female purity, for the ties of friendship, for the sanctity of oaths, public honor and private virtue—all these considerations may be cast aside so long as the object in view is the consolidation of the State and the aggrandizement of the ruling power. Such cynical profligacy, if proved against an individual, would consign his memory to never-ending infamy; if perpetrated by a mob, usurping the functions of government, it would, as in the case of the French revolutionists, have banded all other States that professed to be foremost in civilized and humane principles against the tyranny. But the comparative isolation of Ireland and the powerful position which England had secured amongst the European powers enabled her Machiavellian Prime Minister to carry out his atrocious design without attracting much attention. Nay, more, in the inscrutable ways of an overruling Providence the crime-stained power which perpetrated it has been suffered to thrive and wax rich and great on the fruit of its iniquity. We must not let our views of human justice seek to establish any paradox in the fact that Great Britain has prospered beyond all comparison since the Union, and that concurrently Ireland has dwindled away to a mere skeleton of her former self, instead of becoming rich, free and happy, as Pitt assured the world she must. God's ways are not our ways; in His own good time He will vindicate His justice. Even as it is, time has shown that all this perfidy and plotting has been practically ineffective, for so little has the Union been able to consolidate the governmental systems of Great Britain and Ireland that even now the Tory Government, after resisting the proposal of Home Rule as treason to the empire, are practically undoing the work of the Union by giving back to Ireland the control of nearly the whole of her resources under the machinery of the Local Government Bill. As a matter of fact, looking at the restricted character of her ancient Parliament, and the total absence of popular representation and voice in both parliamentary, urban and baronial affairs in the system which prevailed before the Rebellion was planned,

what is offered now is far more than the people ever dared to hope for in pre-Union days. And this result is due altogether to the spirit which was fostered by the lessons of the Rebellion. Again and again it has been shown that that spirit is irrepressible and ineradicable. Hence we see that though the heroic men of '98 lost in the field, they are victorious in the grave, and the legacy of devotion and love of country they left has not been altogether squandered or disregarded by those who have been called upon to take up the *rôle* which they were compelled so sorrowfully yet so gloriously to abandon.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

MODERN APICULTURE.

AMONGST the most humane of man's interferences with the natural development of the more tractable members of the animal world, both for their benefit and his own, has been the culture of bees. In most other cases of domestication the improvement has to be paid for by some sacrifice on the part of the animal itself or of its master. Who does not lament the moral evils that have come upon sporting and betting humanity in the production of that most superb of animals, the thorough-bred horse! How many "horsey" men are made in the rearing of a single racer? On the other hand, the ploughing horse must do a slave's work for his food and lodging, and the ass and mule render an unwilling service; while it is only domestic animals which are attacked by that pest of the South African Veldt, the tsetse fly.

There have not been wanting philosophers, like Count Leo Tolstoi, whose doctrine, implicitly at least, condemns the domestication of the sheep and the ox, not so much because the beasts of the field are cruelly treated in the process, for indeed they are served and pampered like princes from the womb to the shambles, in happy unconsciousness of the speedy and probably almost painless death which awaits them, but because, in the opinion of these thinkers, man was created for a vegetable diet, and that flesh meat has been responsible for most of his transgressions. No such fault, however, can be found with the domestication of the honey-bee, for bee-keepers tell us that not only are the bees

themselves made more comfortable and prosperous under man's providential management, but that their guardian is instructed and morally improved in the process. The present writer is ready to indorse this statement in all its parts from his own experience in the management of a small apiary, and he will confess that he has had to submit at times to receiving humiliating if useful lessons from the puny objects of his charge when careless or blundering treatment has made them rebellious. Fortunately, however, the bitter experiences are mostly gone through in the beginning of the bee-keeper's career, and they ought not to discourage him.

Bees have been a subject of careful cultivation from the earliest times, and numerous treatises have been written on their management. Of ancient works on the subject, the most familiar to us, of course, is the fourth book of Virgil's "*Georgics*," which was not, perhaps, considered a very trustworthy text-book, even in its own day. The ancient Egyptians seem to have invented the system of floating apiaries. The inhabitants of Lower Egypt observed that the flowers and fruits of the earth were more forward in Upper Egypt than with themselves by above six weeks. Towards the end of October, therefore, they embarked their hives in boats and conveyed them up the Nile into Upper Egypt, arranging that they should arrive at their furthest destination just after the subsidence of the inundation, when the land had been sown and the flowers were beginning to bud. After remaining at their first station long enough to gather the full flush of nectar from the flowers, the bees were conveyed some miles lower down the river during the night, and, travelling thus in stages, they traversed the whole length of Egypt, keeping pace with the height of the flower season as it advanced northwards towards the delta of the Nile. They reached their home in Lower Egypt about the beginning of February, when the hives, which were carefully marked and numbered, were returned to their respective owners.

This practice of moving bees from pasture to pasture was common among the ancient Greeks and Romans, and continues to this day among the dwellers upon the banks of the Po. "As soon," says Pliny, "as the spring food for bees has failed in the valleys near our towns, the hives of bees are put into boats, and carried up against the stream of the river in the night, in search of better pasture. The bees go out in the morning in quest of provisions, and return regularly to their hives in the boats with the stores they have collected. This method is continued till the sinking of the boats to a certain depth in the water shows that

the hives are sufficiently full, and they are then carried back to their former homes, where their honey is taken out of them." The forms of hives used by the ancients were various, some being woven with osier twigs, while others were made of cork, hollowed wood, boards or earthenware. The Japanese and Indians of to-day use cylindrical hives lying horizontally, constructed sometimes of earthenware and sometimes of wood. In Cashmere, where such hives are used, the bees are not destroyed, but, when the honey is removed, they are driven forward with smoke, and the virgin combs at the back are taken away, while the bees are left to winter on the old and soiled combs in front, their stores being supplemented, if necessary, with sugar and meal. In England, even yet, the barbarous practice of destroying bees has not entirely died out among the peasantry; but probably, before many years have passed, it will be almost unknown.

The great revolution in bee-keeping was inaugurated in the year 1851, when the movable comb-hive was invented by the Rev. L. L. Langstroth, a native of Philadelphia. A somewhat similar hive had been invented in 1838 by Dr. Dzierzon in Germany; but Langstroth's invention was quite independent of this, and was a great improvement upon it, owing to the fact that the roof was movable, allowing the frames to be handled from the top, whereas Dzierzon's hive was opened from the side.

The chief feature of the new hive was, not merely that the combs were built in frames adjusted for the purpose, but that these frames were movable. Wooden frames of one sort or another had been used long before Langstroth's days, and seem to have been known to the ancient Greeks. Huber, who was a contemporary of Goëthe, and to whom we owe much of our knowledge of the mysteries of bee-life, invented a form of hive especially suited for close observation. It consisted of a number of wooden frames one foot square and rather less than an inch and a half in width. These were united together by hinges at one side so that they could be opened and shut at will, like the leaves of a book, while the two outer frames were closed by squares of glass. When closed the whole assumed the form of a cubical box, and might be kept together by means of cords. It is worthy of note that Huber's investigations were carried on when he was blind, and he was entirely dependent upon the assistance of his wife and a man-servant into whom he had instilled his own love of natural history. But so well did he direct their observations and experiments that he was able, in 1792, to publish his work entitled "*Nouvelles Observations sur les Abeilles*," to which we are indebted for the foundation of our scientific knowledge of bees.

Though Langstroth's invention was an undoubted boon to the bee-keeping world, which it has since completely revolutionized, it was hardly a source of profit to the inventor himself; in fact, shortly before his death a subscription was being made in America and in England to relieve his straitened circumstances. He died of apoplexy while addressing a congregation at Dayton, Ohio.

The use of movable comb-frames hanging from the top of the hive-sides enables the bee-keeper of to-day to have his colonies under much better control than used formerly to be the case, while his harvest of honey is vastly improved both in quantity and quality. In the first place the frames are easily fitted with an artificial midrib, to serve as a foundation for the comb. This consists of a sheet of wax stamped between rollers with hexagonal bases upon which the cell-walls are afterwards raised by the bees. When made of pure unrefined wax these sheets of foundation are readily accepted by the busy inhabitants of the hive, and often enough, within two days after insertion, they are found well filled with eggs, or gleaming with the first deposits of honey. The use of artificial foundation is a device for saving labor in wax-production. The calculations of experts make it probable that from six to twelve pounds of honey are consumed in the production of one pound of wax, the making of which involves a great strain upon the energies of the bee. It follows, then, that, if a large part of the wax is provided, which is the case when thick sheets of foundation are given, there is a wide margin of time and energy to spare for the production of honey.

Again, bees, if left to themselves, will often produce many more drones than are required in the apiary. Now, drones are reared in larger cells than the ordinary worker-bees, and, if worker foundation is given, the bees will not commonly modify it in order to produce drone-comb. Hence the queen, finding no drone-cells, will not lay drone-eggs. It thus happens that the number of idlers and useless mouths in the colony is kept down to a sufficient minimum, while the population of active workers is correspondingly increased.

Another advantage of movable frames comes from the fact that not only may their position in the same hive be altered, but that they may be readily transferred from one hive to another. In the early spring-time, when the queen or mother-bee starts her laying operations in earnest, she strives to maintain the spherical shape of her brood-nest. That is to say, supposing for the sake of explanation that there are five combs occupied with eggs and larvæ,

the middle comb will contain a large circular patch of brood on both sides, while the two adjacent combs will have smaller patches, and the two outer ones smaller still. But it will happen that the bee-keeper wishes to hasten on the egg-laying, in order to have the colony strong by the time that the fruit-blossom is well out. He may therefore take one of the outer combs of the brood-nest and change its place with that of the central comb. Upon this the queen, in order to preserve the spherical shape of her nest, will fill the new central comb with eggs, and also lay in the other combs until she has completed a sphere which is necessarily much larger than the original one. This method, if discreetly used, will do much towards bringing on a colony to its full strength in good time.

But perhaps the chief benefit to be derived from the movable frame is the fact that when full of capped honey it may be removed, emptied of its contents without the destruction of the wax-cells, and returned to the hive to be refilled by the bees. Much time is thus saved, and probably twice as much honey is secured as would have been the case had the bees been left to build out their combs afresh. The operation of emptying is carried out by means of the "extractor," a cylindrical vessel fitted with a spindle, in which the honey is driven out of the combs by centrifugal force. Before the combs are placed in the extractor, the cappings of the cells are removed by a sharp knife with a broad blade which has been previously dipped in hot water. When the cappings are melted down they usually produce a cake of beautiful, light-colored wax.

Under favorable circumstances the quantity of honey which may be produced from a single hive is very great. It is not an uncommon thing for one colony of bees to produce some two hundred pounds in a season. But probably the largest harvest ever taken from one hive was secured last summer by an amateur bee-keeper in the Isle of Man. One of his colonies produced three hundred and thirty-four pounds of honey.¹

¹ The following figures will serve to illustrate this part of our subject. They are taken from *The Bee-Keepers' Record* (London), December, 1891. The first table gives the results for sixteen years from an extensive apiary in California, and shows the conditions of weather influencing the yield of honey :

Years.	Inches of rain.	Number of colonies.	General average.
1876, . . .	21¼	150	200 pounds.
1877, . . .	4½	300	No honey; half bees dying.
1878, . . .	20¼	150	275 pounds.
1879, . . .	12¾	300	No honey; half bees dying.
1880, . . .	22⅞	200	175 pounds.

No such results as these were ever attained under the old system of straw hives or "skeps." Moreover, the honey produced under the present system is always perfectly clean, for it is not, as a rule, extracted from those combs in which eggs have been laid and brood reared, as the exuviae of these are apt to spoil both the color and the taste of the honey. In order to explain how the brood-combs are kept separate from those which are destined for the extractor, it will be necessary to give a short description of the architecture of the hive.

The modern movable comb-hive usually consists of two chambers or boxes, one above the other, and separated by means of a sheet of perforated zinc. In each of these chambers some ten or eleven frames hang by the ends of their upper bars from shoulders on the sides of the walls. The floor of the hive is separable from the other parts of the same, as is likewise the case with the roof. The object of the zinc separator is to prevent the queen bee from ascending into the upper chamber and laying her eggs in the combs there. For this purpose it is perforated with slots large enough to admit the workers, but not the queen. Thus the lower story is reserved entirely for the raising of brood and for such stores as the bees require for their own sustenance. It is

1881,	.	.	.	13 $\frac{3}{8}$	400	20 pounds.
1882,	.	.	.	11 $\frac{1}{8}$	120	15 pounds.
1883,	.	.	.	11 $\frac{3}{4}$	150	40 pounds.
1884,	.	.	.	41 $\frac{1}{4}$	160	100 pounds.
1885,	.	.	.	8 $\frac{7}{8}$	200	No honey; half bees dying.
1886,	.	.	.	28 $\frac{3}{8}$	240	175 pounds.
1887,	.	.	.	16 $\frac{3}{8}$	330	10 pounds.
1888,	.	.	.	20	400	50 pounds.
1889,	.	.	.	24 $\frac{3}{8}$	420	36 pounds.
1890,	.	.	.	39 $\frac{1}{2}$	430	60 pounds.
1891,	.	.	.	19 $\frac{3}{8}$	450	21 pounds.

The next table gives the averages for seven years of an apiary in Sussex :

						Average per hive. Pounds.	Rainfall. Inches.
1885,	42	29.68
1886,	28	31.62
1887,	34	23.44
1888,	4	29.83
1889,	66	27.53
1890,	14	24.13
1891,	60	27.79

The averages in this second list are not high, nor do they represent what is expected from a good honey district in England. This last year, in North Wales, I secured an average of 94 pounds per hive. In 1889 the average in the same apiary was 109 pounds.

usually filled with food during the late summer, so that, when the upper story or "super" has been taken away after the harvest, there still remains enough food to support the colony during the winter. If natural supplies are not sufficiently abundant by the fall, the deficit may be made up with sugar boiled to a syrup, with which the bees store their empty cells.

Of course it does not always happen that extracted honey is the only product of the "super." Our readers are doubtless familiar with the neat little basswood boxes or "sections" of honey-comb which are often exposed for sale in the windows of the grocer's store. These sections have been filled out by the bees upon a thin sheet or midrib of pure wax, artificially prepared, and the beautifully level surface of the comb is secured by separating the sections from one another by means of thin metal sheets, which prevent the bees from extending the cell-walls beyond a fixed distance from the midrib.

The actual removal of full combs from the hive is frequently a source of great irritation to its inhabitants. Every comb has to be cleared of bees, and where smoke and brushes are relied upon, such an operation cannot easily be performed without much disturbance. In fact, for days after the removal, it is often unsafe for passers-by to approach the apiary unprotected. Much, however, may be done to avoid these troubles by careful manipulation. But an invention has recently been made which makes the process of robbing the hive an easy one to the merest novice. When the top story of the hive is full of honey, and the time has come to empty it, it is lifted up a few inches from the lower chamber, and between the two is placed a board fitted with a trap-door, formed by two delicately adjusted strips of tin, meeting together so as to form a V, through which a bee may pass but not return. When the upper chamber is laid upon this board or "super-clearer," as it is called, the bees have only one way for going below, and that is through the trap-door. They are not long in finding it, and if the weather is favorable the chamber is emptied of its occupants in from four to six hours, and may be carried bodily away without the bees ever, apparently, becoming aware of their loss.

It is perhaps clear, from what has been hitherto said, that modern bee-keeping does not involve any hard treatment of the bees. The insects are comfortably housed and relieved from all that uncertainty as to the future which is incident to a swarm left to shift for itself in the wilds and forests. They are not destroyed at the end of the season, but are rewarded for their hard work with a liberal allowance of food and plenty of warm packing

during the winter. It is true that they are robbed of sometimes as much as five-sixths of their total store ; but then this is entirely superfluous wealth, as far as they are concerned, and may be taken as a fair rent by their landlord, the bee-keeper. When they are left to themselves, their surplus honey, if indeed they are able to gather any surplus, is liable to be entirely wasted. It will sometimes happen that wild bees, when they have settled in a cave or some other favorable situation, will go on increasing their store, year after year, until the older combs begin to grow useless with damp and age ; whereas, were they under the charge of a careful manager, they would be equally secure against famine, and there would be no waste of their produce.

It is the part of the skilful apiarist to study the natural laws which rule the life of bees, and give those laws the most favorable circumstances for working themselves out. He provides for his charge a suitable abode, which, unlike the crevice in the rock or the hollow of the tree, may be enlarged for greater storage in summer and contracted for warmth in the winter. He provides the queen with all the space she needs for giving play to her wonderful fertility, and he satisfies the toil-loving instinct of the workers by insuring a long-continued succession of the flowers they most do love. If need be, he can add to the joy of the bee nation by an indefinite increase of their numbers. For if he divides his colonies and provides each with a young queen, according to a method which we shall hereafter describe, he will soon increase his apiary fourfold. But such increase is only attained by sacrificing the present income of honey.

In hives where fixed combs are built there is often cause for anxiety, because the apiarist does not know whether the colony is headed by a good prolific queen, or even whether there is a queen there at all. In the case of movable combs this difficulty is done away with, and it is only necessary to lift out a few of the frames in order to see how many larvæ are growing to maturity, while a more careful search may reveal the queen herself. If she is too old she may be caught and superseded.

If the apiarist wishes to increase the number of his colonies in a way which involves less uncertainty than that of natural swarming, the operation of dividing his existing stocks is rendered perfectly easy by the use of movable combs, as these may be transferred from hive to hive without difficulty. But it may happen that he prefers the bees to choose their own time of swarming, and in that case he has to hive them by an operation which, if sometimes troublesome, is full of interest for those who

wish to observe the habits of bees. The task of securing a swarm is often full of difficulty, especially when the cluster is formed among the thin upper branches of a tall tree or at the top of a high chimney. As a rule, however, the position chosen is more assailable, and, when the swarm is once secured in a basket or by cutting off the branch on which it has settled, the rest of the work is easy enough. For the bees are now in the best of tempers, and there is no danger of their stinging unless, by an awkward movement, one or two of them happen to be crushed. A new abode has been made ready for them, and they are shaken off on to a sheet laid out in front of it. At once, those nearest the entrance make their way inside. A cheerful humming is set up, and the rest of the bees, forming in orderly procession, follow their foremost comrades into the hive, and start their operations of comb-building on the sheets of foundation prepared for them. They are enabled to do this by the supply of honey which they have taken care to bring with them from the parent hive, and, as no time is lost, cells are soon built out for the queen in which to deposit her eggs, in order that a new generation may speedily arise to carry on the existence of the colony. Some three weeks must pass before any young ones are hatched from their cocoons, and, meanwhile, the original members of the swarm are dying off rapidly, owing to the great strain which is laid upon their energies in the task of nursing the younglings of the family and laying up their store of honey. But, if all goes well, the new generation will soon begin to hatch out in great numbers, and in the case of an early swarm the owner will probably obtain a fair quantity of surplus honey from the upper story, besides leaving enough in the brood-chamber to serve as winter stores for its inmates.

Readers who have seen nothing of the practical operations of bee-keeping may wonder how the bees allow their owner to move them about at will, and whether they do not at times make an effective use of the deadly weapon wherewith nature has furnished them. It is well, of course, for beginners to be provided not only with a veil but also with a good, thick pair of woollen or india-rubber gloves. Very soon, as confidence comes, the gloves are discarded, and when the novice has become an expert in his craft, he even learns to do without the veil. Different races of bees differ not a little in disposition, while those in the same hive will show great varieties of temper at different seasons, and even in different hours of the day. The careful manager must, therefore, know when to choose the best time for his operations, and he will always proceed with that quiet deliberation which is acquired, often

enough, only by bitter experience; for the very least jarring or jerking is apt to disturb the inmates of the hive, and a careless novice will sometimes provoke a general attack where an expert would come off without a single sting. It is well, therefore, for a beginner, who has had no practical instruction, to start with some quiet race of bees such as Carniolans, which are remarkable for their gentleness.

Smoke is an effective agent in the quieting and subjugation of bees. It must be used in large or in small quantities according to the nature of the operation in hand, but an apiarist who prides himself on his personal influence over his bees will use as little as possible. A free use of the smoker is advisable when two colonies are to be united into one. The combs, covered with bees, are taken from the two stocks to be joined, and are alternated in a single hive. The instinct of bees is, ordinarily, to regard all strangers who enter their hive as hostile intruders, and unless due precautions are taken the union will be one only of murderous conflict. The smoker is, therefore, pretty vigorously plied, both before and after the union, and the use of it should go on until both parties have been coerced into friendship.

An interesting instance of the change of demeanor of bees when subdued is afforded in the operation of "driving," which is performed when we wish to remove the occupants of a straw hive, or "skep," into a frame hive. The skep is inverted on the ground so that its floor-board now forms a lid. Smoke is puffed in at the entrance, and a minute or so is allowed the inhabitants to fill themselves with honey, which they always do when disturbed. The board is then removed, and an empty skep is firmly clamped over the one to be driven, in such a position that the edges of the two skeps meet in one point, while the upper one is inclined at an angle of 45° above the lower. The operator, after again smoking the bees, begins rapping vigorously with both hands upon the sides of the skep to be emptied. As soon as the rapping is started the bees, being now filled with honey, which acts as a sedative to their temper, and being, moreover, too frightened by the shaking and noise to offer any resistance, do not attempt to fly away, but begin a quiet and orderly procession into the empty skep above, passing over the point of contact on their way. In from ten to twenty minutes they are all clustering within their temporary lodging, quiet and completely in hand, and may be carried away to their new location to be transferred to a frame hive. It is best to unite two or three colonies of driven bees in order to make one strong stock, and if the union is performed soon after the driving, the

insects are so thoroughly cowed that they may be shaken together in a skep like so many beans.

So far, we have given a general account of the external aspects of apiculture without entering far into the inner life of the beegarden; but for one who approaches the subject with the feelings of a naturalist, it is precisely the inner economy of the hive which presents the most interest. And, indeed, the study of bee-life, even where it does not carry the observer beyond his own garden, provides him with a source of amusement and instruction which is not soon exhausted.

A prosperous colony, about the month of May, consists of a fertile queen, a few hundred drones, and from thirty to fifty thousand worker-bees. The queen differs from the workers in size, shape and color. She is somewhat larger than they are, has comparatively shorter wings, and is longer and more slender in structure. The drones, too, are larger than the workers, and more bulky in shape than the queen. The purpose of their life is to impregnate the newly-hatched queens, and, when their services are no longer required, they are ruthlessly driven out by the workers.

Let us suppose that a young virgin queen has just emerged from her cell in a hive which has been deprived of its original queen by a swarm, or in some other way. One of her first acts is to destroy her sister queens who are just on the point of hatching out from their cells. This she is prevented from doing by the workers whenever they have made up their minds to send out a second swarm or "cast," as it is called. When this happens, the emigrant bees are headed by the virgin queen who has failed in her attempt to destroy her rivals. After the last swarm has departed, only one young queen is allowed to survive. Within a week or so after her birth she issues forth from the hive on her mating flight, and, after meeting the drone, who dies within a few hours of the accomplishment, she is rendered fertile for life, which in her case lasts from three to four or five years. In a day or two after impregnation, which always take place on the wing, she starts her maternal duties, and begins to fill the combs of her brood-nest with eggs. When in her prime, she is capable of laying from two to three thousand eggs a day, and a vigorous queen will do so for days, and even weeks, in succession. In other words, she yields every day a quantity of eggs which is equal, on the lowest computation, to twice her own weight. More properly, it is four times her weight, for at this period more than half her weight consists of eggs; so that, in the winter, her weight is one-

fourth of that of her daily yield of eggs in the summer. It may be wondered how she achieves this prodigious result without any strain upon her energies; for it would seem that her powers of digestion must be equal to those of a man who is able to eat up the better part of an ox and feel perfectly well the next day. Such, however, is not altogether the case. In fact, her stomach is smaller than that of the worker, but, by an admirable division of labor, the task of digestion is performed for her by hundreds of worker-bees, who keep her supplied with digested food, which, with little or no further defecation, is rapidly transformed into eggs. By far the greater part of these eggs are laid in the smaller cells, and eventually become worker-bees; but the queen has the power of laying drone-eggs at will, whenever drone-cells have been provided by the workers to receive them. In fact, as Dr. Dzierzon discovered, drone-eggs are produced by parthenogenesis. He says: "All eggs which come to maturity in the two ovaries of a queen bee are only of one and the same kind, which, when they are laid without coming into contact with the male semen, become developed into male bees; but, on the contrary, when they are fertilized by male semen, produce female bees." Moreover, just as every egg is, before fecundation in the body of the queen, potentially a male or a female, so, after fecundation, the female egg is potentially either a queen or a worker. The difference is produced by the different treatment of the larvæ after they are hatched from the egg. All the newly-born grubs are fed by the workers on a kind of pap or digested food during the first three days of their existence, but on the fourth day after hatching the worker-larvæ are weaned, and their nurses begin to feed them on honey. The queen, on the contrary, is never weaned, and her continued feeding on pap or "royal jelly," as it is sometimes called, serves to make her development more rapid, as well as more complete.

The various metamorphoses of bees and their periods of transformation are well explained in the following table, which we borrow from Mr. T. W. Cowan's work, "The British Bee-Keeper's Guide-Book":

	Queen. Days.	Worker. Days.	Drone. Days.
1. Time of incubation of egg,	3	3	3
2. Time of feeding the larvæ,	5	5	6
3. Spinning of cocoon by larvæ,	1	2	3
4. Period of rest,	2	3	4
5. Transformation of larvæ into nymphs,	1	1	1
6. Time in nymph state,	3	7	7
Total,	15	21	24

	Queen. Date.	Worker. Date.	Drone. Date.
1. The hatching of the egg takes place, and the grub emerges on the	4th	4th	4th
2. The cell is sealed over on the	9th	9th	9th
3. The bee leaves the cell as a perfect insect on the	16th	22d	25th
4. The bee leaves the hive to fly on the	5th	14th	14th

It will be seen from the table that the queen completes her series of changes much more rapidly than the workers and drones. In fact it is possible for her to be laying eggs before her equals in age have left their cells as perfect bees, though this will not often happen. It should also be observed that the worker stays nearly a fortnight in the hive before issuing forth to gather honey. This period is often shorter, and will vary according to the needs of the colony; for the newly-born insects are the nurses of the larvæ, and they begin their duties almost immediately after leaving the cell. Moreover, not only do they nurse the larvæ, but it is upon them that the drones depend for their subsistence; for Pastor Schönfeld has recently shown that these gentry are so helpless as to be unable to feed themselves, and that, if their food is withheld, they die after three days, in presence of abundance of honey. The same authority thinks that this is the reason why the drones perish so quietly at the end of the season. It will sometimes happen that the worker-larvæ are fed with digested food a little beyond the allotted period. In this case they become half-developed queens, who, though incapable of mating, are still able to lay eggs, all of which produce drones. Their existence helps to confirm the theory of the parthenogenesis of drones. Such prolific workers are sometimes a source of trouble in an apiary, though they are not usually tolerated by bees which have a good fertile queen. They do not lay their eggs in the same orderly way as the queen, who never misses a cell in her passage over the combs, but their eggs are deposited up and down the comb without any regard to order.

We have seen that a vigorous queen at the height of the season will lay upwards of three thousand eggs a day, or two a minute, and it will readily be inferred that the increase of population will often proceed at a very great rate. And such, in fact, is the case. Moreover, as fifty thousand bees form a strong hive, and as a normal colony going into winter-quarters does not materially increase its spring muster, it may be well imagined that the mortality among bees in the summer months is very great. Their death-rate varies with their activity, and it has been stated that, speaking roughly, a bee will live six weeks in summer and six months in winter. Of course such an assertion but very inaccurately represents the truth.

To illustrate this subject we make the following extract from a letter to "Gleanings in Bee-Culture," a journal published at Medina, Ohio.

"Here are observations on a colony of bees I followed in Palestine, January to December, 1891. As nearly as I could make out, the colony numbered some ten thousand bees, January 7.

	Daily average.	Total.
January 7 to 20,	100	2,000
January 20 to February 7,	666	11,988
February 7 to March 3,	700	16,800
March 3 to 18,	2,333	34,995
March 18 to April 10,	2,600	57,200
April 10 to May 21,	1,000	30,000
May 21 to June 17,	2,111	56,977
June 17 to July 10,	2,277	50,094
July 10 to August 3,	1,250	30,000
August 3 to 29,	460	10,960
August 29 to September 13,	200	4,000
September 13 to October 14,	115	3,000
October 14 to November 11,	35	1,000
November 11 to December 10,	28	1,000
December 10 to 31,	0	—
Grand Total,		320,034

. . . . The colony did not swarm, and at the end of the season it was reduced to very nearly what it was in the beginning; three hundred thousand bees were hatched and passed away; the colony had produced nearly one hundred and eighty pounds of honey."

When we consider the above facts and remember that, owing to changes in the weather, the expenditure of energy by the bees, and therefore their mortality, is probably more variable than their rate of production, we are not likely to be far from the truth in saying that, during a busy working-day in summer, sometimes as many as four thousand bees will leave their hive, never to return. A death-rate such as this will soon tell heavily on the population of a hive which, by any mischance, has been deprived of its queen, and consequently the careful apiarist, whose bee-garden is large enough to admit of such a practice, will always have a supply of young queens ready for emergencies. These may be produced somewhat after the following manner: As soon as the old queen has left her home with the swarm, there will be found in the hive from six to a dozen cells built quite differently from the common worker or drone-cells. They hang mouth downwards from the comb and are shaped somewhat like an acorn in its cup, which they also resemble in size. These cells contain the larvæ of the future queens, and they are all fed plenteously upon digested food until their cells are sealed over. Unless the owner interferes, the first queen that hatches will probably destroy her sisters; but

if all the cells but one are taken away and placed each in a small queenless hive of three or four combs covered with bees and containing honey and larvæ, there will soon be a number of young queens, which, if successfully mated, may be transferred to larger colonies whenever they are wanted. Such a need arises after a swarm, since, if the hive is left to itself, a period of three weeks will often elapse before the new queen is ready to lay, and meantime there will be no young produced to make up for the heavy mortality among the older workers. If the surplus queens are not all wanted in the course of the season, they will, if born early, have raised the little colonies in which they were reared to the proportions of a populous hive, strong enough to pass through the winter. We cannot here do more than touch upon this subject of queen-rearing. It is an art which has been carried to a great degree of perfection, especially in America, and considerable profits are often secured by the sale of artificially raised queens.

Special precautions have to be taken in introducing these queens to new colonies. As the queen is the sole parent of the family, the members of her household are extremely careful that no harm shall happen to her, and are attentive to her every want. While she is in the hive no strange queen is admitted, and so attached are the workers to her person that she is often allowed to rule when she is in her fourth or fifth year, long after her fertility has begun to wane. Superannuated queens are, however, eventually deposed by their colonies. This affection of the bees for their common mother renders it necessary, for on removing her, in order to put another in her place, the bee-keeper must wait till the colony has realized its loss and become eager for a new sovereign before he ventures to make the substitution; for, if the stranger is introduced too soon, she is likely to be destroyed by the workers. It is, therefore, a common practice to enclose her within the hive in a small cage of wire-net or perforated tin for a day or more, according to circumstances, so that the bees may become accustomed to her presence. When they have found out how necessary she has become to them, they begin to feed her through the bars of the cage, and when she is released they crowd about her, and give her a kind of ovation before she enters upon her new duties. A caged queen should always have access to honey or sugar when in the cage, for otherwise, if the workers do not provide her with her ordinary digested food, she will very soon starve.

Before winter bees enter upon a period of rest, during which little or no breeding goes on, and they do not leave the hive in great numbers at a time. Their bodies are so constituted that

they can, if need be, remain indoors for weeks together without detriment to the perfect cleanliness of the hive, though, of course, a sanitary flight is occasionally necessary. During their hibernation they are generally in a semi-torpid state, and form a cluster among the combs, which is only disturbed when they fill their honey sacs from the adjacent cells with a supply of food which may last them several days. If the weather is not unusually cold, the consumption of stores does not go on rapidly, and is just enough to keep up a temperature of about 60°. But about the month of March, when breeding is going on apace, a much higher temperature is required for the nursing of the tender brood, and a much more rapid encroachment on the winter supplies is necessary for their nourishment. At this time the temperature of a prosperous hive is probably about 90°, while at swarming-time, when the bees are unusually excited, it is sometimes as high as 96°.

There is an evil tendency among bees which is apt to show itself now and again during the winter months when the weather happens to be milder than usual, and, indeed, at any time when there is no honey to be found in the fields and gardens. Their foraging instinct will then sometimes take a wrong direction, and the members of a strong colony, although well supplied with stores, will combine to rob a weaker hive of all its winter food. The best preventive of this troublesome tendency is to keep all the colonies strong by uniting the weak ones about September; but, failing that, the entrance of the hive may be narrowed, so as to leave a defensible passage. Bees will make a much more determined resistance to an attack of this sort if there is a queen present in the hive. In fact, as a rule, they are always in better heart, both for fighting and working, when the future of the colony is secure. The addition of a comb of larvæ to a broodless swarm will help to attach it to a new location, and a practised eye will often be able to detect the absence of a queen by the listless behavior of the bees as they go in and out at the entrance of their hive.

Though bees appear to recognize members of their own colony by the sense of smell, and are jealous of intrusion, yet they exercise considerable discrimination in the exclusion of strangers. During the honey-harvest all comers seem to be welcome, and no right-minded colony will refuse a stranger the right of laying down its load of treasure in their hive if it so desires. If a number of bees from one hive are marked during the honey-flow, several of them will probably be found, ere long, distributed among

various hives of the apiary. When, however, a strange bee comes to rob, it is easily recognized as a marauder. Langstroth, in his "Treatise on the Honey-Bee," says: "There is an air of roguery about a thieving bee which, to the expert, is as characteristic as are the motions of a pickpocket to a skilful policeman. Its sneaking look and nervous, guilty agitation, once seen, can never be mistaken."

The honey produced by bees is gathered from the flowers, and sometimes, as in the case of the bean and some laurels, from the leaves of various kinds of plants. The nectar, or thin, sugary syrup, which is produced by the flowers most abundantly in the early morning, is sucked up by the bees through their long, pliant tongues into the honey-sac, whence it is transferred to the cells of the comb after undergoing chemical change in the body of the insect. Besides honey, the pollen of flowers is necessary as food for the bees, especially for the young larvæ, to which it is given in an undigested form when they are weaned. The use of it may be supplied, if necessary, by wheaten or pea flour, which is sometimes exposed in the open air on stavings, so as to be more easily gathered. The pollen is gathered into compact lentil-shaped pellets, carried by the bees on their posterior legs, which are provided with recurved hairs, to keep their loads in place. It is a gladdening sight in the early spring, when the busy workers are streaming into the hive with their golden burdens of crocus pollen heaped up symmetrically on either side. Sometimes their load seems almost too heavy for them, and they will occasionally rest on any object near the hive, or on the observer's hand or clothes, while summoning up strength for their flight through the entrance and their final labors within.

As is well known, it is the distribution of pollen from one flower to another by bees and other insects which causes the fertilization of plants, and, on this account, a few hives of bees are a useful addition to the orchard or fruit-garden. There are some flowers, however, which the honey-bee cannot fertilize. One of these is the common red clover, into which her tongue is not long enough to penetrate, and which depends upon the humble-bee for its reproduction. A curious effect of this dependence was felt not many years ago in New Zealand, where, previous to 1884, all red clover seed had to be imported owing to there being no humble-bees to fertilize the flowers. Several unsuccessful attempts had been made to import these insects, but they died on the voyage out. In 1884, however, nearly five hundred humble-bees were sent out packed in moss and in boxes containing reservoirs of ice, so as to

keep the temperature just above freezing-point, and to keep the bees in a dormant state on the voyage. About one hundred of the bees survived, and their offspring now abound in New Zealand, so that clover seed has been exported thence to England. The secretary of the Canterbury Acclimatization Society wrote, in January, 1895: "The humble-bees have been a great success in Canterbury, and clover seed has been *exported* to England the last three or four years. It is estimated that the clover-seed crop is worth £30,000 per annum to this province, and this is entirely due to the successful importation of the humble-bee."

When common bees are sent by sea they should be placed in the refrigerator of the ship, and then, if they are well packed, they may travel round the world without being any the worse for their journey, for the outside temperature is cold enough to keep them dormant, and not so cold as to oblige them to consume much food in keeping up the necessary minimum of heat in the cluster.

We have already said something about the use of wax in the hive. Wax is a secretion from the body of the bee, which is given off in a solid state from the four junctions of the ventral plates of the abdomen. It comes forth in the shape of eight little scales or flakes resembling mica, two from each joint. These scales are removed by a pincer-like joint of the hind leg. They are then transferred to the front leg, and thence to the mouth, to be masticated by the jaws with the addition of saliva, which modifies the wax and renders it malleable. For the production of wax close clustering is commonly necessary, in order to keep up the requisite temperature of 87° to 98° Fahr. The cells of the comb are built in the form of hexagons, which is the most suitable for the purpose. Dr. Reid observes:¹

"There are only three possible figures of the cells which can make them all equal and similar without useless interstices. These are the equilateral triangle, the square, and the regular hexagon. It is well known to mathematicians that there is not a fourth way possible in which a plane may be cut into little spaces that shall be equal, similar and regular, without leaving any interstices."

There are sixteen drone-cells, or twenty-five worker-cells, to one square-inch of comb.

There is yet another product of the hive, not yet mentioned, which, if useless to man, is often put to a good purpose by the bees when in their wild state. This is a sticky, resinous substance called propolis, collected from the buds of the poplar, horse-chestnut and various other trees, and is used in closing all useless chinks and

¹ See *The Honey-Bee*, by E. Bevan, p. 388.

openings in the hive. It is said, too, to be sometimes of great service in the embalming of intruders in the hive which have been stung to death and are too heavy to be carried away. An unwary snail, for instance, will creep through the entrance, and, being stung, will retire within its shell to die. The instinct of the bees tells them that, with such an encumbrance in their midst, their hive will soon be uninhabitable unless the proper remedy is applied. They therefore glue down the rim of the shell to the floor-board, so that the evil odor does not infect the hive.

The free use of propolis is often a serious nuisance to the bee-keeper, sticking to his hands and rendering the movable frames almost immovable. The quilt, too, which covers the frames is often glued down fast, so that careful handling is necessary in order to remove it without disturbing the bees. It may be wondered how the insects themselves carry and apply this sticky material without becoming involved in it like birds in bird-lime. But nature has provided them with the proper appliances, not only for keeping their home clean but for removing the stickiest substances from their own bodies. Their saliva, which is yielded freely and is of service in the modification of wax and honey, is also used for cleansing purposes, and is, in fact, both soap and water to the bees. Moreover, they are provided with natural combs and brushes formed by hairs of various degrees of thickness, as well as with claws at the ends of their feet. It is a common and interesting sight to see bees performing their toilet or grooming one another in the sunlight. In the case of propolis, the manipulation of it is so delicately performed that little or none adheres in its wrong place. The gathering of it by the bees is thus described by Mr. F. Cheshire:¹

“If a piece of propolis be placed on the finger, and a seat be taken near the hive, ere long a bee will be at work appropriating the treasure; and in this way I have studied, with a hand-magnifier, their methods of packing it. The mandibles, by a gnawing process, cut off a ribbon, which passes down under the thorax. This, by a process of mastication, is softened, and carried by the legs backwards, without soiling any part of the body, and finds its way to the pollen basket, where it glistens like a tiny brown glass bead. The bee, loaded, returns to the hive, and here the expectant painters lay hold of the material with their mandibles, pull it off in strings, and apply it as desired.”

Propolis, though necessary to bees in a wild state, is only a hindrance in a well-ordered apiary, and, though once regarded as valuable for its supposed medicinal qualities, it is now no longer in any request in the commercial world.

¹ *Bees and Bee-Keeping*, vol. ii., p. 602.

It does not fall within the scope of this paper to enter into the microscopic study of the bee. For those who are interested in this pursuit, several complete and well illustrated manuals have been published; while such as desire to learn at first hand from the microscope will find occupation for many a long hour. It may be of interest here, however, to say a word about the action of the sting of the bee. As is well known, the sting usually remains in the wound with a large part of the intestines adhering to it, while the aggressive insect pays for its revenge with its life. The actual pain of the sting is not often severe, but its after-effects are extremely disagreeable with some people; for occasionally a single sting on the finger will cause the arm to swell beyond the elbow, while one on the face will often produce considerable disfigurement. But such cases are the exception rather than the rule, and the enthusiastic bee-keeper does not greatly count the cost of becoming inoculated. The present writer's experience at the outset of his career as an amateur apiarist was that, though the swelling caused in him by a single sting was considerable at first, and accompanied by a slight upsetting of the system, yet very soon these effects began greatly to diminish. In his first year with the bees, the effect of some thirty stings incurred in an imprudent experiment with vicious bees at the end of July was less disagreeable than the consequences of a single sting in the beginning of the previous June.

The reason why the bee, unlike the wasp, is unable to withdraw its sting from the wound is, that the end of it is furnished with two rows, each containing ten barbs. These barbs are larger in the worker than in the queen, and the result of this difference is that the queen, who, realizing instinctively the value of her life to the community, is more chary in the use of her sting; is also better able to withdraw it if she does occasionally employ it.

It will, perhaps, add to the interest of our subject if we compare the habits of bees with those of one or two of the well-known species among hymenopteræ. The humble-bees, or *bombi*, are nearly related to our hive-bees, and are also partly social. A common species of them, the *Bombus muscorum*, not unfrequently makes its nest in the open fields, constructing it with moss, plastered on the inside with wax, so as to keep out the rain. The general construction of the nest does not resemble that of the hive-bee either in size or symmetry; and the cells, which are oval in shape, are heaped together without apparent order. These cells, besides the larvæ, contain also honey and pollen. The mother-bee, who is impregnated before the winter, has to begin

her work of founding a colony single-handed, as the males and workers do not survive the winter. The first eggs laid produce workers, and when these begin to hatch out the mother is relieved, by degrees, from her work of nursing the larvæ and foraging. In due time males and females are born, both of which are tolerated in the colony without any restriction as to number.

The nest of the *bombi* is far from being as populous as that of the hive-bee. In one large colony of the *Bombus terrestris* there were counted one hundred and seven males, fifty-six females and one hundred and eighty workers—a number equal to that of the young, which are sometimes hatched out in two hours in a prosperous hive.

The common wasp (*Vespa vulgaris*) presents many points of resemblance to the humble-bee. In both cases the queen alone survives the winter, the nests are commonly found beneath the ground, and the colony contains males, females and workers. The nest of the wasp, however, is more symmetrical than that of the humble-bee, having a nearer resemblance in structure to that of the honey-bee, for the cells are hexagonal in shape, though they do not present the same neatness and regularity of formation. The combs are regularly placed, and, under favorable circumstances, the nest may contain a population which has been rated as high as thirty thousand. The position and structure of the combs, however, differ from what we find in the hive, for they are circular in shape, are arranged one above another horizontally, and each contains a single layer of cells opening downwards. The material, too, of which they are made is different. It consists of a papery substance manufactured by the wasp from dried wood, or sometimes even from paper itself. The raw material is worked by her mandibles, with the addition of saliva, into a pulp, which is easily moulded when moist.

During the first half of the summer only workers are produced, but later on fully developed females and males make their appearance, the latter being produced by parthenogenesis from eggs laid by the later broods of workers.

Another of the Hymenoptera with habits in some ways resembling those of the bee is the ant, whose natural history is peculiarly interesting. They, too, have their males, females and workers; but the neuters are wingless, while the females lose their wings after their nuptial flight. Whilst in this state they are taken by the workers to found new colonies. In certain species of ants there are two kinds of workers, one kind consisting of the soldiers, who are provided with large mandibles or biting-jaws, to fit them

the better for warfare. There are some species of ants which capture the pupæ or immature young of other species and train them up as slaves; nor do they limit their exactions to their own genus, for several kinds of insects have been found living regularly with the ants in their nest. Chief among these domestic animals are various kinds of the sugar-yielding *Aphis*, which are kept by the ants in their nests for the sake of the sweetness which they excrete. Sir John Lubbock writes:¹

“The ants may be said literally to milk the aphides; for, as Darwin and others have shown, the aphides generally retain the secretion until the ants are ready to receive it. The ants stroke and caress the aphides with their antennæ, and the aphides then emit the sweet secretion. . . . Nor is this the only service which ants render to them. They protect them from the attacks of enemies, and not unfrequently build cowsheds of earth over them. The yellow ants collect the root-feeding species in their nests, and tend them as carefully as their own young. But this is not all. The ants not only guard the mature aphides, which are useful, but also the eggs of the aphides, which, of course, until they come to maturity, are quite useless.”

The longevity of ants is much greater than that of either bees or wasps. Sir John Lubbock, whose observatory ant-nests enabled him to keep ants under observation for long periods, identified workers of *Lasius niger* and *Formica fusca* which were at least seven years old, whilst of two queens of the latter species which he kept, he declared that one lived for more than thirteen years and the other for nearly fifteen. Five years is probably the limit of a queen-bee's life.

After this digression, and before bringing this paper to a conclusion, we will yet presume upon the patience of the reader so far as to devote a few paragraphs to what may be called the curiosities of Apiculture. That bees do nothing invariably is a fact which, though it adds to their interest in the eyes of the naturalist, is often a source of despair to the novice bee-keeper. Swarms will sometimes choose the most inconvenient places for clustering, and will collect in a sooty chimney, when there are plenty of suitable trees quite near the hive. A swarm has been known to take possession of a post-box, and so to delay the letters through one delivery and until some experienced person was able to remove them. In July, last year, a swarm from an apiary under the present writer's management settled in the thin upper branches of a tall lime tree. The position seemed, at first, quite unassailable, as the cluster was far away from the trunk of the tree and out of reach of any basket or skep that could be stretched out towards it, nor was there any suitable branch against which a ladder might

¹ *Ants, Bees and Wasps*, p. 69.

be rested. Eventually, however, a ladder was planted with ropes, somewhat after the fashion of a flagstaff, and by this means the branch holding the swarm was reached and sawn away, along with the clustering bees. The bees were safely hived, and before July was over they had produced more than thirty pounds of surplus honey.

The instinct of bees works rather for the species than for the individual. One result of this tendency is their extreme recklessness of their own lives. The sentinels who keep watch at the entrance and the workers who stream through any opening that is made in the quilt over their hive seem to have no sense of fear. They are not alarmed by heavy bodies descending upon them, and, without the use of smoke, it is extremely difficult to avoid crushing them in many operations, however slowly performed. Their extreme eagerness for honey or sweets will often lead them into the most dangerous situations, and it is on such occasions that the limitation and one-sidedness of their instinct will show itself. "No one," says Dr. Langstroth,¹ "can understand the extent of their infatuation until he has seen a confectioner's shop assailed by myriads of hungry bees. I have seen thousands strained out from the syrup in which they had perished, thousands more alighting even upon the boiling sweets; the floor covered and windows darkened with bees, some crawling, others flying, and others still so completely besmeared as to be able neither to crawl nor fly—not one in ten able to carry home its ill-gotten spoils, and yet the air filled with new hosts of thoughtless comers."

The above does not speak well for a bee's power of adapting means to ends, at least under certain conditions; nor does the spectacle of a bee ascending and reascending the pane of an open window in fruitless efforts to escape tend to increase our respect for her sagacity. Sir John Lubbock made some experiments, which any one may repeat, to illustrate this helplessness of bees in finding their way in unaccustomed situations. He writes:²

"I have been a good deal surprised at the difficulty which bees experience in finding their way.

"For instance, I put a bee into a bell-glass 18 inches long, and with a mouth 6½ inches wide, turning the closed end to the window. She buzzed about for an hour, when, as there seemed no chance of her getting out, I put her back into the hive. Two flies, on the contrary, which I put in with her, got out at once. At 11.30 I put another bee and a fly into the same glass; the latter flew out at once. For half an hour the bee tried to get out at the closed end. I then turned the glass with its open end to the light, when she flew out at once. To make sure, I repeated the experiment once more, with the same result.

¹ *Hive- and Honey-Bee*, p. 277.

² *Ants, Bees and Wasps*, p. 278.

"Some bees, however, have seemed to me more intelligent in this respect than others. A bee which I had fed several times, and which had flown about in the room, found its way out of the glass in a quarter of an hour, and when put in a second time came out at once."

The experiment just described illustrates the fact that bees make for the light. If they are taken into a gas-lighted room, they fly about the gas like moths. As we have said above, an opening made in the quilt at the top of a hive will cause a stream of bees to issue forth. Yet, when the hive is laid quite open, its inmates will take very little notice of a strong flood of sunlight, remaining perfectly quiet and gentle as long as there is no other cause of disturbance. Their chief concern on such occasions seems to be to fill themselves with honey.

With regard to the sense of hearing in bees, opinions differ, and evidence is very conflicting. The popular opinion on the subject was expressed by the tumult which, until quite recently, was the usual accompaniment of a swarm. Sir John Lubbock, in the work from which we have already quoted (page 221), says :

"I have never succeeded in satisfying myself that my ants, bees or wasps heard any of the sounds with which I tried them. I have over and over again tested them with the loudest and shrillest noises I could make, using a penny pipe, a dog-whistle, a violin, as well as the most piercing and startling sounds I could produce with my own voice, but all without effect. At the same time, I carefully avoided inferring from this that they are really deaf, though it certainly seems that their range of hearing is very different from ours."

And again (page 225) :

"It is, however, far from improbable that ants [and the same may be said of bees] may produce sounds entirely beyond our range of hearing. Indeed, it is not impossible that insects may possess senses or sensations of which we can no more form an idea than we should have been able to conceive red or green if the human race had been blind. The human ear is sensitive to vibrations reaching, at the outside, to 38,000 in a second. The sensation of red is produced when 470 millions of millions of vibrations enter the eye in a similar time ; but, between these two numbers, vibrations produce on us only the sensation of heat. We have no special organs of sense adapted to them. There is, however, no reason in the nature of things why this should be the case with other animals, and the problematical organs possessed by many of the lower forms may have relation to sensations which we do not perceive."

Having thus given a general review of the main operations of the apiary and of some of the principal facts of bee-life, we bring this somewhat lengthy paper to a conclusion. Our object has been to interest the general reader, and not to provide such detailed information as would enable anyone to make a successful start as an amateur bee-keeper. If anyone has this object in view, he will find the instruction he requires in the works of Langstroth, Cheshire, Cowan, Doolittle, and others, and in the various agricultural journals which are published in England and America.

JAMES KENDAL, S.J.

CARDINAL WISEMAN.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF CARDINAL WISEMAN. By *Wilfrid Ward*.
Two volumes. Longmans, Green & Co. 1897.

THE life of Cardinal Wiseman was more interesting, important and eventful than has been the life of any English ecclesiastic since the death of Cardinal Pole.

It is wonderful that we have had to wait for a whole generation since his decease before the appearance of any biography of him ; indeed, it was not till twenty-eight years after his death that any account of his eventful career was undertaken, as it then was by the late Father Morris, S. J.

An excellent life has now appeared, thanks to Mr. Wilfrid Ward, to whose filial piety we owe the admirable account of his father, William George Ward, and of the history of the Catholic movement in England which immediately preceded, accompanied and followed his father's unceasing intellectual activity.

But, after all, we are very far from regretting the delay which has thus taken place in the production of a life of Wiseman. Mr. Ward has done his work well, supplied as he has been with all the documents collected by Cardinal Manning and Father Morris since 1865, and acquainted, as he has shown himself to be, with the temporal and spiritual environment of the illustrious man whose biography he has undertaken. Nevertheless, we think that even Mr. Ward does not quite apprehend the full meaning and significance of Cardinal Wiseman's career, and we doubt whether it will be possible for any one to do entire justice to it till the twentieth century shall have completed more than half its course. For Wiseman's life was, as it were, the temporary arena for the meeting and conflict of forces the result of diverse epochs, and of ideas and of streams of tendency which, while hurrying onwards, there met, and thence again diverged even more and more from each other.

The struggle which had endured for two and a half centuries between the parties into which English Catholics were divided was practically terminated by his Pontificate. That great Catholic revival which followed, as a most unexpected result of the French revolution, was carried forward by him to the utmost of his power, and we do not see that he could have done more to promote it than he did do—especially the latest form of it, which was em-

bodied in the Tractarian movement. He witnessed the liberation of Italy from Austria and other events which made it plain to clear-sighted politicians that the end of the Papal principedom was at hand, as well as those ecclesiastical agitations which could have no other logical termination than a conciliar decree of Papal infallibility. He beheld the high tide of Catholic reaction advance almost to its highest point. He also witnessed the early stages of that scientific, historic and critical movement which has so greatly alarmed many timid Catholics during the last thirty years. With much of it his bright intelligence sympathized and desired to sympathize, up to a certain point, and his first laurels were gained through his efforts (very laudable and meritorious at the time they were made) to reconcile the science of his earlier days with what was then the average condition of Catholic opinion. It was during his rule, also, that English Catholics began to secede from the Liberal party, with which they had long been closely allied, and commenced that alliance with Conservatism which so generally characterizes them to-day.

Thus he was brought in contact with, and was influenced by, the old Ultramontanism of Lammenais and the new Ultramontanism of Veuillot ; the old Gallicanism of the English clergy of the generation which preceded his own and the new Gallicanism of those "liberal Catholics" who were so specially abhorred by Pius IX. in his latter days. The greatest outburst of English anti-Catholic fanaticism of the century was not only witnessed but was set going by him, while that system of Biological thought which has probably done more than any other since Voltaire and Rousseau to destroy belief in Christianity—the system enunciated by Charles Darwin—troubled the last five years of his life, as we well know, having been anxiously consulted by him about it.

Thus the first head of the new English Hierarchy was indeed a most interesting and significant personality, on account of the circumstances in which he found himself, as well as on his own account ; and we feel sure that, in the future history of modern English Catholicism, the importance of the career of its first Cardinal Archbishop will become more and more increasingly evident.

Nicholas Wiseman, the son of a Spanish merchant and an Irish lady, was born at Seville on August 2, 1802. Destined by his mother for the priesthood from his infancy, he was, after the death of his father in 1805, taken first by his mother to Waterford, where he learned to speak English, and afterwards (in 1810) consigned to Ushaw College (near Durham), where he remained till

1818, when he went to the English College then newly reopened at Rome. He took the degree of Doctor of Divinity in July, 1824; was ordained Priest in December of the same year, and became Vice-Rector of the College in 1827. He had early devoted himself assiduously to the study of Oriental literature, and his "*Horæ Syriacæ*," which appeared in 1827, at once brought him much renown. In the following year, though not yet twenty-six years old, he was made Rector, a post he retained till 1840. During these years he became more and more esteemed; his acquaintance was sought by many most distinguished visitors to Rome, where he was the most celebrated and admired English preacher.

Early in the autumn of 1835 he made a visit to England, returning to Rome in that of the following year, and this visit seems to have largely determined the course of his subsequent career. He was much struck by the depressed condition in which he found the Catholics of England. About that he wrote: "Catholics have just emerged from the catacombs; their shackles have been removed, but not the numbness and cramp they had produced." Himself full of hope from the Catholic movement in Germany, which he had witnessed during his journey to England, he was further encouraged by the nascent Oxford movement; while on his arrival he was no unknown personality, but was welcomed by many men of distinction who had known and esteemed him in Rome. No wonder, then, that when an opportunity offered itself for him to address the English public he eagerly availed himself of it, and gained a striking success.

One of three embassy chapels which once were the only tolerated Catholic chapels in London, that of the Sardinian Embassy,¹ in Lincoln Inn Fields, which still exists, was the theatre of his first triumph.

Its chaplain, Dr. Baldaconi, wishing to revisit Italy, asked Dr. Wiseman to take charge of his church during his absence. The request was granted, and Wiseman took up his abode (after having paid a round of visits in different parts of England) in its vicinity, at the house of the father of the present Judge Bagshawe.

He was amused, Mr. W. Ward tells us,² at the rigorism of his host's Irish cook, "whose delight at Wiseman's name and fame in Protestant England passed into horror when his doctors forbade him to keep abstinence, and she was asked to cook a chop for

¹ It was built in 1648, and was sacked in the revolution of 1688. It was therein that the first statue of the Madonna was erected since the Reformation, namely, about three years before Dr. Wiseman came to it.

² Vol. i., p. 232.

him on Friday. She not only refused, but gave warning, indignant at being expected to deny the first principles of Christianity."

His Advent lectures, addressed to Catholics and Protestants alike, produced an immense sensation, and his success reacted strangely upon his own impressionable nature. "I used to shed tears in the sacristy, fearing that whatever good the lectures were doing to others, they were filling me with vainglory"; so he told the present Cardinal, his successor.

The result was that Bishop Bramston, the then Vicar-Apostolic of the London district, caused him to give a Lenten course of lectures at the Chapel of Moorfields. The building was crowded continually when he preached, and by no undistinguished audience, the celebrated Lord Brougham being one of the most constant of his auditors. Wiseman himself wrote, saying: "I had the consolation of witnessing the patient and edifying attention of a crowded audience, many of whom stood for over two hours without any symptoms of impatience."

One great cause of the interest felt in him was the work he had written "On the Connection between Science and Revealed Religion," which was first made known in the form of lectures, delivered in Cardinal Weld's rooms at Rome in the Lent of 1835, and which were speedily published. Devoted as they were to the consideration of the difficulties which were then felt with regard to various questions which had arisen concerning physical science and criticism, they were welcomed and read with extraordinary avidity. In the present day some of his arguments are, of course, out of date, owing to the advance of science; but they have an historical interest, and an especial interest for us who seek to understand Wiseman. They show that he had a real sympathy for science as well as art, that his mind was a broad one, that he deprecated most earnestly anxious fears with respect to human intellectual progress, and that his great desire was that Churchmen should show themselves to be sympathetic with science, and the Church to be evidently an aid to, instead of a check upon, intellectual advancement in all directions.

It is interesting here to note that he had himself suffered from difficulties and doubts about the truths of Christianity,¹ and that it was at the very time when he was thus tried that he began to collect together notes for his above cited work on science and religion.

It seems to have been the matter of biblical criticism, little de-

¹ Vol. i., p. 64.

veloped as it then was, which gave rise to these misgivings. As to their extent and intensity, he tells us, in a subsequent letter (written in 1848):

“Many and many an hour have I passed alone, in bitter tears, on the *loggia* of the English College, when everyone was reposing in the afternoon, and I was fighting with subtle thoughts and venomous suggestions of a fiend-like infidelity which I durst not confide to anyone, for there was no one that could have sympathized with me.”

This lasted for years.

Before terminating his successful visit to England he, in conjunction with Daniel O'Connell, founded and started the “Dublin Review,” the first number of which appeared in May, 1836, to which his own contributions gave the tone.

He returned to Rome for a few years, and became the greatest attraction there to a variety of most distinguished men. But his great desire was to reside in England—a desire soon gratified. In 1840 Pope Gregory XVI. doubled the number of the English Vicars-Apostolic (from four to eight), and he was named co-adjutor to Bishop Walsh of the Central District, becoming Bishop of Melipotamus *in partibus*, and President of Oscott College, near Birmingham, which, under him, became the centre of the Catholic movement, especially in all that concerned ecclesiastical art and ritual. For such matters Bishop Wiseman felt the greatest interest, and he longed to familiarize Englishmen with all stately rites and ceremonies as practised at Rome, to which he had been accustomed from his youth, and which he greatly loved. But at that very time a different ecclesiastical revival was taking place in England under the guidance of the illustrious Gothic architect, Augustus Welby Pugin (and his liberal employer, John, the sixteenth Earl of Shrewsbury), who was a fanatic in favor of everything mediæval, but whose fanaticism was often amusing. Once, speaking in depreciation of another man to a friend of ours, he said: “My dear sir, my dear sir, he is a man who does not know what a mullion is!” On another occasion, when that holy man, the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer, was vesting for benediction, Pugin came up to him in the sacristy, and, taking hold of his vestment, exclaimed: “My dear sir, what *is* the good of praying in a cape like that?” It was a great proof of the largeness of mind of Wiseman that, in spite of his Roman education and Roman tastes, he could adapt himself to the mediæval movement he encountered, and the importance of which, then and there, to the projects of Catholicity was certainly great. He so adapted himself thoroughly, and approved and wore the large “Gothic”

chasuble (appreciating justly its much greater beauty and dignity compared with the Roman one), in spite of the opposition which it encountered from various quarters. As Mr. Ward says:¹ "Pugin and Wiseman remained throughout, like the representatives of allied armies of different nations, working together for the common cause, but with strong differences of habit and tradition."

It was in the spring of 1844 that we made the acquaintance, at Nottingham, of Bishops Wiseman and Walsh, and, on the same day, that of an extremely urbane and gentlemanly Protestant minister, who afterwards became the celebrated Oratorian, Father Faber. For two years we were at Oscott, and saw much of the future Cardinal, as we subsequently did at York Place—his town house—and at his country residence, Etloe House, Leyton.

It is, in our opinion, a common fault of biographies (especially of the biographies of men of piety, widely esteemed) that they endeavor to depict the man described as being altogether and exclusively animated by one set of motives and ideas. They wish to represent him as having been worldly or unworldly, self-denying or self-indulgent, governed by high motives or by low ones, and so on. But surely each man's experience of his own life—the examination of his own conscience—ought to teach him that his life is an internal conflict; that he is, as it were, two men in one; and that, at one time, one of these men, and at other times the other, gets the upper hand. Such again, we venture to think, and so we have been often told, is the experience gained in the Confessional. Most men reveal themselves as made up of a bundle of ideas, sentiments, desires and inclinations, which vary from time to time in force and efficiency; and though, of course, the amount of oscillation which takes place in one man may be very different from that which takes place in another, yet that in the vast majority of men there are times and seasons when they are governed by motives which at other times are but little operative.

The most eventful circumstance that took place during his presidency at Oscott was the reception of Newman and his band of Oxford associates; and everyone who has the cause of Catholicity at heart must be grateful to him for the skill and tact with which he appreciated, encouraged and received the many converts of those days, whose advent was witnessed with mixed feelings by many of the old English Catholics. But so much has been written about the Oxford movement that we will refer to it as little as possible here.

¹ P. 359.

It was while we were under his rule at Oscott that Gregory XVI. died. Dr. Wiseman was a strong conservative, and his sympathies were altogether for the Austrian domination in Italy, and he abhorred the liberals. We well recollect how, when he got news of the election of a new Pope, the boys were assembled, in order that he might impart to them "good news," and with what fervor and unction he told them what, he believed, had taken place. He had been informed that the new Pope was Cardinal Ferretti, whom he knew to be a strong supporter of Austria and the old ways, and thanks were duly given to God accordingly. Great was his dismay when tidings came that the new Pope was Cardinal Mastai Ferretti, a prelate so well known for his liberalism that Gregory XVI. had once said of his family: *In casa Mastai anche il gatto é liberale!*"—"In the Mastai's house even the cat is a liberal!"

With such conservative tendencies, it is no wonder that Bishop Wiseman gave an enthusiastic reception at Oscott to the Comte de Chambord, then generally known as the Duc de Bordeaux. That royal "dog-in-the-manger," who would neither do what was necessary to mount the throne nor abdicate, and so betrayed his best friends, such as the Comte de Falloux,¹ was very solemnly received, one of the lads being appointed to recite to him some lines by Wiseman, wherein "a crown" was foretold for him, though the prophecy was "hedged" with the words—"when Heaven shall know it best."

The great event of Cardinal Wiseman's life, the foundation of the new Hierarchy in England, was now close at hand. This had been some years in preparation, and negotiations were actively carried on by Bishop Ullathorne in 1848. The storm which was excited rather by the manner in which the foundation of the new Hierarchy was announced than by the fact itself, has already been described by us in the pages of this REVIEW, so that we will not take up space now by retailing it, but refer our readers to what we have before said.² We will only notice here one aspect of the event which has generally been passed over in silence.

After the death of good Queen Mary, and the accession of the energetic and talented Elizabeth, the Catholic bishops and priests were deposed or imprisoned in large numbers, and the Castle of Wisbeach was inhabited by a number of them, who lived together in peace and resignation.

¹ See a most interesting work entitled *Mémoires d'un Royaliste*, par le Comte de Falloux, 2 vols., Paris, 1888. Bishop Dupanloup, on learning the fatal manifesto, exclaimed, with inexpressible sadness, "*O sang de Charles X.*"

² See AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, 1892, pp. 777-782.

By degrees the Catholic bishops died or disappeared from England, and the number of the Marian clergy necessarily decreased. Unhappily the bishops consecrated no one to the Episcopal office, and soon colleges, as everyone knows, were founded abroad (Rome, Douay, St. Omer, Valladolid, etc.) for the education of laymen, as well as those intended for the ecclesiastical state. The inevitable consequence was that some, both of the clergy and the laity, were made to a certain degree "un-English"; and the Catholics of the United States well know how good it is to be "in touch" with national feeling and sentiment. But between 1580 and 1640 a lamentable struggle arose among the Catholics of England. The Fathers of the Society of Jesus, and notably Father Parsons, were vehement politicians in support of Spain, and some of them seem to have had no hope of reintroducing Catholicity save by the sword. They took up a vigorous position with regard to the Oath proposed to Catholics repudiating the Pope's deposing power, and, through one of their number, the peace and harmony which had reigned among the inmates of the prison of Wisbeach became transformed into a most bitter and unedifying strife. Many of the surviving Marian priests and many of the laity above all things desired to have a bishop with ordinary jurisdiction, to which the Jesuits were violently opposed,¹ and an arch-priest was appointed largely in their interest. Of course the Jesuits were actuated by a desire for God's greater glory and the welfare of the Church; but their well-meant, mistaken efforts resulted in nothing but calamity to the unfortunate Catholic laity of England, to say nothing of the clergy. Ultimately, however, Bishop Bishop was appointed, and, regarding himself as possessed of ordinary jurisdiction, nominated a chapter. This body persisted through the successors of Bishop Bishop, including the very last Vicars-Apostolic, the members of the chapter themselves electing new ones to replace those who died. It was their office to exercise jurisdiction over the whole of England and Scotland, should there ever be no bishop. When, however, the New Hierarchy was established, this body, which was known as "the Old Chapter," felt that its occupation was gone; but wishing to perpetuate an institution which had acquired so much historical interest, they changed their name into "the Old Brotherhood," and its present estimable head is the universally respected, Dr. Frederick Keymer, who was forced by Cardinal Manning to resign

¹ For all details as to these conflicts see a translation of *Panzani's Memoir*, with an introduction and appendix by the Rev. Dr. Berrington, London, 1793.

the Presidentship of Old Hall College because he would not (before 1870) endeavor to cause a number of mere boys to sign a petition to Rome in favor of the definition of Papal Infallibility.

Cardinal Wiseman, then, by his New Hierarchy, put an end to all the long series of party dissensions which had continued from the early days of Queen Elizabeth to the thirteenth year of Queen Victoria.

Among his many activities he favored the Jesuits, and quickly introduced a variety of religious orders, greatly, as it turned out, to his own disappointment and mortification.

As every one knows, Newman became an Oratorian, and Faber joined him for a time, to become subsequently the head of the Oratorians of London. It was to Father Faber that Cardinal Wiseman, so early as October 27, 1852, addressed that edifying letter to which we before referred as showing Wiseman's earnest piety, and which we think the most pathetic one we ever read.¹ We have only space for a few extracts from it:

"My dear Father Faber . . . I had from the beginning entertained [the conviction] that steady, continual and persevering work among the dense and sinful masses could only be carried on by religious communities. . . . When I came to London there was not a single community of men. . . . Now it is different.

"1. The Jesuits have a splendid church, a large house, several priests. Scarcely was I settled in London than I applied to their Superior to establish here a *community* [and] for missionaries to give retreats to congregations, etc. I was answered on both heads, that dearth of subjects made it impossible. Hence we have under them only a church which by its splendor attracts and absorbs the wealth of two parishes but maintains no schools, and contributes nothing towards the education of the poor at its very doors. I could say much more, but I forbear.

"2. The Redemptorists came to London as a Missionary Order, and I cheerfully approved of and encouraged their coming. When they were settled down, I spoke to them of my cherished plan of missions to and among the poor. I was told that this was not the purpose of their institute *in towns*, and that another Order would be required for what I wanted.

"3. The Passionists I brought first to England. . . . I got them placed at Orton Hall, and thence they have spread. . . . After a time they migrated to the Hyde, thence into the fields, and now they have come to St. John's Wood. They have never done me a stroke of work among the poor, and if I want a mission from them the local house is of no use, and I must get a person from the Provincial, as if it did not exist.

"4. The Marists I brought over for a local purpose . . . but at least at present I dare not ask them about general work.

"5. And now, last, I come to the institute of which I almost considered myself a member, San Filippo's Oratory. . . . But, as a matter of fact, you know that external work, the work I have been sighing for, is beyond its scope. . . .

"Now look at the position in which I am. Having believed, having preached, having assured Bishops and clergy that in no great city could the salvation of multitudes be carried out by the limited parochial clergy, but that religious communities alone can, and

¹ See vol. ii., p. 115.

will, undertake the huge work of converting and preserving the corrupted masses, I have acted on this conviction. I have introduced or greatly encouraged the establishment of *five* religious congregations in my diocese; and I am just . . . where I began! Not one of them can undertake it. It comes within the purpose of none of them to try. Souls are perishing around them, but they are prevented . . . from helping to save them, at least in any but a particular and definite way. . . .

“And now let me be a little selfish, in another illustration of what appears to me a wrong pushing of axioms to un contemplated extremes. In your last letter but one you excused yourself for not oftener coming to me, because S. Filippo warned his followers against going much into the houses of Bishops, and therefore, *à fortiori*, of Cardinals. He of course said that in a place and at a time when a Bishop's or a Cardinal's household was called a court, the antechambers of which were filled with cavaliers and chamberlains, etc., and files of servants; when such a visit was to a great man, rich, and perhaps immersed in public and secular affairs. But do you think that if he had ever contemplated a Bishop in a Protestant country who . . . can hardly make two ends meet, and whose whole court consists of a single priest, . . . good and charitable Philip would have intended to put *him* under the ban, and bid his followers to shun *him*, while he made no prohibition whatever against visiting secular noblemen?”

This letter was not written in vain, and by degrees Faber and his Oratorians came to take real, active charge of a parish.

In the year before this letter was written a man was received into the Catholic Church who was destined to produce an effect on English Catholicity only second to that of Cardinal Wiseman. We refer to the then Archdeacon of Chichester, Dr. Manning. Little did the Cardinal think, when he warmly welcomed the ex-Anglican dignitary, that he was welcoming a power which would absorb or entirely dominate his own; for he was one whose nature shrank from conflict and sought for others on whom he could lean. Manning, on the contrary, though he did not seek for conflict, had no tendency to shrink from it; while, so far from seeking for the support of others, it was with difficulty he could endure their aid, his desire being himself to suffice for everything and to do everything himself.

A man possessed of such gifts and powers as those of Dr. Manning could not fail to dominate and rise, whatever church he might have been a member of. Had he not become a Roman Cardinal he would inevitably have been an English bishop, and, very probably, Primate of all England. With his untiring energy and inflexible will, power inevitably fell into his hands. It was as natural for him to rise and dominate as for a cork to float on the top of water. Besides the contrast already mentioned between the two Cardinals, there was the remarkable difference in external appearance and personal tastes. As to art and science, so appreciated by Wiseman, Manning cared little for the former, while of the latter he was absolutely ignorant. An Oxonian “Don” of his own Oxford days, he had no more sympathy for than knowledge

of modern science. On one occasion, when we were trying to make him appreciate the strength and variety of the evidence which exists in favor of man's great antiquity, he replied: "Oh, as to that evidence I have a very short answer: '*Non credo.*'" But, as in the case of Wiseman, so in that of Manning, we should err greatly if we affirmed that his character was merely "this" or "that." He was a different man at different times, as he was now and again influenced by circumstances which stirred his feelings; and what he strongly advocated at one period of his Catholic career became distasteful to him at another. But, in spite of what we have said about the inevitableness of his ascendancy, its rapidity was none the less astonishing. Within a week of his reception Cardinal Wiseman gave him the tonsure, and two months later he ordained him priest, and a few days afterwards a confessional was offered him in the Jesuits' Church, and he soon gained the warm regard of the Cardinal, who placed unbounded confidence in him. Then Manning went to Rome, where he spent about half of each year, and became a *persona gratissima* to Pius IX.

About the time that Wiseman wrote the above-cited letter to Faber, he conceived the idea of enlisting Manning's services in the foundation of a community which should be specially devoted to carrying out, under the Cardinal's direction, his designs in reference to the London poor. Next year he recalled Manning from Rome, proposing that he should take part in founding a community of Oblates similar to those St. Charles had founded at Milan, to be called "Oblates of St. Charles." After various negotiations and much opposition on the part of the older clergy, this community was founded in 1857 and given control over the Episcopal Seminary, Old Hall. Its opponents declared that the rules of St. Charles had been so altered as to give less power to the Bishop and more to their superior, Dr. Manning, and that, instead of carrying out the Cardinal's wish for a body of priests at his own disposal, Manning was introducing into England a congregation which would recruit itself from the secular clergy (thus diminishing the number of the Cardinal's direct subjects), but would nevertheless be as completely under Manning as the Oratories were under Newman and Faber. In the end the rule was revised and the Oblates withdrawn from Old Hall. In the very year in which the Oblates were founded, Dr. Manning was appointed by the Pope Provost of Westminster.

Simultaneously with the carrying on of the project about the Oblates a great dissension arose between the Cardinal and his

oldest and best friends, which Mr. Ward has admirably depicted¹ in his painful chapter entitled "Estrangements."

Two years before the foundation of these Oblates the Cardinal's ill-health led him to apply to Rome for a coadjutor, and his desire was to have for that purpose an old and close friend and associate, George Errington, D.D., who had become Bishop of Plymouth. He was an admirable man, full of devotion to duty and true piety, as his end fully proved. He was also really a kind-hearted man, but externally unconciliating, not to say severe, being a most strict disciplinarian. Wiseman's desire was granted, and Pius IX. made Dr. Errington Archbishop of Trebizond (*in partibus*) and coadjutor to the Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster, *with right of succession*.

He soon came into collision with Provost Manning, and therefore with the Cardinal, who had fallen completely under the Provost's influence. It was the management of the Seminary of Old Hall and the question of the Oblates of St. Charles which caused the first "rift within the lute." But even apart from any distinct question of such a kind, the more close approximation of two men so radically different as Wiseman and Errington could not but cause friction. The former soon began bitterly to regret the appointment of his coadjutor. He felt his position to be intolerable, and eagerly desired to undo the step he had taken. Manning did his best to aid him in effecting this, and made use, for the purpose, of the help of the Hon. and Rev. George Talbot (a man of very poor capacity, a convert Anglican Rector whom we knew at Oscott), who had become chamberlain to and had acquired great influence over Pius IX. Manning soon found how great this influence was, and he did not hesitate to make large use of it, subsequently, in the steps which led to his appointment as Cardinal Wiseman's successor in the See of Westminster.

Thus Dr. Manning had both direct and indirect access to the ear of the Pope.

But it was not only to succor Wiseman that Manning thus acted. He was at that time an extreme zealot for what was then known as "Ultramontanism," and it was his one great object in life to promote it. Now, Dr. Errington was a member of the opposite party. He was, as most English traditional Catholics then were, eminently national, and only so far Roman as every Roman Catholic was bound to be. Cardinal Wiseman, whose health was rapidly becoming worse, made Manning his "Procurator," and

¹ See chapter xxv., vol. ii., p. 253.

obtained for him, from the Pope, his appointment as "Proto-Notary Apostolic." Meantime Dr. Errington, though asked to do so even by the Pope, and offered in exchange the Archbishopric of Trinidad (certainly a *very* poor exchange for Westminster!), repeatedly refused to resign, and various English Bishops sympathized with and supported him; to deprive a man of his "right of succession" was an unprecedented act. Nevertheless, the Pope at last took the matter into his own hands, and simply commanded (in a decree dated July 22, 1860)¹ his removal from the coadjutorship—a very *Colpo di stato di Dominiddio*, as Pius IX. himself said. Nothing could then have been more edifying than the conduct of Dr. Errington. He at once obeyed and subsided, first acting as a simple parish priest, subsequently becoming a Professor of Theology at Prior Park College, near Bath, where he died. We esteemed him highly. We knew him in our Olcott days when he resided there, and had the pleasure of his acquaintance also in his latter days.

The next burning question was that of the Pope's political position. The year 1859 was marked by two events, as to the relative importance of which time alone will enable us to judge. One event was the war of France against Austria, and which was the first act of an inevitable series resulting in the loss of the Pope's civil Princedom. The other event was the publication of Darwin's "Origin of Species," that made popular the idea of "Evolution," which has become, in the domain of theology, the absolutely indispensable support of the Pope's spiritual dominion.

The feeling prevalent in Europe as soon as the greater part of the Roman States were taken away, became very strong.

"The feeling aroused by the trials of the Papacy," Mr. Ward tells us,² "was strong in England. Manning, who had been in Rome, in 1860, with Wiseman, was deeply affected by it. And here, as well as in France, the resulting movement had its manifestations of a more extreme or more trivial nature. It became the fashion to dwell on every word and phrase of the Pope; to send him addresses on every occasion. The imitation to which men are led by passionate affection and loyalty appeared in England, as elsewhere. The introduction of Roman customs even in small things seemed to give happiness. In 1849 Newman had written to Wiseman, asking if Roman vestments were *permissible*, in spite of the episcopal sanction given to Gothic. Now, not only Roman vestments, but the buckled shoes and knee-breeches of

¹ Vol. ii., p. 378.

² See Vol. ii., p. 418.

Roman ecclesiastics, were worn by English priests, and their use was regarded by some as a mark of a truly Roman spirit. Those who held aloof from such customs were looked upon as not in the fullest sense loyal Catholics."

Cardinal Wiseman was earnest and zealous in support of the Pope's temporal power, but he by no means shared in the extreme and absolute sentiments manifested by Manning, and by Louis Veuillot in his journal, "l'Univers," whose abject prostration before the nascent absolutism of the Second Empire had been the cause of infinite evils to the Church in France—evils which press upon it in the present day. Meantime at Rome itself liberality of thought became strongly condemned on political grounds in a way most distressing to many earnest Catholics. There had been a great congress at Malines, attended by three thousand Catholics, and presided over by the archbishop of that city, Cardinal Sterckz. Cardinal Wiseman attended, accompanied by the present Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Vaughan. As to this, the latter has informed Mr. Ward that :¹

"The reception given to Cardinal Wiseman was most enthusiastic. . . . Montalembert's great address on 'A Free Church in a Free State' aroused opposition amongst some of the clergy present. Some of the more ardent spirits endeavored to pit Wiseman against Montalembert, as the representative of Ultramontanism and Liberalism. In this attempt, however, Cardinal Wiseman had no share. His meeting with Montalembert was most cordial. They talked much together of old times."

But such opinions as those of Montalembert met with no toleration at headquarters. Mr. Ward's² words are :

"The publication, on December 8, 1864, of the famous 'Syllabus Errorum,' with the accompanying Encyclical, had the effect of expressing the Pope's indignant anger at the attitude of the civilized world. . . . The logical positions taken up in the 'Syllabus' and Encyclical were, for the most part, capable of moderate interpretation; but they were used or urged by extreme men on either side. The most keen and indignant supporters of the Papacy wished to put into them all that protest against the modern world which the sixty-three propositions had contained. The free-thinkers, on the other side, wished to make it appear that the Church had once and for all dissociated herself from the civilization and progress of the nineteenth century. . . . The papers represented these Papal documents as the 'definitive divorce of the Church from the modern world.'"

To Cardinal Wiseman the situation was most painful and trying. The hope that the Church would once again impregnate the civilized world with her spirit and ally herself with the great movements of the age had been a hope, a sentiment and a conviction which had animated him throughout his career.

¹ Vol. ii., p. 457.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 472.

He preferred the generous large-mindedness of peace to the stringent discipline of war. He dreamt, as we have said, of a church which should adopt and sanctify all that is best in modern civilization. He was by no means a martinet. He favored freedom in matters of art and in matters intellectual. But this by no means suited those who were subsequently stigmatized by Newman as "an oppressive faction." As Mr. W. Ward truly said at that time :

"Some were attempting to set aside these freedoms in favor of a rigid uniformity as the test of orthodoxy—a system of badges and uniforms by which the true Papal janissaries might know each other."

But with the vigor and energy of Manning the failing energy and health of the Cardinal was quite unable to contend. Thus he fell more and more under his influence. It was at the first meeting of the Catholic Academies (affiliated to the Roman Academy), on June 29, 1861, that Wiseman spoke for the last time on the adaptability of the Church to all civilizations. His idea was to found an institution which should keep Catholics abreast of the science and literature of the day. Manning's idea was to form one which should infuse into the English laity the most extreme Roman spirit. Naturally, Newman refused to join it.

Actuated, as we have said, by the conviction that the civil Princedom of the Pope was providentially coming to an end, it seemed to us and to one or two friends that the time had come for an attempt to restore the ancient tribute of Peter's Pence to the Holy See. Those who may feel any interest in this movement are referred to what we have already written¹ concerning it. Dining with Provost Manning, one day, in the refectory of his Oblates of St. Charles, we explained to him the ideas and objects which had induced us to set Peter's Pence going. From these ideas he altogether dissented, and expressed great aversion to our aim, declaring that the money contributed should be devoted to the payment of troops to combat the Italian Nationalists and maintain the Pope upon his throne. This declaration caused us immediately to cease having any further connection with the movement.

Cardinal Wiseman had always been most kind and considerate to Dr. Newman, and as early as 1854 had endeavored to obtain for him a titular bishopric, in order to secure for him, as Rector of the Catholic University of Ireland, a satisfactory *status* in his dealings with the Irish bishops.

¹ See AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, 1892, pp. 784 and 785.

Beloved and highly esteemed by Catholics generally, he had, nevertheless, ceased to occupy the minds, and still more the affections, of non-Catholics. At last, and quite suddenly, Newman emerged from the cloud of prejudice and misunderstanding which had so long enshrouded him, thanks to the rash, unjustifiable attack made on his honesty by the late Canon Kingsley. This occasioned the publication, in 1864, of Newman's "*Apologia pro Vita Sua*," the effect of which was marvellous. He at once attained to an enormous popularity among non-Catholics, which he retained till his death, and indeed still retains.

It was at this time that a desire which not a few Catholics of the higher orders had long felt led to decided action. Many Catholics had desired for their sons an English university education, and some had already sent their sons to Oxford or Cambridge, the restrictive tests there having been removed. The English Catholic bishops did not forbid them to do so, and in August, 1864, Dr. Ullathorne, Bishop of Birmingham, offered the mission at Oxford to Dr. Newman. The offer was accepted by him, and he spent over £8000 in buying ground for the purpose. He also drew up a circular explaining his intention of founding an "Oratory" at Oxford for the benefit of Catholic undergraduates, to whom Parliament had at last opened the universities. Cardinal Wiseman himself favored the project; but, unluckily, he who had practically become his superior was intensely opposed to it, and a document still exists wherein Newman laments the change in the Cardinal's views on this most important question. Why was Manning thus hostile? No doubt he was honestly convinced that there was danger to Catholic youths in sending them to Oxford and Cambridge. No doubt there was and is danger. It is also dangerous to walk out in the street for fear of slipping on a piece of orange peel, yet that should not keep a reasonable man within doors! Catholic youths are freely allowed to go now, and the overwhelming importance of their so doing is recognized by the highest Catholics, both ecclesiastical and lay. We cannot but think that Manning was actuated not only by the "danger" above referred to, but also by a strong personal feeling of jealousy of Newman, whose popularity was now so great. We would not venture to report this belief save for the evident jealousy he subsequently showed at Newman being made a Cardinal, and the extraordinary steps he took to try and prevent it. As we observed with respect to Wiseman, most men's characters are mixed, and the fact that they have been generous and self-sacrificing on some occasions is no guarantee that they may not be actuated by mean

and selfish feelings on other occasions. When the time came for the succession to the Archbishopric of Westminster, Manning's letter to Talbot at Rome make it evident how much he desired and sought to obtain that dignity. But we do not think that effort ought to be imputed to him as a fault. There is no more pride and vainglory in knowing we have a vigorous and keen intellect and a strong will than in knowing we have blue eyes and well-shaped limbs. No doubt Manning was sincerely convinced that no one else was so fitted for the post as himself, and that he was truly serving God in trying to obtain it. The remarkable thing is that after the long and affectionate correspondence with Talbot till what he sought was gained, from that moment Talbot appears to have been dropped. We think it necessary to refer to these matters here because, without them, certain actions of Cardinal Wiseman, and especially his action with respect to a matter so important as the education of Catholics, would be liable to be quite misunderstood.

We will now revert to the direct consideration of the last important matter of Cardinal Wiseman's life—the education of English Catholic youth.

Newman's excellent design was suddenly traversed by a report that, upon application, Propaganda had taken the matter out of the hands of the Episcopate. Thereupon a memorial was addressed to Rome, signed by one hundred and eighty-eight Catholic laymen, by ourselves among the number, though the overwhelming majority were men of high social position and great influence. It was a petition for the maintenance of the existing liberty the Catholic laity then enjoyed. Mr. Frederick Wetherell took it to Rome. He called on Cardinal Barnabo, who was very courteous, but objected that the memorial had not the signature of a single prince or duke. When told that in England there were no princes save of the blood-royal, and that the only Catholic duke was still a minor, not twenty-one years old, the Cardinal replied that he was perfectly acquainted with the organization into peers, baronets and gentlemen, the last being the lowest (*il grado piu basso*), and that the signers of the memorial were mostly of that rank. Mr. Wetherell tried to explain the position of English gentlemen without titles, and how it was that many gentlemen of ancient lineage would never consent to obscure their family descent by a mushroom "title," which they would feel to be a degradation, since men raised to the peerage in England thenceforth become known by their titles instead of by their family names. But all was in vain. The result of the efforts made was

the complete triumph of Manning. Catholics were forbidden to send their sons to the universities, and the attempt to found a Catholic college at Oxford came to an end, to the profound disappointment and great mortification of Newman, and to the deprivation of the English laity, for a whole generation, of the most important, the absolutely indispensable means of attaining to the intellectual level of the non-Catholic educated portion of the nation, whether Anglicans, Nonconformists or Free-thinkers.

The decree did not issue from the Propaganda at once, in compliance with the pressure brought to bear on it by Manning. Propaganda referred the matter back to the English Hierarchy as being a matter of local interest. Then a meeting of the English Bishops was convened, as Mr. Ward tells us :¹

“ Before it assembled, on December 13th, Cardinal Wiseman’s last illness, of which he died two months later, had actually begun. But he sanctioned the circulation among the Catholic laity and clergy,² on December 5th, of a list of questions in reference to the advisability of Catholics going to Oxford, and he presided at the meeting itself. The publication of Newman’s circular, describing the proposed functions of the Oratory at Oxford, was, at this meeting, unanimously decided to be unadvisable. The Bishops, likewise, addressed a letter to Propaganda, urging the necessity of discouraging Catholics from going to the Universities ; but many members of the Episcopate were opposed to any direct prohibition. Newman felt the action of the Bishops to be decisive. On December 28th he wrote to his Bishop, Dr. Ullathorne, that his scheme was abandoned, and that the land was to be resold.”

Two months later he wrote to a friend :

“ The Cardinal has done a great work. Alas ! I wish he had not done his last act. He lived just long enough to put an extinguisher on the Oxford scheme—quite inconsistently, too, with what he had wished and said in former years.”

This is a welcome testimony to the breadth and intelligence of Wiseman’s views, which his failing health and enfeebled will could no longer cause to prevail.

In Cardinal Wiseman’s later years he passed a considerable time at his country house at Leyton, enjoying the society of friends who visited him in succession. He was always fond of and kind to children, and on one of several occasions when we dined with him he insisted on our bringing with us our son, then but a lad of seven. Wiseman on these occasions loved to talk on questions of science, and was willing to accept enlarged views as to the antiquity of man. But he was much vexed and perplexed about the Darwinian theory, and would walk up and down the garden dis-

¹ Vol. ii., p. 476.

² *Mirabile dictu*, Dr. Newman was omitted from the list of persons consulted.

curring Evolution in its various bearings. Especially distasteful to him was the idea of the descent of man from any Simian ancestors, although, of course, he could bring no serious arguments against it, his scientific knowledge, as is that of so many ecclesiastics, being especially deficient in matters Biological. Thus, in a Pastoral letter he published on the subject, his arguments were entirely rhetorical, deprecating "for our fathers the morals of the monkey, and for our mothers the charms of the baboon." Nevertheless, when compared with his successor, he must be declared to be one who loved science and largely understood it.

He was greatly consoled towards the end of his life by the much greater appreciation of his merits and his virtues which the English public manifested. Much sympathy was shown to him in illness, and his lectures were largely attended. January 27, 1865, was the date fixed for a lecture by him on Shakespeare at the Royal Institution, which he was never able to give. The following letter to Canon Walker (in 1863) well expresses those scientific tendencies of his to which we have above referred, and his increased popularity:

"My dear Walker:—I am really sorry you cannot come up this year, at least at present, but I hope you will make up by a long visit. Last night I dined with the astronomers. I was the Astronomer Royal's guest at the monthly 'club' dinner, sat at his right, and received the first toast on which he rose to speak. Of course I had to make my speech; and afterwards we adjourned to the monthly meeting, where some very interesting communications were made. At the end the Astronomer Royal (Airy) announced my presence, which was most applaudingly acknowledged.

"I spoke to Owen, who was a guest like myself, to say I would come and see him at the Museum. I want to talk about Lyell, Huxley, Darwin, etc. I wish you could be with me. There are many things you have not seen, I think, in London—Museum of Practical Geology, Horticultural Gardens, new pictures, R. A. Exhibition, Museum of Royal College of Surgeons, etc., that would occupy a few days. I hope you will come as soon as you are well, and take your holiday in London. Searle is not returned. He had an audience of the Emperor and got leave to dig up the Douai plate, and he is waiting for official leave, etc. I may tell you, with all reserve, that the Queen has expressed herself much pleased and 'touched' by the manner in which I spoke of the Prince Consort in my lecture. I cannot but consider it a great step in working back from the prejudices of the Hierarchy feelings. However, I must close, leaving many things to say. Yesterday I saw the French ambassador, the man who restored public Catholic worship in China, etc.—Baron le Gros. He gives poor accounts of Japan. I suppose we shall have war there.

"Yours, affectionately, in Christ,

"N. CARD. WISEMAN."

The Douai plate above referred to had been buried by members of the college before being driven out by the French revolutionists, but there was an accurate memorial as to where it had been

placed. It was found and is now divided between the two colleges, both of which descend from and represent Douai, namely, Old Hall and Orton. The plate comprised presents which had been made to the college at various times by members of old Catholic families—presents bearing their arms and having appropriate inscriptions.

In the very beginning of 1865 the Cardinal began to fail, and January 11th was the last time he was able to drive out. The next day he dictated part of the projected lecture at the Royal Institution, on Shakespeare, which he greatly desired to give. On Sunday, January 15th, he was taken suddenly ill, and so dangerously that the last sacraments were administered to him, and though he rallied on Tuesday, the end was rapidly approaching.

Canon Morris gives¹ the following testimony as to the impression made on his immediate attendants by his patience during the last weeks of his life :

“He was quietness itself, and his patience and obedience were perfect. He had not said a querulous word during the three weeks he had been so ill, and he was ever ready with gentle thanks for any little service. He passed whole days in silence, uttering only a very few sentences ; but all the while he was gentle, collected, and himself. He seemed to be like a man who was calmly meditating, and he occasionally gave us a glimpse of the subjects that were occupying his mind. . . . His obedience was very striking ; he would move immediately, exactly as he was told ; and it was a touching sight to see him, when so weak that he could hardly swallow, obeying like a child what Mr. Tegart [the surgeon] told him to do, in that voice of quiet authority that doctors of body and soul are alike obliged at times to use. . . . A day or two before this, when we were giving him some food, he said, ‘I do this from pure obedience, for it does me no good.’ We never once saw him dejected or in low spirits. Once I was giving him a mixture that must have been very disagreeable—strong beef tea with brandy in it—but I thought that he had ceased to be able to distinguish one thing from another. To my great amusement he said, ‘That is what I call dull—beef and brandy!’

“His sense of comfort and support from the rites of the Church remained strong to the last ; and his mind, though clouded or wandering on most subjects, appeared to be alert as to the preparations for the last offices before and after his own death.

“He spoke about his funeral, saying as quietly and unconcernedly as if it had been some function he was himself to perform, ‘I shall look to you and Patterson for the ceremonial. See that everything is done right. Do not let a rubric be broken.’ After some other details he added, ‘And, of course, the religious will say the office here in the room.’ And so they did—representatives of eleven religious orders of men, including the congregations of Secular Priests, but, according to Roman etiquette, not including the Fathers of the Society of Jesus. . . . ‘I do not wish anyone to read to me when I am dying,’ he said ; ‘but I had rather be left to my own meditations.’ Canon Morris remarked : ‘But you would like to have the litany, My Lord?’ ‘What? The Commendation of a Departing Soul, the Church’s words?’ he answered, quite brightening up. ‘I want to have everything the Church gives me, down to the Holy Water. Do not leave out anything. I want everything.’”

¹ Quoted. Vol. ii., p. 509.

The Canons assembled on the 5th of February to receive his dying profession of faith. Canon Morris gives the following account of the ceremony :¹

“ He was vested, as he lay in bed, by Mgr. Searle, who had so often vested him before. He had on his rochet, his red mozzetta and zucchetto, his pectoral cross and gold stole ; and he wore the sapphire ring which, when he was made Cardinal, he received from the Propaganda. . . . I said to him, ‘ Canon Hunt, as the Missionary Rector, will anoint your Eminence.’ He bowed his head. I added, ‘ And will you have the *Asperges* from the Senior Canon ?’ He answered, looking round at me, ‘ I want everything.’ The Canons then came into the room, wearing their choir dress, and formed a semicircle about him. . . . Canon Maguire, as the Senior Canon, in the absence of the Provost, having sprinkled the Cardinal with holy water, I knelt at his side and read the creed of Pope Pius IV. When it was ended, the book of the Gospels was handed to him to kiss, for the Oath with which it concludes. He put his hand upon it, and said, ‘ Put it down.’ And then : ‘ I wish to express before the Chapter that I have not, and never had in my whole life, the very slightest doubt or hesitation in any one of the articles of this Faith ; I have always endeavored to teach it ; and I transmit it intact to my successor.’ The Missal was then lifted up to him, and he kissed it, saying : ‘ *Sic me Deus adjuvet et hæc Sancta Dei Evangelia.*’ He then added, ‘ I now wish to receive Extreme Unction at your hands as the seal of my Profession of Faith.’

“ He then gave the Pontifical blessing, and received from each Canon the ‘ kiss of peace.’ ”

He then grew gradually worse. Provost Manning had been telegraphed for on the 4th of February and arrived on the 12th, but it is doubtful whether the Cardinal recognized him. He passed away on the morning of the 15th at eight o’clock.

The body lay in state on Friday and Saturday, the Office for the Dead being successively chanted by different bodies of religious. The following Tuesday it was carried to the Pro-Cathedral at Moorfields, and the next day it was thrown open to the multitude which thronged to enter, and whose conduct was wonderfully decorous. The newspapers joined in a chorus of sympathetic praise, and some provincial journals were even extravagant in laudation. Even extreme confessional divergence did not hinder cordial expressions of sympathy, as the following extract from the “ Patriot,” a leading organ of the Protestant Dissenters, may suffice to show :

“ Cardinal Wiseman, with all his faults—perhaps we might say *in* his faults—was a thorough Englishman ; and though he committed himself deeply to Ultramontane doctrine and spirit, there was something in his English culture and full communion with English life which tempered his Ultramontane zeal, and made him a very different man from the popular notion of a Papal emissary. A certain humane influence was shed over his life, not so much by his high intellectual culture as by his reputation for general learning, and which he was unwilling to risk by any acts or utterances of bigotry which would have shocked the sense of the English people. . . . The reputation for refined scholarship, when cherished, acts as a softening, subduing medium, and tends to tone down the harshness of religious bigotry and polemical strife. To the last, Cardinal

¹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 513.

Wiseman prided himself with justice on his scientific and æsthetic attainments; and one of the very last, if not the last occasion on which he appeared in public, showed him to be no mean critic of the various styles of architecture, and no mean proficient in the history of the art. These tastes and pursuits formed a link of connection between the Prince of the Roman Church and the free-minded, free-spoken Englishmen which no mere narrow-minded foreign zealot would have established; and they gave him a large audience of intelligent and cultivated Protestants whenever he appeared before the public. . . . We feel the touch of nature which makes the whole world kin, and can join very heartily in the ejaculation which myriads will utter this day over his grave, 'May he rest in peace.'"

The funeral service was fixed for Thursday, February 23d, and the church was crowded with a very distinguished congregation, among whom were the Duke and Duchess of Sutherland, Lord Malmesbury, Lord Southwell, Lord Campbell, son of the Lord Chancellor, representatives of various embassies, and almost all the Catholic peers and leading commoners. Provost Manning preached on the occasion.

The ceremonial was carried through most carefully both in the Pro-Cathedral and at the cemetery, where the body was interred to await its final deposition in the Cathedral of Westminster, which was then a vision of the future, but the walls of which are now rapidly rising.

Immediately in front of the hearse was a private carriage, wherein rode a private chamberlain from the Vatican, with Sir George Bowyer and Mr. Waterton carrying the Cardinal's hat and the mantles and grand crosses of the Orders of St. John of Jerusalem, Charles III. of Spain, and St. Januarius of Naples.

The history of this memorable funeral was well expressed in the "Times" of Friday, February 24, 1865. It said:

"Yesterday the body of Cardinal Wiseman was solemnly buried, amid such circumstances of ritual pomp as, since the Reformation at least, have never been seen in this country; and we may add amid such tokens of public interest, and almost of sorrow, as do not often mark the funerals even of our most illustrious dead. Not since the State funeral of the late Duke of Wellington has the same interest been evinced to behold what it was thought would be the superb religious pageant of yesterday. Since the death of Cardinal Wolsey we believe no English Cardinal has been buried in this country, and the funeral obsequies were looked forward to as likely to afford a splendid ceremonial of the most impressive kind. . . . Everywhere the cortège was received with marks of profound respect. At least three-fourths of the shops along the line of route were closed, the streets lined with spectators, and every window and balcony was thronged. Altogether, the feeling among the people seemed deeper than one of mere curiosity—a wish, perhaps, to forget old differences with the Cardinal, and render respect to his memory as an eminent Englishman, and one of the most learned men of his time."

On the choir of the church of Moorfields there had already been placed the following inscription, which had been written by the Cardinal himself in 1860. All that was needed was to supply the date of his decease:

NE . DE . MEMORIA . DEVM . PRECANTIVM
 MERITO . EXCIDERET.
 NICOLAVS . S . R . E . PRESB . CARDIN . WISEMAN
 PRIMUS . ARCHIEPS . WESTMONAST .
 HVNC . LAPIDEM . VIVUS . SIBI . POSVIT
 QUI . CVM . AB . INEVNTE . ADOLESCENTIA
 APVD . ANIMVM . SVVM . STATVISSET
 CHRISTIANAE . VINDICANDAE . RELIGIONI
 FIDEI . CATHOLICAE . ILLVSTRANDAE
 IVRIBVSQVE . ECCLESIAE . TVENDIS
 VITAM . INSVMERE
 AB . HOC . PROPOSITO . VSQVE . AD . EXTREMVM . SPIRITVM
 SCIENS . NVNQVAM . DECLINAVIT
 MERCEDEM . A . DEO . POTIVS . QVAM . AB . HOMINIBVS,
 EXPECTANS
 QVAM . AD . PEDES . PIENTISSIMI . DOMINI . HVMILLIME.
 PETITVRVS
 DIEM . SVVM . OBIIT.
 [XV . FEBR . MDCCCLXV]
 ORATE . PRO . EO.

We have several times cited passages in which Cardinal Wiseman is called a *great Englishman*, but it would be very unjust did we terminate this notice of his life without pointing out that he was also a *great Irishman!* For his mother was Irish, and it is a question physiology has by no means decided in the negative whether a mother has not a much larger share in determining the innermost nature and the essential character of a son than has his father. The geniality, the kindness, the ready eloquence, and—when not in pain and suffering—the light-heartedness of Wiseman are surely genuinely “Irish;” and genuinely “Irish,” also, was the reception given him when, in 1858, he made a tour in the island of St. Patrick. As Mr. Ward tells us:¹

“The visit of a Cardinal, a representative of the Papal Court, who was likewise connected by race with the Irish people—of one, moreover, whose claim to public distinction, irrespective of his ecclesiastical *status*, was universally acknowledged—seized upon the imagination and religious enthusiasm of the country. The Catholic population treated the visit as a kind of royal progress, in which they were proud to claim the kinship of blood and religion with an illustrious guest. It was an occasion for the Irish Catholics, so long downtrodden by legal and social proscription, to raise their heads, and to give vent at once to their Catholic loyalty and their pride in their Church. And ultimately the strong religious antipathies of Irishmen appeared to give way, and many Protestants united with their Catholic countrymen in the acclaim of welcome to the Roman Cardinal.”

¹ Vol. ii., p. 289.

That the illustrious visitor "rose to the occasion" with noteworthy readiness and tact will surprise none of our readers. But we have the most unexceptionable testimony that he did so in a remarkable degree, as no one can suspect Newman of exaggeration, and yet he declared that no other public man in England could have answered to the demand thus made upon him with the spirit and intellectual power which the Cardinal displayed on the occasion.

His visit extended from August 23d to September 17th, and arriving at Kingstown, he visited the Capital, Dundalk, Maynooth, Carlow and Waterford, concluding with the last-named city, which was the native city of his family. It is interesting to note that he was invited to dine at the Mansion House in Dublin and meet Thomas Bright, the engineer of the Atlantic cable. In his speech on the occasion the Cardinal, after referring to the Greek fire burning under the sea, said, with respect to our familiar international cable :

"This little spark which we are now sending under the ocean, this flash of lightning which passes from shore to shore, this fire which burns unextinguishable below the depths of the mighty waters, may truly be considered, if it were not too sacred an expression to use, to be the flame of that love and of that charity between the two nations of which the sacred text says that 'many waters shall not extinguish it, and floods shall not overwhelm it.'"

With the quotation of these truly and happily prophetic words, whereby his bright intelligence gave expression to his deep and warm spirit of charity, an English reviewer of his life for an American magazine may well bring his labor of love to a conclusion. A labor of love it has been, as we knew Nicholas Wiseman from the spring of 1844, for more than twenty years ; and we have no recollection, as to that intercourse, of anything which it is not a pleasure to recollect, save alone that physical suffering and occasional mental depression by which he was from time to time so severely tried. We heartily thank Mr. Wilfrid Ward for his admirable work for its own sake, and we thank him for having by it given us the opportunity of expressing our sentiments and mentioning some of our reminiscences with respect to that great and not yet fully appreciated man, Nicholas Cardinal Wiseman, the restorer of the English Hierarchy and the first Archbishop of Westminster.

ST. GEORGE MIVART.

THE MIRACULOUS IN CHURCH HISTORY.

THERE is nothing, perhaps, in which the contrast between ancient and modern times is more striking than in the general attitude of men's minds in regard to miracles. Through all antiquity the interference of unseen powers with the course of nature was accepted without difficulty by pagans and Christians alike. In the middle ages men were as ready to believe miracles as the most ordinary facts. They felt perfectly at home in a world of wonders. In modern times it is just the opposite. Narratives of the supernatural, instead of being eagerly welcomed, are listened to with a smile of incredulity or a feeling of distrust. The common disposition is to account for all that happens by natural causes, and to deny what cannot be accounted for. The whole body of unbelievers—materialists, pantheists, agnostics, deists—proclaim the supreme, undisturbed reign of law in every sphere, and refuse to believe any departure therefrom, whatever may be the evidence in favor of it. Indeed, they decline to weigh the evidence as a waste of time, so sure are they that what transcends nature can never be verified, or—as they put it—“whatever happens is always natural, and what is not natural never happens.”

This is the fundamental principle of the infidel school. “With us,” says Renan, “the question is settled, unhesitatingly settled. The denial of the supernatural has become an immovable dogma.” And this he feels the need of repeating in every one of his books, although one would hardly think it necessary, if, as he assures us, it is already “the conviction of every cultivated mind”! He is ready himself to stake his reputation on the denial of miracles. “If,” he says, in his preface to the “Life of Jesus,” “such things as miracles ever happen, then the contents of the following pages are meaningless and worthless.”

A similar conviction prevails among those rationalists who still call themselves Christians. Not only do they refuse to believe in later miracles, but their whole concern is to do away with those of the Old and New Testament, by questioning their historical value, or by reducing them to the proportions of natural events. Even among those Protestants who continue to profess their belief in the principal mysteries of the faith, there is a growing tendency to explain away much of what in the Bible was always looked

upon as miraculous, while others accept the Bible miracles as they stand in the sacred narrative, but will listen to no others.

Not so the children of the Catholic Church. They believe in a manifestation of God's power and goodness in every age. In their eyes the seal of miracles is as clearly set on the history of the Church as on that of the chosen people. Side by side with the natural course of events following, as in secular history, the law of cause and effect, they discern and proclaim, in every Christian age, not only a divine guidance and providential help, but a countless number of facts which clearly transcend the powers of the visible world or of the human soul, and reveal the hand of God himself.

It is to these facts that we propose to devote the following pages. Taken together, they form one of the most characteristic features of ecclesiastical history. They are equally interesting to the scientific scholar and to the devotional reader. But their interest naturally depends on their historical reality. Christianity itself is essentially a historical religion, consisting largely of facts and based on facts, and what it was at its inception it remains for all time. Just as the faith of the Christian rests on the facts of the Gospel, so the faith of the Catholic is indefinitely strengthened by the assurance that God has never ceased to show his presence among his own by "signs and wonders" such as had accredited originally the work of the apostles. In like manner, the soul that aspires to holiness gathers inspiration and guidance from the lives of the saints, but only on condition that the wonderful things related of them are believed in.

Thus, then, the historical value of the miracles constantly met with in Catholic history and Catholic literature becomes a question of considerable importance, speculative and practical; and the answer to it, as already remarked, has varied much from one period to another.

I.

That the early ages of the Church, with the memory still fresh of the miracles of Christ and the apostles, should have readily believed in the divine character of the extraordinary happenings they witnessed, and lovingly dwelt on them as new manifestations of the divine favor, is only what might naturally be looked for. So, too, the barbarian conquerors of the Roman Empire, when they were conquered in turn by the Church, and became her dutiful children, proved no less desirous to hear of and to witness the supernatural. Ignorant but reverent, violent in their impulses, but childlike and trustful, they accepted unhesitatingly all the

strange things they were told of the doings of God and of his saints. They sought for miracles with the same eagerness as people in our day look out for sensational happenings. An abundant supply was found in the Acts of the Martyrs, and still more in the wonderful lives of the Fathers of the Desert. St. Athanasius had told the story of St. Anthony; St. Jerome, that of Hilarion, his disciple, and of St. Paul, his predecessor, in the solitary life. Cassian had related the wonderful things he had heard and witnessed in the desert. Sulpicius Severus had described in classical language the wonderful deeds of St. Martin, while many others of lesser note had collected all the strange stories they could find to satisfy the craving for the marvellous that filled the souls of their readers.

Gathered together, upwards of two hundred years ago, under the general title of "*Vitæ Patrum*," they form what Lecky calls "an invaluable collection—one of the most fascinating volumes in the whole range of literature." Yet we venture to say that they are surpassed by those of two writers of the sixth century, St. Gregory, Bishop of Tours (+595), and St. Gregory the Great (+604). The former—Gregory of Tours—is unique in the abundance and variety of the wonders which he relates of the Blessed Virgin, the Apostles and the early martyrs in his book, "*De Gloria Martyrum*," and of other saints in its sequel, "*De Gloria Confessorum*." In his "*Vitæ Patrum*" he tells of the miracles wrought by the holy men of the Western Church; and, finally, in the work devoted to the honor of his predecessor, St. Martin ("*De Miraculis St. Martini, libri quatuor*"), he describes the daily happenings at the tomb of that great saint, many of which he witnessed himself, and which cannot fail to strike the reader of to-day as an exact counterpart of what we are told of the happenings at the shrine of Lourdes.

But, though interesting and attractive in many ways, the stories of the Bishop of Tours cannot compare with those which his great namesake and contemporary, Pope Gregory, embodied in his "*Dialogues*" (*Dialogorum, libri quatuor*), in which he commits to writing, at the request of his friends, the wonderful things he had learned, on what he considers reliable authority, of holy men and women, mostly of his own time. "I give my authorities," he says, "for all I relate—sometimes their very words, sometimes the sense of them, when their uncouthness forbids them to be reproduced literally." They certainly can have lost nothing in the reproduction, for, from beginning to end, in the four books of St. Gregory, there is an inexpressible charm, a familiar sense of the

unseen which communicates itself to the reader, a combination of faith, piety, gentleness and sweetness unsurpassed, if ever equalled, in any other writing of ancient times.

To this already inexhaustible store, from which mediæval devotion drew its principal nutriment, were added fresh supplies in each generation by the chronicles of the monasteries and by the lives of other men and women of especial holiness, through whose striking lessons and actions God continued to sustain his Church even in her darkest days. Writers, preachers, poets, all drew from this accumulated wealth of wonders. It was largely put in requisition in the thirteenth century by the Dominican author of the "Golden Legend," a work much inferior to most of the sources it was drawn from, yet which in a great measure superseded them all. No book enjoyed anything like its popularity in the latter part of the middle ages. It was translated into the chief European languages, copied to no end, and in such constant demand that, after the invention of printing, in England alone a new edition of it was issued almost every year from 1474 to 1500.

II.

Such, then, were the principal sources at which former ages slaked their thirst for the marvellous. Their waters, though often adulterated, were drunk without misgiving by almost all. But gradually, with the diffusion of learning, a habit of discernment grew up in the Church. Blind, unquestioning reverence gave place to intelligent inquiry, with the result of setting aside as unreal or of reducing to the measure of natural occurrences thousands of facts which for centuries had been believed in as divine. But countless others still remain. In the "legends" of the breviary, in the popular lives of the saints, in books of devotion, in church histories, in the annals of shrines and places of pilgrimage, ancient and modern, the Catholic is confronted with them at every step, and great is his perplexity to know which among them to accept, which to question or to reject.

Happily he is under no obligation to pass judgment on any of them. The only miracles a Catholic is bound to believe in are the miracles of the Bible. The others he can pass by at any time, and leave to those whom duty or taste may lead to a closer investigation of their value. Yet the general subject is one of no ordinary interest to enlightened minds, and, indeed, there are few Catholics who, for one reason or another, are not desirous of forming a definite opinion regarding a certain number of those facts which, by a few or by many, rightly or wrongly, have been looked

upon as miraculous. Let us see by what principles and methods they may form their judgment.

Miracles are facts, and facts in general recommend themselves for acceptance in proportion to the amount and value of the evidence in their favor. Yet evidence, though the chief thing, is not the only thing. There is, besides, the antecedent likelihood or unlikelihood of the fact itself, considered in its general features or in its concrete circumstances, which makes it easy or hard to accept. Each individual has in some things his own standard of what is likely or unlikely, generally based on his personal experience or on the general principles he has formed for himself or received from others. Thus, in the present connection, to the mediæval mind a miracle was antecedently probable, and consequently admitted on slender evidence; to the modern mind, on the contrary, full of the notion of the universal reign of law and accustomed to discover ultimately a natural reason for the most extraordinary things, or to disprove, as a rule, what cannot be accounted for, a miracle is antecedently improbable, and becomes admissible only on the strongest evidence, while to the atheist, the materialist, the rationalist, as already observed, no amount of evidence will suffice to bring conviction.

For the enlightened Catholic, the likelihood or unlikelihood of a miracle, before any discussion of evidence, must depend entirely on the kind of miracle it is, and on the circumstances in which it is supposed to have happened. Considered in the abstract, a miracle implies no greater exercise of divine power than the maintenance of the order of nature in each one of its parts, and God is as free to interfere with this order as He was to establish it. If one would know whether He is likely to do so, the most natural way is to ascertain what He has done in the past. And here the Bible, which is the history of God's dealings with mankind, tells how, from the creation to the coming of Christ, God never ceased to reveal himself, not only in the wonders of nature and in the voice of conscience, but in those visible signs of His presence and power which we call miracles. The mistake, or rather the inconsistency of Protestants, as Cardinal Newman has well shown in his essay on "Ecclesiastical Miracles," is to suppose that, after the preaching of the Gospel, God had entirely changed His methods and left His children without any further special sign of His favor, the presumption being, on the contrary, that He continues to do as He had done before. Indeed, at no time has human nature been satisfied with anything short of a direct communication with the unseen. Even at the close of this scientific age of ours, rationalism

meets the requirements of only a few. The rest are religious, or they are superstitious, putting idle fancies and unfounded beliefs in the place occupied by worthier objects in the minds of faithful Christians.

Furthermore, the position of Protestants in regard to miracles is inconsistent with their belief in prayer, for prayer implies a constant interference of God with the common course of events. When we pray, we ask God to do for us what we do not expect to happen if things are left to themselves. Nor is the difficulty evaded by narrowing, as many are disposed to do, the sphere of prayer to spiritual effects; for to accomplish such effects the intervention of God is not less necessary, though less sensible, than in His exceptional action in the outer world. But, as a fact, the great majority of Protestant believers do not think of placing any such limitations. They appeal to God for all manner of favors, temporal as well as spiritual, for themselves or for others—such as relief from pain, recovery from sickness, success in undertakings and the like, all which evidently imply a special action of God of the same kind as is put forth in miracles, and differing only in the magnitude of the result, or in the amount of proof those who witness it have of its being really due to an exceptional interference of the divine power.

Thus, then, the very existence of prayer as a part of the divine economy implies that, besides that unvarying action by which God sustains the order of the universe, there is also a constant special action by which He modifies in some measure the ordinary course of things. For many wise reasons this latter action is commonly concealed from human eye; but we can easily conceive of reasons why it should be occasionally manifested. And what such reasons are, in fact, we may gather in some measure from the words of our Lord himself, who promised miraculous powers to those whom He sent to preach this Gospel, and in general to all those possessed of great faith, such as it shows itself in the lives of His saints.

It followed, therefore, that far from objecting systematically to facts because of their miraculous character, we should be rather disposed to welcome them as naturally belonging to the general economy of religion as we know it to have been established. But this is very far from an indiscriminate acceptance of the marvellous, such as we find in children or in persons of unenlightened piety. The marvellous is often absurd, and, even when admissible in the abstract, it may be surrounded by circumstances such as to make it seem unworthy of the holiness, the wisdom, or the

goodness of God. We instinctively think of these divine attributes as compared with the facts in question and with the circumstances in which they are supposed to have happened, and form already an opinion of their reasonableness. But when we have satisfied ourselves in that regard, the reality of the facts has still to be established.

And it is established, like all facts which we have not ourselves witnessed, by the testimony of others.

III.

Now it has to be remembered that of the numberless facts thus known to us, and which we call history, there are comparatively few that rest on anything more than probable evidence. Certain great social and political movements, changes of dynasties, decisive events, facts of a general and public character we may know with the most perfect assurance; but the particulars of these same events we cannot be entirely sure of, any more than of the bulk of facts that constitute our knowledge of the past. They rest originally on nothing more than probable evidence, and we take them on trust from those who address us or whose books we read. We have no interest and no positive reason to question their accuracy; what they tell us falls in with our previous notions, and so we admit them without difficulty. Yet the slightest reflection will tell us that while admitting, we are far from being sure of them.

And this is exactly our condition in regard to miracles. A comparatively small number are susceptible of demonstration; the others we admit on probable evidence, and we do so without difficulty if only we find them in harmony with our conceptions of God and of what we might call His method of government.

Among those regarding which no reasonable doubt can be entertained, we may place in the first rank the miraculous facts upon which the Church bases the canonization of her saints. At all times the supreme test of eminent holiness has been looked for in the power of miracles exhibited by God's servants during their lifetime, and still better after their death. Only where such signs are forthcoming can the Church be induced to propose anyone, however holy and beautiful his life may have been, to the veneration of the faithful. Miracles are essential, and, in the discussion of those put forward, the Church has exhibited for the last three hundred years a strictness unequalled in any court of justice. In his celebrated book, "*De Canonizatione Sanctorum*," Benedict XIV. describes the procedure in a most interesting manner. The

investigation is pursued on the very scene of the miracle by men of reliable character and high standing, all sworn to be only concerned to discover the truth and to report it faithfully. A special officer is appointed to watch the evidence and note down any reasons for questioning its value, such as hesitancy, discrepancies, and the like. The witnesses speak on oath, and their trustworthiness is closely examined. Their social position is looked into, their known character, their mental culture, their habits of life—in a word, everything that could add to or detract from the weight of their testimony. Only eye-witnesses are admissible; hearsay evidence is of no account. A single witness is never sufficient to establish a fact, however trustworthy he may be deemed personally. And even where there are several, if they belong to the family or to the religious order of the "candidate" their testimony is clouded by a suspicion of undue favor, and needs to be corroborated.

The evidence thus collected and deemed sufficient is forwarded to Rome and sifted afresh by a special commission of cardinals and counsellors; and then again another objector, technically called *Promotor fidei*, and popularly *Advocatus diaboli*, is present to detect the weak side, if any there be, in the evidence presented. The discussion is of the most searching kind, and not infrequently leads to a declaration of insufficiency of the evidence or to an order for further investigation. Finally, if the issue is favorable, the whole matter is gone over once more by a congregation of cardinals, and discussed last of all in presence of the Pope, who decides.

IV.

The reality of the facts alleged is not the only question in which the Church is concerned. She has also to determine their real character—that is, whether they belong to the natural or to the supernatural order. In this age of science, after so much of what was universally looked upon as preternatural for centuries has come to be accounted for by certain natural forces, the question is one of especial importance, and often of especial difficulty. But the Church has been alive to it long before the recent developments of the physical and physiological sciences, and it is no small matter of surprise to see how clearly our old theologians realized the fact of the close resemblance and frequent connection in the same individual, sometimes in the same fact, of the divine and the human. Far from ignoring the advance of the science of nature and of the human body and soul in their normal and abnormal conditions, the Church seeks to bring all the light they

can supply to bear on the facts she undertakes to investigate. The better to test them, Benedict XIV. kept in close communication all his life with the medical faculty of the University of Bologna, one of the most progressive of the period, and it has been a standing rule, he tells us, with the Congregation of Rites, to put aside all cases of cure, recovery, and the like, which the best medical authorities considered to be of a natural, or even of a dubious character. This great pope, the most learned man of his age, tells, in the work already referred to, with much interesting detail, all the precautions that are taken in the examination of the different facts presented as miraculous, such as visions, ecstasies, revelations, cures, etc. The conclusion that forces itself on the unbiased reader is this : that even when full range has been given to scientific assumptions, there still remains to the credit of the Church and of the canonized saints a considerable number of facts which no scientist is, or will ever be, able to account for.

There are many more in the annals of the Church, patent, based on independent, indisputable testimonies, which cannot be reasonably disputed. Such are the facts of ecclesiastical history specially discussed by Cardinal Newman in his "Essay on Miracles." Such, again, numerous events of an extraordinary character¹ minutely investigated by the Bollandists and by other historians. No Catholic who has studied their proofs will be tempted to deny them, nor will any outsider, except in obedience to a general prejudice.

But though there be many of this kind, their number is very small compared with those which come to us resting on weaker evidence. These have to remain as they are found, in every conceivable degree of probability, or uncertainty, or unlikelihood. "An inquirer," says Cardinal Newman (c. v.), "should not enter upon the subject of the miracles reported or alleged in ecclesiastical history without being prepared for fiction and exaggeration in the narrative to an indefinite extent. This cannot be insisted on too often—nothing but the gift of inspiration could have hindered it. Nay, he must not expect that more than a few can be exhibited with evidence of so cogent and complete a character as to command his acceptance ; while a great number of them, as far as the evidence goes, are neither certainly true nor certainly false, but have very various degrees of probability, viewed one with another ; all of them recommended to his devout attention by the

¹ Related by eye-witnesses such as St. Cyprian, St. Augustine, St. Athanasius, St. Ambrose ; or those which come to us sustained only by probable evidence in every degree from the strongest to the weakest.

circumstance that others of the same family have been proven to be true, and all prejudiced by his knowledge that so many others, on the contrary, are certainly not true. It will be his wisdom, then, not to reject or scorn accounts of miracles, where there is a fair chance of their being true; but to allow himself to be in suspense, to raise his mind to Him of whom they may possibly be telling to 'stand in awe and sin not,' and to ask for light,—yet to do no more; not boldly to put forward what, if it be from God, yet has not been put forward by Him."

This attitude of suspense, it must be acknowledged, is difficult to the modern mind in presence of the strangeness, not to say the repulsiveness or the absurdity of certain things related of the saints. But while ready to admit that they are occasionally such as to entitle us to dismiss them at once as unworthy of attention, we would remark that singularity of itself is no conclusive proof of unreality. Though strange to us, facts, supernatural as well as natural, may be perfectly in keeping with the genius of the people or of the period to which they are ascribed. If God works miracles in favor of His children, it is only natural that they should be of a kind to fit in with the notions and meet the anticipations of those they are meant for.

Neither should the authority of the Church be appealed to too freely in support of what does not recommend itself on other grounds. The sanction she gives to miracles, if any, is commonly of a negative kind—that is, she finds no fault with those who believe in them. She canonizes her saints, but not all that is told of them.¹ If some of their wonderful doings are referred to or related in her liturgical books, such as the breviary, it is only as enjoying a certain amount of probability. That this is her mind she often indicates herself by some saving clause, such as, "it is said," "we are told." As for the stories related in the popular lives of the saints or in devotional works, she leaves them to stand or fall entirely on their own merits,—that is, on their antecedent likelihood or unlikelihood, and on the manner of evidence upon which they rest. True or false, they are generally harmless, and consequently the Church has no special reason to be concerned about them.² Sometimes, indeed, and from the beginning, she

¹ Their miracles, their revelations, their visions borrow something of the reverence due to themselves, but remain open to investigation, and prove to be in part unreal or purely natural.

² "Occiderit S. Georgius draconem," says Bollandus (præf. 7), "verum an metaphoricum, quid interest? Vulgus verum existimat occidisse, aliter docti sentiunt; errat pars alterutra sine piaculo."

has forbidden the diffusion of certain unauthentic stories, but it was because they were likely to prove hurtful to her children. But beyond that she does not go, nor, indeed, can she be expected to sit all the time in judgment on whatever claims to proceed from God. It is a task she leaves to those who are specially fitted for it and feel drawn to it, like the Bollandists, who for the last two hundred and fifty years have done so much to sift, by the methods of scientific criticism, the truth of history from the accumulated mass of legend in the lives of the saints.

V.

But, it may be asked, how did so much legendary matter gather around the names and lives of the holy men of old? How did these wonderful stories originate, so much of which we cannot accept to-day as literal truth, particularly in the Lives of the Fathers of the Desert and of the mediæval saints? The answer is, first, most of them grew spontaneously. Legends are a natural growth of the human mind. They spring up and expand side by side with the facts in the history of every individual, of every institution, of every great event that awakens a lively and abiding interest. Joan of Arc, Napoleon, Washington have their legends. The war of the Revolution and the war of the Union have their legends too. Stories continue to be told of the popular generals which, closely investigated, prove to be groundless. The legends begin in the very lifetime of the heroes; they grow with years under the same process. The longer they remain unwritten the more room is there for additions. Fresh incidents, anecdotes, borrowed by mistake from other stories, collect of themselves around the primitive nucleus and are eagerly welcomed by readers or hearers ever unwilling to question anything that adds to the honor or greatness of what they love. In the same way arose the legends of the saints. To put it in the words of Froude ("Short Studies," I.), "They grew up in some way or other; they were repeated, sung, listened to, written and read. In Ireland, and all over Europe, and over the earth, wherever the Catholic faith was preached, stories like these sprang out of the heart of the people and grew and shadowed over the entire believing mind of the Catholic world. Wherever church was founded, or soil was consecrated for the long resting-place of those who had died in the faith; wherever the sweet bells of convent or monastery were heard in the evening air, charming the unquiet world to rest and remembrance of God, there dwelt the memory of some Apostle who had laid the first stone, there was

the sepulchre of some martyr whose relics reposed beneath the altar, or of some confessor who had suffered there for his Master's sake—of some holy ascetic who, in silent, self-chosen austerity had woven a ladder there of prayer and penance on which the angels of God were believed to have ascended and descended. It is not a phenomenon of an age or of a century ; it is a characteristic of the history of Christianity. From the time when the first preachers of the faith passed out from their houses by that quiet Galilean lake, to go to and fro over the earth, and did their mighty work, and at last disappeared and were not any more seen, these sacred legends began to grow. Those who had once known the Apostles, who had drawn from their lips the blessed message of light and life, one and all would gather together what fragments they could find of their stories. . . . So the legends grew, and were treasured up, and loved, and trusted."

But, besides this unconscious process of generation, others of a more deliberate kind were at work. Thus, it is difficult not to see in many of the stories of the desert and of the cloister thinly veiled fictions, originally destined and understood to convey, under these striking forms, some salutary moral or spiritual lesson.¹ Some of these stories were mere oratorical developments or literary compositions, the Bollandists tell us, mistaken by subsequent generations for a history of real facts. And, if all must be said, there were stories set afloat and accredited which had their origin in deliberate deceit, the work of unscrupulous men who knowingly lavished on saints whose history was forgotten miracles gathered on all sides from the authentic records of other saints. Sometimes they invented them bodily. Tertullian tells us how this was done by the writer of the apocryphal history of St. Paul and St. Thecla, who confessed, later on, that he had done it through a mistaken love for the Apostle. It must be confessed that he had many imitators in subsequent ages.²

VI.

And now, if we would take a general view of the miraculous in the course of Christian ages, it will be seen :

¹ The same may be said of those dragons the saints are described as fighting against and vanquishing, or the serpents they drove before them into the sea ; they only meant the errors and vices which the saints expelled by the preaching of the gospel.

² Fuere says "Lud. Vivès. De Tradend. Disciplinis," c. v., "qui magno pietatis loco ducerent mendaciola pro religione confingere: quod et periculosum est, ne veris adimatur fides propter falsa, et minime necessarium, quoniam, proprietate nostra, tam multa sunt vera, ut falsa tanquam ignavi milites atque inutiles oneri sunt magis quam auxilio."

First, that miracles constitute an abiding, indubitable feature of the history of the Catholic Church ; that many of them rest on evidence so clear and so conclusive that to deny them would lead logically to the destruction of all historical certitude.

Secondly, that others in far greater numbers, though not so conclusively demonstrated, are based on evidence equal, at least, to that upon which we admit the ordinary facts of history.

Thirdly, that the great majority of the miracles which we read or hear of are merely probable, in varying degrees from the most acceptable to the slenderest probability ; some of so unlikely, not to say so unworthy a kind that one cannot help wishing to see them expunged from our books of devotion.

Fourthly, that in dealing with all of them the Catholic is left to his own judgment. But it must be an enlightened judgment, that is, based on a direct examination of the evidence or on proper authority. Authority in this matter may be of two kinds, that of experts or that of the Church. By experts we understand those who have made a special study of hagiology, and thus acquired a more refined tact for discerning truth from invention or imagination ; or again, those who have made a thorough study of any special event or of the life of a saint, and whose judicious manner of handling the subject is calculated to inspire confidence. Short of a personal study of that case, to follow such a leading is surely the wisest course. As regards the Church, it will be remembered that she commits herself very sparingly to facts of any kind, and especially of this kind. Her judgment, when she does interfere, is generally not direct but implied, and she claims no infallibility for it ; yet it would hardly be respectful or even judicious to question lightly what she has extended her sanction to in any degree.

Fifthly, even when the facts alleged are considered baseless or otherwise inadmissible, a Catholic always handles them with a certain reverence, because of the saint with whose name they have come to be connected, and because of the people whose religious sense might be shocked by the association of levity with anything they hold sacred.

A religious teacher may be sometimes perplexed as to the use he may make of apocryphal studies. The fact of finding them in devotional books will not always justify him in doing so. They may have been useful to those they were originally meant for and be positively harmful to others. If he does not believe in them himself, he has no right to relate them as true. But if his hearers are likely to be benefited by them, he can relate them as being

found in such a book or told by such a writer; and still better, he may refer to them as legends, poetic fancies, and the like, of interest only as embodying and conveying some salutary lesson.

Finally, if, confining ourselves to well attested miracles, we examine in what proportions they spread themselves over the different Christian ages, we shall find them just as we might be led to expect from the promise of Christ and the needs of His Church. In the divine economy miracles are the testimony of God in favor of a doctrine, a pledge of His favor towards His chosen servants and a reward of their faith. We therefore naturally look for miracles at the first preaching of the Gospel, and at its subsequent establishment amidst the various nations of the world; we look for them at any time at the hands of men of extraordinary virtue, and as the reward of a lively faith.

And this is exactly what we find. Miracles abound in the primitive Church. They are lavished on the barbarians, hardly sensible to any other argument. They reappear in every age as the ordinary accompaniment of great holiness.¹ They are more frequent in the "ages of faith," both sustaining and rewarding that fundamental virtue. That a vast number of the miracles in which the middle ages believed should properly be ascribed to the religious enthusiasm of the period, joined to its ignorance of natural laws and forces, will hardly be questioned at the present day. But after full allowance is made for these agencies it will still, we believe, remain an historical fact that real miracles abounded in that period more than in subsequent ages.

The miracles in particular related of the Irish saints are often, owing to their special strangeness, a source of great perplexity to hagiologists, some, like Bollandus himself, admitting their reality,² while others, struck, on the one hand, by the sort of reckless lavishness with which the supernatural is cast into these narratives, and, on the other hand, by the fact that these wonders, out of all proportion with other accounts of miracles, are related, as Bollandus remarks, only of saints of the Celtic race, Irish, ancient

¹ "Vera miracula," says S. Thomas (c. 2, 9, 178a, 2), "fiunt virtute divinâ ad hominum utilitatem, uno quidem modo ad veritatis prædicatæ confirmationem, alio modo ad demonstrationem sanctitatis alicujus quam Deus vult hominibus proponere in exemplam virtutis."

² "In ejusmodi patrandis prodigiis sese ferè simplicitati ac fidei hominum Deus attemperat. Ideo Hibernorum, Scotorum, Britannorum tam qui Albionem quam qui Armoricanæ Galliæ oram incolunt planè portentosæ sunt sanctorum vitæ, atque ex miraculis ferè incredibilibus contextæ, quia apud eas gentes et constantia fidei egregia et vitæ simplicitas ac candor olim rarus extitit."—*Pref. gen.*, c. 2, § 2.

Scotch, Welsh and Bretons, are led to ascribe these extraordinary features, not to the facts themselves, but to the peculiar bent of the Celtic imagination, in the people who originated the stories or in those who committed them to writing.

One of their most conspicuous features is the familiar intercourse supposed to exist between those ancient monks and hermits and the wild animals by which they were surrounded on every side, the latter losing their ferocity or their shyness in presence of the favored servants of God. The birds, we are told, loved to gather round them and to feed from their hands. The game, large and small, when hard pressed by the hunter, sought refuge beside them. The strongest and fiercest animals became their humble slaves. If the numberless stories of this kind were confined to one region or to one race, one might be tempted to see in them only the wild wanderings of undisciplined fancy or allegories meant to express the gentleness and helpfulness of the saint as compared with the un pitying selfishness of the natural man. But stories of a similar kind abound in the lives of the Desert Fathers, several of which are attested by reliable eye-witnesses, and thus accredit that manner of miracle as a species, if not in its individual facts. "The ancient authors," writes Montalembert ("Monks of the West," c. vii. 5), "who record these incidents are unanimous in asserting that this supernatural empire of the old monks over the animal creation is explained by the primitive innocence which these heroes of penitence and purity had won back, and which placed them once more on a level with Adam and Eve in the terrestrial paradise! 'Is it wonderful,' says Bede, 'that he who faithfully and loyally obeys the Creator of the universe should, in his turn, see all the creatures obedient to his orders and to his wishes?'"

The same writer adds: "The dignity of history loses nothing by pausing upon these tales. Written by a Christian and for Christians, history would be unfaithful to herself if she affected to deny or to ignore the supernatural intervention of Providence in the life of the saints chosen by God to guide, to console and to lift up his faithful people. Certainly, fables are sometimes mixed with truth; imagination has allied itself to authentic tradition to alter or to supersede it, and there have been guilty frauds practised on the faith and piety of our ancestors. But justice has reached most of these through the learned and unsparing criticism of those great masters of historic science whom the religious orders themselves had given to the world long before our modern critics were heard of.

“It is, then, both just and natural to record these pious traditions without pretending to assign the degree of certainty which belongs to them. They will not disturb the minds of those who know the requirements of nations accustomed to live by faith. Echoing the beliefs of our fathers, they have fed the souls, and charmed the fancies, and comforted the hearts of twenty generations of brave and fervent Christians during the most productive and brilliant ages of Christendom. Authentic or not, there is not one which does not do honor to human nature, and which does not proclaim some victory of weakness over strength or of good over evil.”

VII.

In these last words Montalembert brings back to us a view which should never be lost sight of, viz., the value of the miraculous histories of the saints irrespective of their historical reality. For fiction itself not only has its poetic charm; it has also its philosophical interest. Legend, in fact, is history after a fashion; it reveals the ideals of the past, as annals and chronicles reveal its facts. It is the inner soul of a period, reflecting its thoughts and feelings, its tastes and aspirations. Hence, it comes to pass that the historians of our day who want to know not only the public events of a period but its inner life and guiding spirit, turn to the legends and the poetry of the time as expressing what is deepest in men's souls and uppermost in their minds. Only thus can they see the living past and portray it in its fulness. As Froude again happily puts it: “In the records of all human affairs it cannot be too often insisted on that two kinds of truth run ever side by side, or rather, crossing in and out with each other, form the warp and woof of the colored web which we call history; the one the literal and external truths, the other the truths of feeling and of thought which embody themselves either in distorted pictures of outward things, or in some entirely new creation—sometimes moulding and shaping true history; sometimes taking the form of heroic biography, of tradition, or of popular legend; sometimes appearing as recognized fiction in the epic, the drama, or the novel. It is useless to tell us that this is to confuse truth and falsehood. We are stating a fact, not a theory; and if it makes truth and falsehood difficult to distinguish, that is nature's fault, not ours. Imagination creates as nature creates by the force which is in man, which refuses to be restrained; we cannot help it. The histories of the saints are written as ideals of a Christian life. For fourteen centuries the religious mind of the Catholic world threw them out as its form of hero worship, as the heroic patterns of a form of

human life which each Christian within his own limits was endeavoring to realize. For fourteen hundred years these stories held their place and rang on from age to age ; as the new faith widened its boundaries, and numbered ever more and more great names of men and women who had fought and died for it, so long their histories, living in the hearts of those for whom they labored, laid hold of them and filled them ; and the devout imagination, possessed with what was often no more than the rumors of a name, bodied it out into life, and form, and reality."

Thus the miraculous in Church history, even in its least substantiated elements, retains an abiding value for all ages ; how much more what comes to us with the unquestionable warrant of authentic fact ! It is each time a fresh revelation of God to His children, a fresh token of His presence and of His love. It strengthens their hold on the miraculous facts of the Gospel, and keeps alive in them that sense of mystery and overruling power which is of the very essence of the religious spirit.

J. HOGAN.

IS GEOLOGY A SCIENCE?

I.

INTRODUCTION.

IF we open any scientific periodical of the beginning of this century, or read the lives of men who devoted themselves to science at that time, we cannot help being struck by the number of different characters assumed by any one of the *savants*. We see the same individual carrying on observations alike in zoology and physics, in agriculture and astronomy. The field of science was then so small that a very slight vantage-ground sufficed for surveying the whole. In our day, on the contrary, it almost requires a Yerkes' telescope merely to see the ever-receding frontier of any one of the provinces into which the space has been divided.

The great area of observation is now mapped out into separate territories which each science must conquer for itself. One only pretends to supreme dominion. The metaphysician, the philosopher *par excellence*, claims sovereignty over all regions of human knowledge, and dictates laws for each. If any mere "natural" philosopher venture to inquire into the deeper mysteries, or to attack any abstract question, he is immediately—and with justice—repelled, and his proper subordinate position is pointed out to him. And even in his own domain each must be able to render an account and pay tribute. Above all, we have an established religion of logic. *A priori* truths are the articles of its creed, and deduction the ritual ordained. Some forms of induction and of *à posteriori* argument are tolerated, but only in the degree prescribed by the logical high priest. Mathematics are lawful, and experiment is permitted, but it is dangerous to argue on inference and fatal to proceed by analogy.

This is all as it should be; but unfortunately our metaphysician does not always recognize that, before putting down an apparent heresy with a strong hand, he is bound to inquire into the truth of the accusation and to examine all the evidence for the defence. It has more than once happened that a case has been judged summarily, and the supposed offender has been sharply rebuked, when a patient hearing would have established his orthodoxy. As a natural consequence we often find the modern scientist raising the standard of revolt and proclaiming his independence, nay, even

going so far as to express his contempt for the whole procedure of the court in which he has been once prematurely condemned.

Among other reprimands which he has administered, our metaphysician in former years had one always ready for the geologist. "Logic," he said, "and Certainty! You must worship at these shrines alone. You should follow the example of astronomers and chemists. Their reasoning is sound, and their conclusions—at least many of them—are beyond cavil. But you geologists, what right have you to the name of science? How do you prove your assertions? On what do you ground your conclusions? You have neither a beginning nor an end! You argue from analogy based upon assumption. Why, even among yourselves you cannot keep the peace! I do not believe that there is one detail on which you are all agreed; and your very first assertions, the animal origin of fossils and the sedimentary character of the rocks, are incapable of truly cogent, logical proof. How can you tell that they were not all created some six thousand years ago in the state in which we find them?"

* * * * * * *

The geologist has no fear that such attacks will ever be repeated. He has gained an established position, and he has had a territory conceded to him. Its boundaries are wide, ranging from those of chemistry and mineralogy on one side to biology and archæology on the other. Still it may be that here or there a metaphysician could be found who has never seen the title-deeds to the estate, or who has not altogether thrown off his doubts as to the solidity of the geological argument. He will not give utterance to the speech I have described, but he does not discard the idea altogether, but looks to it as a sort of *Torres Vedras*, behind which he could always fall back, if a geological onslaught carried his other defences.

No one would now call in question the explanation which astronomers give us of the solar system. The most ardent defender of mediæval learning owns that on this point the older theories are obsolete, though they were accepted by an Aristotle or an Aquinas. In the same way, if any one attempted to invoke the assistance of phlogiston in order to explain the diminished weight of a burnt coal, he would be looked upon as a mere *Rip Van Winkle* in physical science. But there are still a few who consider themselves versed in the knowledge of modern observation, and even fully believe in the certainties of natural science, and who yet do not feel so sure of their ground when they enter the domain of geology. The literal interpretation of the Biblical Cos-

mogony has such a firm hold on their minds from childhood that they find a difficulty in shaking it off. Indeed they feel instinctively that the greatest caution must be exercised before they can depart from the strict letter of Scripture. They ask for proofs, in such a case, which they would never consider necessary under other circumstances. And, after all, how can we contend with an adversary who appeals to an omnipotent Creator? Are we going to say that it is beyond His power to create fossils? Shall we prescribe a time-limit to His eternal decree?

God did undoubtedly call everything into existence at some moment of the past, and, when He did so, it must have commenced existence as a "going concern." If an intelligent creature had then viewed it, he would have been immediately tempted to say that he could see natural effects, and therefore there must have been natural causes. However simple the order of the universe may then have been, there was some kind of motion going on, and our reasoner would have said that each particle that moved must have come from some more distant spot, it must have had some *vis à tergo* to force it forward. If there was heat, then he might affirm that there had been a collision of worlds, or some other material cause for the heat. He might even go so far as to reconstruct in theory the state of the world for some preceding age.

How can we tell that this is not really our own case? How can we venture to affirm that our restorations of former ages are not mere theory, but that they do really represent facts? The difficulty is great, I allow, but it is not insuperable. The intelligent creature whom we have supposed present at the Creation would have argued well in support of his theory, but it would be theory still. He would have found no true parallel of action now going on by which he could prove his statements. There would have been no traces left on the things he saw which pointed with certainty to such a former state.

Yet, any one who has a little practical experience in geological research will find that certainty has, as it were, grown upon him unconsciously,—nay, perhaps in spite of deep misgivings at the outset. "What!" he began by saying, "this sandstone, that almost turns the chisel when I try to carve it, was once loose sand on a sea-beach! And this crumbling chalk was once a soft ooze, like that now found in the Atlantic! And the flints in it, that will scratch glass, represent former sponges! And this curved outline on a polished face of limestone shows the home of an animal as soft as the oyster! And this brittle slate, you say, was

laid down as soft mud on a river bank! How can I believe such things?" It is long since he spoke like this. He has now studied patiently the details of his science, he has learned the history of the sand and of the deep-sea ooze, and of the oyster-like shell-fish with its surrounding bed, and of the soft-clay bank of the river. He has weighed the evidence they give of their own vicissitudes. He has seen that the deepest ocean would have long since been filled up by the silt of centuries if the superincumbent weight had not pressed the earlier deposits ever nearer to the centre of the earth,¹ and thus brought them into closer contact with the subterranean fires. He has pondered on the effects of this heat and pressure in hardening and crystallizing the once soft mud. He has examined all the traces of volcanic outbursts and of mountain upheavals. He has observed the veins of minerals left by infiltrating waters. He is at last conquered by the testimony brought before him. Now, therefore, he must be able to give a reasonable account of his belief, or rather conviction; for geologists contend that it is not faith or assumption on which they found their conclusions. They claim to have certainty, and that not only in the firmness with which they hold to their opinions, but also in the truer sense that their assertions are founded on well-ascertained facts.

II.

CERTAINTY.

In order to appreciate the argument for geological truth we must first have a clear understanding as to what we mean by certainty. Taken in its strictest sense, this word signifies the conviction which follows upon exact demonstration, where every step of the argument, from beginning to end, is a proposition which must be true, and cannot under any possible circumstances admit of doubt in a logical mind. But there is a broader though well-recognized use of the term "certainty," to signify the attitude of our minds towards the facts of every-day life. In these it is very seldom that strict demonstration can be applied. There is, therefore, usually a bare possibility of our being deceived. Yet the

¹ It is a fully established fact that many parts of the earth are now slowly sinking. Darwin proposed, as a theory, that the reef-building corals were just keeping pace, in their race for the surface, with the sinking floor of the Pacific, and that they thus maintained their islands at a constant level. These animals cannot thrive below the depth of eight or ten fathoms, and are killed if exposed by the tide, yet the most recent observations prove Darwin to have been right in supposing that the coral structures are often nearly 2000 feet in thickness.

evidence is so strong that our minds are compelled by their very nature to hold the proposition as true, without any hesitation or misgiving. It is in this sense, and in this sense only, that we can be certain of the observations of modern science. It is, therefore, in this sense that we use the term in our present discussion.

By certainty, then, we mean the adhesion of the mind to a judgment which is founded on experience, and which excludes all reasonable doubt.

It may be urged that as long as any doubt, however slight, remains, we cannot have a perfect apprehension of the conformity between intellect and object, and that, consequently, the evidence is not absolutely convincing. But, since the doubt is in such a case unreasonable, though logically possible, we cannot refuse to call our state of mind certainty, unless we desire to give the lie to human nature and affirm that our perceptive faculties are incapable of perceiving their proper objects. And, indeed, the use of the word with our present meaning is so fully established, even in philosophical works, that we are legitimately entitled to retain it until logicians supply us with other language. In any case, this is the only meaning of the term "certainty" which can be applied to the "certainties" of any natural science; and if we can show that geological conclusions attain to this standard, we have proved the right of geology to the name of science in the same sense in which astronomy or chemistry can claim that title.

Certainty, therefore, embraces all those conclusions from experience on which a man will act with entire confidence, even though he may not be able to show, *à priori*, that the facts *must* be such as he sees them to be. It includes not only past and present experience, such as that this piece of paper, which I have just put into the fire, is now burning with a bright flame. It is also certain that the next piece which I tear from the same sheet will also burn. It is true there *might* be something wrong with this second piece;¹ it might, for instance, be impregnated with some chemical. But the contingency is so remote that it would be folly to entertain the supposition. A man who habitually doubted such things, and who showed his doubts in his conduct, would inevitably be considered an unpractical and useless member of society, to use no harsher term. Yet it would be hard to dislodge him from his position by mere reasoning.

¹ If there were nothing wrong with the paper, and it still did not burn, we should be right in saying that this was preternatural; but we may deal with the question of miracles later.

But, it may be objected, the experiment just described is far from complete, and one might well feel justified in doubting whether the second sheet of paper would burn. There are innumerable circumstances which might make all the difference between the two pieces. Such an objection is easily answered by pointing out how many minutiae are presupposed when experiments or observations are described. No one really conversant with the subject would expect to have these written down. We presuppose, for instance, in the present case, that the second scrap of paper is to all outward appearance like the first; that it shows no signs of dampness or discoloration; that we have reasonable grounds for thinking that it has not been subjected to chemical treatment before we took it up, and that it has not since been tampered with.

Now, it is precisely these minutiae, never expressed, but always implied, which suggest *practical* doubts to the casual reader of geological literature. These doubts can indeed be easily removed, but only on one condition: *Go and see*. There are few of us, at the present day, who do not live within a short distance of a good geological museum, and still fewer who may not, if they will, form an interesting collection for themselves in the course of a day's excursion in their immediate neighborhood. No study of books can supply the knowledge to be gained by examining and handling a few of the commonest fossils.

The theoretical doubt of the philosopher, on the other hand, arises from a demand for too rigid a proof. In all physical matters the only certainty we can obtain is of the broader kind; and, as long as the metaphysician himself uses the term "certainty" to describe the effects of his personal experience, or as long as he concedes that any natural science can have certainty in its conclusions, so long must he abstain from calling geologists rash for saying that they also are certain of the results of their observations.

I suppose no one would impute rashness to Robinson Crusoe when he felt certain of the presence of man on finding the footprints of his unknown visitors. Yet the impression *might* have been formed by some curious combination of wind and tide and an erratic sand-worm. Why has nobody suggested such a solution before? Because it is felt by all that the coincidence of material causes required to produce such an imitation would be so improbable as to be truly called impossible, in ordinary human parlance.

III.

MIRACLES AND CREATION.

In other words, the certainty which we have of geological phenomena, as of other physical facts, is not of the kind which we can obtain by mathematical argument, but is the conclusion dictated by common sense.

A small boy, who had just been learning the gospel of the Sunday, turned to his mother and said: "Mother, why don't you sell all you have and give it to the poor?" The answer given was by another question: "Don't you want any dinner to-day?" The geologist makes a very similar answer to suggestions that fossils might have been produced by a miracle or by creation in their present state. It is not for us to prove that these were not the causes, but it is for our opponents to show why we must appeal to extraordinary agents when all is readily explained as a natural process.

No one now seriously maintains that fossils were created in their present state, but I shall speak, for the moment, as if the supposition had been made in earnest, as I shall thus be able to bring out more clearly the true ground on which geology rests.

Appealing, then, to common sense, we establish, as our first principle, that ordinary agents must be presumed where extraordinary ones are not proved. This principle immediately does away with our power of invoking miracles to explain natural phenomena. Far from denying God's power to work miracles, we may concede that He intervenes by a special act of His Providence in a very large number of cases, in our own day as in all time. But it always remains true that these interventions, however numerous in themselves, form but an infinitesimal percentage of the events in the life of the greatest *Thaumaturgus*. And even of these special acts there are many in which God has used physical agents, working in their ordinary manner.¹ Again, miraculous power is only used by God when, if we may say so without disre-

¹ A very good example of this is seen in the rain which came in answer to the prayer of Elias. There was no sudden convulsion of nature, but the small cloud appears on the far-off horizon, brought by the wind, and gradually increasing in size until the whole sky is overcast. The real "effecting" of the miracle, if one may say so, takes place out of sight, and all that is capable of being perceived follows the natural order of such events.

It is in a similar manner we may conceive the creation to have been effected. As far back as men's limited knowledge can attain with certainty, such as we are describing, so far back at least we must date the creation. We only overreach our limits when we say that the earliest state of things for which we have evidence must have been preceded by some other state, and we then proceed to construct a hypothetical order, to which nothing corresponds at the present day, either in degree or in kind.

spect, He wishes to speak to an intelligent creature in an extraordinary manner. But since this is the object of the miracle, there must be a corresponding clearness in the perception of the creature. He must be able to recognize the language addressed to him. There must, therefore, be a clear separation between such phenomena and those of ordinary occurrence. It is true that God speaks to us in a metaphorical sense, if we would but listen to Him, in every wind that blows, and in every flower that blooms; but these are not His miraculous messages. In order that we may recognize a miracle, the effect must stand out from the usual course. No one writes with white chalk on paper, nor with ink on a black-board. If we desire our writing to be read we take the opposite colors, so that our words may be prominent. So, also, if a series is before us, each member graduating into the next, as in the colors of a rainbow, we cannot distinguish the separate lines. But let some interference take place, so as to make a gap in the series, and we shall notice it at once. Now we shall be able to prove that there is an unbroken chain, or sequence of minute differences, from the living animal to the most obscure fossil, so that such a clear separation between the miraculous and the natural cannot be pointed out in the series.

Granted, however, that the fossils were not produced by a miracle, properly so called, might they not still have been *created* as we find them?—for there is no necessity that man should be able to trace all the actions of God's creative power. To this objection I reply that the same reasoning holds here also. We are compelled by our common-sense principle to ascribe these appearances to physical and organic causes, as may be seen from the following argument.

IV.

FOSSILS,¹ THE RECORDS OF PAST LIFE.

Let us return to Robinson Crusoe on his desert island. He sees footprints on the fine soft sand, with the marks of the toes sharply defined, and he notices that the front part of the impression has been pushed over that of the heel, as the foot was bent in taking a step forward. He necessarily considers these impressions

¹ We may deal later with the manner in which fossils have become buried in the soft clays, sands, or other material that tends to fill up the sea, and we have already touched on the processes by which these have gradually been converted into hard rocks. The former can be observed by any one who will dig in a river bank or on the sea-shore, while many soft sediments can be turned into hard stone artificially by pressure, like writing-chalk; by heat, like brick; or by chemical processes, like concrete; though for other rocks a long period of time would be necessary to reproduce nature's effects.

as the effects of a human agent. He follows the track, and, as it passes on to firmer ground, the outline of each impression becomes less clear, yet the general size and shape still give him confidence that he is following the stranger. Now and again, it may be, the savage has trodden on a stone, and the mark left is nothing but a little wet sand on the rock-surface. Under other circumstances Crusoe would have passed this by as unworthy of his attention; but here he has seen the previous footprints, and there are others beyond to show the path. He is certain that this, also, is due to his fellow-man. In another place there is only a tuft of grass, pressed down and bruised. Yesterday he would have said that this was the resting-place of one of his goats, but to-day he follows another quarry, and he cannot doubt that here again there was a human cause.

Finally the ground becomes firm and covered with vegetation, lying in a thin strip between the rocky sea-shore and an inaccessible cliff. The marks are altogether missing, yet he would be foolish in the extreme if, because there is no trace left of his unwelcome guest, he were to assert that no man had passed that way. He has followed one track hitherto, and whoever made it must have continued his journey, since he is no longer here. Farther on there is a convenient landing-place, where the stranger's boat may have been moored. Crusoe can no longer be certain that his visitor has gone beyond this point, but till now he has had no alternative but to follow the clear dictates of his senses. He has seen not only the impression of a human foot, but alternate impressions of right and left. He has noticed the varied effects of these same feet on sand and rock, on grassy level and on muddy river-bank. No two marks are quite the same, yet all had the same cause. Here the impressions are nearly even for toe and heel—evidently the man was walking slowly; there the toes only have touched the ground, making curved sweeps backwards—he knows that his friend was running at the top of his speed. When on wet sand, the footprints have been converted into mere oblong hollows, which are only shown to be of human origin from their size and the distance they are apart, while those in the tough clay of the river-side retain the very lines of the skin left in relief.

Now, we have a very similar case with our fossils. On the present sea-shore we find the derelicts of animals whose relatives still live within a few yards' distance. As we follow the tracks, not along the surface but into the solid earth, we find similar relics of past life impressed in stones and clays, which have hardened into rocks by pressure, heat, and other physical agents. We

do not trace the course of a single man, but we are in the wake of an army more numerous than that of Xerxes, or than the hordes of Attila. The record left to us is not of footprints only, but of whole lives. This shale, once the soft mud of a flooded river, preserves the story of a battle in which the victorious Ichthyosaurus, with his mighty jaws and teeth, has been left on the field of his triumph, with his vanquished foe half-consumed beside him. Here is a slab of marble, showing the peaceful arts of the coral, constructing with wonderful architectural skill a monument that can rival the pyramids. In these gravels are entombed the fangs and bones of the sabre-toothed tiger, while in the clay below is found the bag of ink with which the cuttlefish concealed his flight. Wherever we turn we are confronted with tracks and worm-casts, or with bones and shells, all similar in form to those made at the present day, though the material in which they are encased may have been turned into the hardest rock. And this similarity of form is not limited to the external shape, but often extends to internal and even microscopic structure.¹

All fossils are not, indeed, equally well preserved; but when we have once seen the better specimens we can easily recognize one less perfect and so gradually go back to those in which still fewer—perhaps only one or two—characteristics are left. For it must be borne in mind that for many kinds of fossils we have the same form in all possible states of preservation, from those in which the smallest details of structure are all present to mere impressions in the rock which show where a fossil has been removed.

This state of preservation does not depend upon age only; there are some very ancient strata in which the fossils are almost perfectly preserved. The material may be altered, as wood is changed into coal; yet even in the coal, under favorable conditions, the cell-structure of the fibres remain. On the other hand, we find recent wood and animal skeletons which have decayed, and their place has been usurped by masses of mud and spar showing no internal organization.

It is true that we have now and then genuine "*lusus naturæ*." Such, for instance, was the piece of soap mentioned by Buckland in his "*Curiosities*," which took the shape of a child's skull. Yet the first scientific man who examined it found out the deception. Such, again, are the curious roots, with a fantastic resemblance to men and animals, of which representations occasionally appear in

¹ For much of their microscopic work botanists prefer fossil plants, as the structure is more clearly defined than in the living herb.

our pictorial magazines. To these we may add the "mimetic" flowers and insects. But none of these form a series as the fossils, do; and, indeed, they seldom represent those parts of organic bodies which are capable of resisting decay.

On the other hand, it often requires considerable familiarity with the "minutiæ" of geology to be able to say whether any particular curiously-shaped stone is or is not a fossil; and still more knowledge is required to tell what organism it represents. Indeed, there are still many mineral structures, such as the famous Eozoon, about which the most skilled geologists remain in doubt. But these doubtful forms do not in the least affect our certainty as to other forms, where the organic structure can be detected, often, by those who have never before held a fossil in their hands.

Thus, in rocks which we can show are certainly older¹ than the coal in Lancashire, England, we find pieces of wood with small bivalve shells attached by their byssus, or bundle of fibres, just as the modern mussel clings to our pierheads. The wood has turned into coal, but with the grain quite distinct, and on the shells we see lines of growth, and occasionally even the hinge with its teeth, and on the inside of the valve we observe the impressions left by the muscles for closing the shell. If we take a small piece of one of these shells and examine it under the microscope, we shall find that it has the same prismatic structure as many living mollusks.

Again, in the limestone rocks of Trenton, New York, we come across a spiral shell similar in general characters to the modern whelk. The greater part of its surface is overgrown with the cell-walls of a small polyp or zoophyte, almost identical in appearance with the horny skeleton of our bryozoa. Perhaps we may find this same shell perforated by a small curved tunnel, such as is effected by certain sea-worms of the present day, or with a number of small white tubes fixed to its surface, reminding us of the parasitic home of the serpula. Nay, more, on one of the sides of our spiral we see a large perforation; and it will not be hard to obtain a whelk pierced in the same part of his shell by one of the boring sponges. Who can doubt that we have here not only the life of a single animal recorded in the lines of growth round the spiral, but also the fatal termination of his career, with the subsequent history of his deserted mansion, become the inheritance of lower forms of life.

¹ We are forced here, to anticipate part of the argument for the relative age of the rocks. Briefly, we say that one layer or stratum is older than another if we find that, for any extensive area, the first is covered by the second, even though both may appear at the surface in other places.

In the British Museum is preserved a specimen of terebratula, nearly as old as the last specimen, from the extreme north of the American continent. It resembles exactly the lamp-shells of our present coasts.¹ Like its modern antetype it is bivalve, with each shell equal-sided. If we look at a fragment under the microscope, we shall find the same structure of elongated and curved cells matted together, and pierced with minute canals. Both have the same curious loop of shell inside for supporting their breathing apparatus; we can even see in the older specimen rows of dark red spots, showing that in former times nature decorated the homes of her subjects even as she paints the valves of mollusks now.

Instances like these could be multiplied indefinitely. We might have referred to the impressions of jelly-fish found on the lithographic stone of Bavaria, or to the skeletons of birds with casts of the feathers preserved in the same rock. We might have called attention to the footprints of amphibia on the old lake shores of Connecticut, or to the ferns so abundantly found with the coal in all parts of the world, or to the wings of dragon-flies and cockroaches from the coal shales of Pennsylvania. But there is no need to lengthen the catalogue.

We will only ask our reader to come with us to the nearest oyster-stall and to examine and compare a live and a dead oyster. The shape is the same both in hard and in soft parts, and you can surely have no doubt whether the dead one was created in his present state, or whether he was once alive, and that but a few hours ago. Empty out the dead animal and compare his shell with any empty valve lying about. Both have the same rough appearance outside, almost as if overgrown with lichen. Both have the same internal pearly layer of shell. In each you may notice the rough circular spots to which were fixed the muscles for opening and closing the valves. Observe also the elevated ridge which marks off the position occupied by the shell-forming mantle. Are you not certain that this also was once filled with a live oyster? Now take the empty shell and come with us to the sea-shore. Here we can find you many more, some nearly entire, others partly worn away from being rubbed over the sand and pebbles by the waves. Yet you see at once that they are true oyster-shells. You would laugh in derision did any one seriously assert his belief that they were created in their present state.

¹ The only modern terebratula lives in the Mediterranean sea, but a nearly allied species, terebratulina, is found off the coasts of North America.

You would concede that, in the abstract, it was quite possible for God to have so created them, but, taking the concrete facts as you find them, you would say that the belief was unreasonable.

Now come with us to the Gulf of St. Lawrence. There, six hundred feet above the present sea-level, we can show you other mollusk shells, with rough outer coating and internal pearly layers, with circular impressions for the valve-muscles and line of mantle attachment. They are often better preserved than those of the sea-shore below. Another journey will take us to the State of Mississippi. There, beneath the town of Claiborne, we can show you other shells that you cannot mistake, from clays which are overlaid by newer deposits hundreds of feet thick. In the Missouri Valley we can show you a still older group of rocks, which contain well-preserved shells.

Thus we go back to older and still older rocks, gathering up a collection of molluskan remains. In each of these specimens there is so much preserved of the characteristic form that we can make a complete series, of which any two adjoining members will be alike except in one minute point. If some of the marks which we seek for comparison with the modern shell are wanting here and there, we are amply compensated by the reasons each one can adduce for having failed to preserve them. The oyster-shell we found on the beach could point to the sea-waves and the sand to account for its abrasions. The specimens from the Gulf of St. Lawrence showed signs of decay from the action of wind and frost. Other shells are flattened by the weight of the superincumbent earth, or have been crystallized into spar by the heat resulting from this pressure. Yet others have had to give place to some new mineral brought by underground streams. This fossil was crumpled during the upheaval of a mountain chain that was half-fused by the passage of a lava stream hard by. Each has a clear tale to tell. Each brings his credentials into court with him, and claims the right of laying his evidence before the jury. His evidence is not shaken by cross-examination, however searching may be the questions put by the counsel for the other side. How can you refuse to give a verdict in favor of a case so well supported? Do not take the evidence at second-hand; no mere reading will convince you as will one half-hour spent in a good collection of fossils. Nor, if you have a geological companion, will you find that half-hour without interest.

In the whole series we bring before you there is no hiatus so great as that between the living and the dead oyster. If a comparison of these two forces you to be certain that both are due to

the same animal agencies, then you must say the same for any two others which lie side by side in the line. If you raise a doubt as to the natural and physical cause for the earliest fossils, then you must allow the same doubt to remain for the modern specimens. You will, in that case, no longer be able to credit your own convictions, founded though they are on simple observation of what is before you. In other words, your doubts as to the animal origin of the fossils must, if logically carried out, lead you into skepticism.

Space does not permit us to go more fully into numberless minutiae by which we might have strengthened our case. We have only sketched the broader outlines of the resemblance between fossils and living animals, confining ourselves to one small corner of the animal kingdom. In all the other divisions there is the same evidence, strengthened indefinitely by the preserved record of inanimate agents that have been at work during all stages of the earth's development. We have pitmarks from rain old cañons and valleys carved by rivers, scratches left by former glaciers, and lava and ashes from volcanoes which have long been extinct.

V.

THE ROCKS, PAGES OF THE EARTH'S HISTORY.

Granting, however, that all fossils are traces of past life, how does it follow that their age is to be measured, as geologists say, by millions of years? What are those wonderful "formations" on which they descant so freely? On what grounds can they affirm that these are arranged in any order of time? What reasons can they give for calling them the pages of the great book in which the history of the earth is written? What right have they to assert that the rocks are records immeasurably more ancient than any parchment or graven monument, that they are witnesses to climatic changes and continental revolutions in uncounted ages before man appeared on the scene?

These are the questions to which we must now turn our attention, though here, too, we can only sketch out the line of argument, without giving the wealth of detail which a large treatise could supply.

If two bricks are lying one upon the other we may well be in doubt as to which was there first, or whether both were laid in their present position at the same moment. But if we go to the mouth of a river, and see a great quantity of clay that has been carried down and spread out over the sea-floor, if we dig through

a few feet of this deposit and then come to a bed of sandstone, surely there can be no doubt that the sand was there before the river began to bring down the clay.

We dig a trench through the clay from below the surface of the water to well above high tide, and we find that the clay gradually becomes thinner, until the sand reaches the surface, rising up into hills and sand-dunes. Yet no one will misunderstand us if we say that the sand-bed is below the clay, as a basin may be said to be below the water it contains.

Farther inland we come to a quarry in the sandstone, and we see that the floor is composed of limestone, which extends back towards the mountains of the interior. Continuing our expedition, we can make out a succession of many different kinds of rock, each cropping out from beneath the others, while the surfaces of contact slope alone at a nearly uniform angle to the horizon. On turning back, therefore, towards the coast, each layer of rock will be seen to dip into the ground beneath the next.

It is a very simple problem in mathematics, when we have the angle of this dip and the horizontal surface exposed, as on a map, to calculate the true thickness of each layer, or stratum, as it is called. Let us suppose this calculation made, and that the clay is found to be, on the average, 50 feet thick, and the sand 100 feet. Then we should say that, *geologically*, the limestone lies here at a depth of 150 feet. If this also had a thickness of 1000 feet, and we found a fossil in its lowest part, we should say that the fossil came from a bed 1150 feet deep, *at least*. We say "*at least*," for its real geological depth may be much more.

Both the sandstone and the limestone beds contain many fossils, some kinds being so frequent that they may be considered characteristic of their respective strata; and, when we follow the sandstone along the coast, we can easily recognize it by the presence of these same fossils. A few miles farther the sandstone turns inland, and we find beds of chalk lying between it and the shore. On the other side a bed of shale appears above the limestone. Our sequence of rocks is, then, not simply clay, sandstone and limestone, but it must now include the chalk and shales as well. Adjusting in this manner all the strata, we can obtain a succession ever more and more complete as we extend our observations. In this manner we may eventually find that our limestone fossil, which at first seemed only a little more than 1000 feet below the modern deposits, must really be assigned to a depth of many thousands of feet. Such observations as we have indicated are being carried on in all countries, and the results are published by

the National Surveys, while local geologists study the detailed succession of smaller areas. The total thickness of all strata found by this means is something over 170,000 feet, or about thirty-two miles. We have now to show what these strata can tell us of the past history of the earth.

Let us go back to our river mouth, and examine carefully what is taking place there. It is not a uniform expanse, sloping gently into the sea, as it appeared at first sight. Near the river mouth the mud is more sandy and mixed with pebbles, and it gradually becomes finer as we go farther out to sea. Here there is a large block of stone dividing the current, which, strengthened on each side in its rush forward, cuts out a channel round the rock. On the lee side there is an eddy, producing curved grooves in the soft clay, and along the most protected line a ridge stands out, gradually getting broader and lower as it extends away from the shelter of the breakwater in front.

Along the margin of the current we again see a similar set of grooves and channels, behind the roots of sedges, with little heaps of dead sea-weed, shells of mollusks, and the carapaces or armor of prawns and shrimps. Here we see fish darting to and fro, now rising to the surface, now sweeping along the floor, and making sharp cuts and dashes in the smooth silt with their lower fins.

In a quiet corner a group of prawns are romping like school-boys, some leaping up in the clear water, others scoring the ground with legs and tail as they rush together. Observe those two having a regular bout of wrestling, while they make a little cloud of mud. When this settles down we see a small, basin-like hollow, with the marks of their limbs impressed like a seal on the yielding floor. They suddenly scamper off, and, as we watch, a majestic lobster marches past, lightly pressing his double-toed legs into the slime on each side of his course, while his tail, spread out and lowered, like that of a turkey-cock, cuts a beautiful and symmetrical groove which might serve as the model for a picture-frame or frieze border. On these stones are clinging some limpets, and on these a sea-anemone waves its tentacles. These double holes show the U-shaped tube of the sandworm, while that pair of eyes, just showing through the mud, reveals the sluggish flat-fish.

Meanwhile a storm has been brewing on the inland hills; the rains have swelled the river, bringing into it, by every burn and rivulet, a tribute of soil and clay, which becomes churned up into a milky liquor. This rolls forward like a bank of heavy clouds, blotting out our view beneath the surface of the water. Yet we

must not complain if the fine mud now settling down obliterates all the patterns and ornaments we have seen forming. They are not destroyed. They are only covered over by nature's protecting varnish, and will remain as a lasting picture of that hour's life.

As the tide ebbs, the receding waters cut miniature rivulets with branching tributaries in the sloping surface. On a lilliputian lake the wind produces waves of a corresponding size, and these, in their turn, form ripples on the tiny shore. Here and there a small crab can be seen trying to drag itself along, making a coarse, straggling trail, very different from the light finger-touches with which it impressed the ocean floor. Small birds also alight on the beach, running to and fro to pick up what appears tempting to their appetites. A frog or lizard also may crawl across to seek the shrunken river, or some cattle may come down to drink, leaving great double hollows where their cloven hoofs sink in the ooze. A passing shower of rain dots the surface with semicircular pits, throwing up a little ridge on the side towards which the wind is driving them. The bright summer's sun is now again sending down his thirsty rays, which soon harden the clay, and even produce cracks where the dry surface contracts more rapidly than the wet mud beneath. When the tide rises again all this will, in its turn, be covered with fresh material by the river, and will be stored up with the former records as a chapter of the earth's history.

Now, cut out carefully a block of this clayey deposit and, without disturbing it more than you can help, place it under a press and gradually squeeze out the moisture. When you have done so, you will find that there are many layers under one another, each of which can now be separated from the next. Each bears a page of the same record, written in the same handwriting, the record and the handwriting of life that has now passed away. Not only has each clay stratum protected the record below it, but it has, for safety's sake, taken a cast of that record, which is preserved on its own lower side, so that, if one page of the story should become blurred and illegible, we can still obtain the knowledge from the other. Each has also retained a hecatomb of fishes, mollusks, and other forms of animal life which could not escape the suffocating clouds of mud. Add to these the twigs, leaves and bones of land-animals, swept down by the river floods, and you will have a faint picture of the manner in which nature illustrates her autobiography.

In Arabia and Syria there are many stones lying on the ground

with rough marks on them, which, to a casual observer, seem the mere weathered surface of the rock. Yet the antiquarian can here trace the handiwork of a bygone race of men. He can make out letters, words and sentences, and he can find their meaning. The writing is not so clear as would be that of a printed page now, but he is none the less certain that it is the work of man. The parallel hardly needs pointing out. We have watched together how the earth's history is written down and stored up. The documents are not, indeed, left to the destructive action of wind and rain, but they are exposed to other agents not less capable of effacing the hieroglyphics. As the mountain masses are continually being scoured and planed down by frost and rain, yet ever sustain their height by being elevated from beneath, so the *débris* of the rivers tends to fill up the ocean bed, yet these maintain their depth by ever lowering their floors. The clays which once were left as a delta at a river-mouth now lie many miles deep below the Atlantic. Pressed down by ever-increasing loads of sediment, they are at the same time heated as they approach the centre of the earth. They are crystallized and altered by the hot percolating waters, baked into hard stone by the increase of temperature, and even at times fused, like over-heated bricks, into liquid lava, which forces its way out again to the surface through volcanic vents. When in the course of ages the remnant of our planet's archives is once more elevated to the surface, how can we wonder that the narrative is difficult to decipher? Yet even here we find most legible passages, in which we can recognize the same handwriting as in the latest document that was formed. The animals may not, perhaps, have had the same shape of limb, nor are the shells or leaves quite the same in form as those now produced in nature's workshop, but they cannot be rejected as witnesses, while the testimony of the channels and ridges, of the pitmarks of rain and of the sun-cracks, are all given in the same language that they speak to-day.

We have, then, a continuous series of pages, all written by the same hand, sometimes in strong and bold characters, sometimes fainter and more faded, but none that cannot be read with a little patience. And this series is not now arranged in artificial grouping by the hand of a collector, but they are left in their historic order, one over the other, as they were piled up on the ocean floor or in the river-bed.

As in the series of fossils, we can again point out to you how strong is the resemblance—often the identity—of the marks on different rock-surfaces. And again, you cannot deny the asser-

tion that, from the lowest to the highest, all were formed by the agencies that are even now at work. They have written not their names, but their lives, their journeys and their battles. Births and infancy, old age and deaths, all are before you, and as tokens of their truthfulness, the witnesses have left their very skeletons to tell the tale to future ages.

VI.

THE AGE OF THE ROCKS.

We must now attack the final question of the time that has been occupied in the composition of this history. Here we must at once confess that accuracy is not in our power. We have no means of fixing, even in centuries, the date of any geological event. Yet we have one certainty, and that is the only one we are concerned to prove. It is certain that the duration of time has been something very great—something to be measured by millions rather than by thousands of years.

Of the many arguments which tend to point out the limits of former time we will pass over those proposed by students of physics and astronomy. They have gone through deep mathematical problems to obtain their results, and they arrive at these results by many different lines of inquiry, such as by the effects of tides in gradually slackening the speed of the earth's rotation or in producing its spheroidal shape, or by the gradual cooling of the sun or of the earth. The duration given by these calculations would suit our contention if we accepted them, for the lowest is ten millions of years, while other physicists allow four hundred millions or more. Still we shall not rely on the physicist. We do not doubt the accuracy of his mathematical labor, nor of his observation, but his basis is not sufficiently sound for our present object. He has built his arguments upon a theory—a most probable theory, we confess, but still only a theory—which goes by the name of the "Nebular Hypothesis." This theory supposes that the earth, sun, moon and planets were once a great cloud of white, hot gases, which rotated on an axis. Parts of this cloud are supposed to have broken off in succession, and by condensing, first into liquids and then into solids, to have formed the planetary system. This is, however, only theory, and we cannot obtain certainty from a theory until it has ceased to be one—that is, until it has proved to be fact. Astronomers tell us that such clouds exist now, that in different parts of the heavens they can see stars representing all the stages which they affirm

our planets to have passed through. But one thing they cannot show us, and that is the one thing required in order to convert their theory into established fact. They cannot show us the actual change taking place in any star from one to another of their stages.¹

If, then, we wish to have at least a basis of fact, we must confine our attention to the certainties we have already established—that the fossils were once living animals, and that the stratified rocks are the effect of aqueous deposition, which took place at such a rate that life could be carried on during the formation.

Our problem then becomes the following: Find the thickness of the strata and the time it has taken to form each foot, and multiply the one by the other. A simple rule-of-three sum, if we can only obtain the requisite data.

First, then, as to the thickness of the strata. This is about 170,000 feet, or 32 miles, in their present state, but it represents a much larger bulk of new deposits. All the lower beds have been compressed and flattened by the pressure of those above. They have in many cases been altered chemically by the heat of the earth and by underground streams containing many salts in solution. In most cases these chemical actions have contracted the rocks most considerably. Again, when we remove some of the beds, we find that the newly-exposed surface has all the appearance of our present mountains and hills, showing that they had been raised into dry land and again lowered for the formation of the later deposits. This is a brief record, but it is a record of many great events. As the sea-bottom is gradually raised—for there are signs of violent or sudden action here—the soft ooze which has been most recently deposited will be swept away, several feet at a time, by the waves breaking over the low ground. As it emerges farther from the waters, rain and wind beat down on the rocks, which have as yet no protecting mantle of grass and trees. Deep cañons, like those of the Colorado, are cut out in a comparatively short time, for the harder rock is not yet exposed.

¹ This objection holds good against the evolution theory as well. It is quite undoubted that animals appeared on the earth in orderly succession of gradual development. Nor is the absence of "missing links" any serious difficulty, for these are being constantly supplied by further excavations of the rocks. But to prove evolution as a fact we must wait until we can show the actual descent, by generation, of one species from another. The nebular theory and the evolution theory may both be the true explanation. If not *precisely* the truth, they may still be very near the truth, for they profess to explain all the phenomena submitted to their tests, always excepting the descent of man from the lower animals. Man's soul, being of a different order, cannot possibly have evolved from the vital principle of the brute.

The tree and the shrub gradually advance to occupy the land. They shelter the rock from the more violent attacks of wind and rain, but they take blackmail for their services by converting the nearest part of the stone into loose soil. Streams are ever filching this from beneath the roots of the plants, in order to hand over the stolen goods to the large river. He forwards them to the ocean, thus taking from the older rocks the material out of which to build up new strata. When, perhaps, many thousand of feet of hard stone have been thus disintegrated and carried off, the land again sinks down, and the waves, rushing forward, despoil their foe of his last garment.

If all the matter thus removed could be restored to its place in the series, or if a constant supply of new earth had ever been at hand, the thickness of the combined strata would have been nearly double what it is. We cannot, therefore, exaggerate if we suppose that all the work done by the sea in spreading new layers over its floor would represent forty or even fifty miles of continuous deposit. Still we shall, for the present argument, neglect the opportunity thus given us of so greatly increasing our figures. Our certainty is the thirty-two miles of sedimentary rock now existing. And it will, we think, prove a sufficiently solid foundation.

Turning now to the other factor of the problem, we will try to obtain a fair estimate of the time it has taken to form each foot of this mighty mass. We must begin by finding the rate at which sedimentation takes place at present, and then see whether that rate should be increased or lessened for past ages.

The deposits now forming in the oceans are due almost entirely to the silt brought down by rivers and streams from the continents. The waves, battering against the rocks, do some injury to them, it is true, but the quantity of material that they add to the general stock is very small. The coast line of a continent or island shows a perceptible change after being for ages bombarded by the great Atlantic or Pacific swell, and a small heap of *débris* at the foot of a cliff will nullify the force of waves produced by a hurricane. It is only at the mouths of rivers that we find great changes. The silent action of rain and frost on the mountains sap their strength, and each little brook and rivulet brings its contribution of pebbles and sand and mud to the great stream which bears along in its waters, at every moment of time, enough earth to sink the navies of the world.

On many of the great rivers of the earth the amount of solid matter transported has been carefully investigated. The quantity will in each case depend on the hardness of the rocks in the area

drained by the river and its tributaries. It varies with the force and volume of the current, and with the windings which impede its course. There is, however, one mighty stream in which all others are, so to say, epitomized. In the Mississippi there is every variety of current and gradient, every combination of curve and straight channel. It contains rapids and waterfalls in the mountains where it takes its rise, and long, smooth stretches of sluggish waters in the lowlands. The vast area whence it derives its supplies is underlaid by every kind of rock, while on the surface of its valley there can be seen every description of wildwood and forest, marsh and swamp, tilled fields and meadow lands, village hamlet and manufacturing city. We cannot, therefore, go far wrong if we take it as a type of all river action and build up our calculation on the data it affords. Careful measurements have been taken of the daily burden of soil and stones discharged by it into the Gulf of Mexico, and the results show that it lowers the surface of the whole basin by one foot in six thousand years. We may assume, then, that this is the general rate at which all land is being denuded. There may be rivers which bring down more sediment, but, on the other hand, there are great areas, like the Sahara, where no transportation to the sea takes place.

But if one foot of the dry land is carried out to sea in six thousand years, this does not mean that the submarine deposits increase at the same rate. The waters of the oceans cover nearly three-fourths of the earth's surface; therefore a foot off the face of the land will give but little more than four inches, if spread out in the sea. Even this claim, however, we will not urge. We shall deal with the question as if the sea were only equal to the land. The advantages thus neglected are at least sufficient to show that the figures of our result cannot be exaggerated, but rather fall short of the truth.

The rate, then, that we take is one foot in six thousand years, and the thickness of sedimentary deposits is 170,000 feet. Multiplying these figures, we obtain *1020 millions of years* as the total time taken—if only the rate of deposition has always been the same as it is now.

But can we make such a supposition? Must we suppose that the quantity of solid matter carried down by rivers has been even approximately constant? This is the last point we have to investigate.

At first sight this appears most improbable. Four questions will at once rise in the mind of an adversary. Can the long series of extinct animals have been destroyed without huge convulsions

of nature, which would throw whole mountains into the sea at one moment? Can the great mountain chains and continental table-lands have been elevated except by some sudden upheaval which would have produced waves of the sea miles high—and would not such waves have swept off all loose material, as they dashed over the newly-raised land? Do we not hear tales of former ages, when the earth was covered with a canopy of snow and ice, which might transport an almost fabulous quantity of *débris*? And were there not other times when a tropical climate reached almost to the poles, accompanied, no doubt, by tropical storms and floods?

Certainly, if all these questions are to be answered in the affirmative, our figures cannot be anywhere near the truth. But we must reply to each in turn. That there have been great changes in the climate and conditions of the earth is most undoubted, but it is easy to attach too much importance to them.

Of world-wide convulsions our history is absolutely silent. When we read the pages patiently, we find that at no time did the fauna of an entire continental region become extinct together. Some species were more short-lived than others, and occasionally a new group appears in very sudden profusion; but there are always a large number of animal kinds which overlap their age of predominance, and linger on into the new order. Many forms, especially among the lowest and most fragile in the animal kingdom, have gone on in uninterrupted succession from the earliest times. In the depths of the Atlantic there is found a fine silicious ooze, composed almost entirely of the gossamer-like shells of Radiolaria. The Venus Flower-basket is a well-known example. This delicate network looks as if it were formed of spun glass, and may be crushed with ease in the hand. It is a giant among pigmies, for most of its fellows are of microscopic size. Yet animals with no better protection have continued without change for half geological time. With instances like these, and there are many others, no possibility is left of wholesale destruction.

Mountains and continents, again, show no signs of violent upheaval. Here and there, it is true, a volcano has suddenly started into existence, but most mountains are the result of slow elevation, which has been insufficient to break up or disintegrate the strata of their sloping sides. These beds are folded up and crumpled and distorted by the lateral pressure of the higher peaks; but this pressure has not been applied by fits and starts, but gradually and steadily, with little change of force except when many ages have gone by.

The great ice theory, on the other hand, has a large foundation in fact. That there was ever one extended sheet of ice over half the globe at once may well be doubted; but that large areas can be so covered is proved by the state of Greenland and of the regions about the southern pole. It is, moreover, a well-established fact that there have been many of those solid rivers of ice, which we call glaciers, in countries where now no single mountain can retain its snowy winter cloak throughout the year. Still, the effects of the most extended ice-sheets, proposed by ultra-glacialists, cannot materially alter our totals. The bulk of the *débris* they carried with them still remains on dry land, and has never been added to the ocean deposits. The ice age was also but a small episode in the history of our planet, and the ice rivers did not last long enough to be able to compete successfully with the water streams of all past ages as carriers of building-material for the ocean architects.

The only cause that remains for modifying our calculations is the fact that there have been great changes of climate in past time. On several leaves of our great volume we find the impressions of gigantic ferns and masses. The *Lepidodendra* and the *Sigillaria* of the coal period were club mosses, which grew to 60 feet and more in height. The 16-foot high *Calamite* is represented by the modern lowly horse-tail or mare's-tail. We may well believe that these giants could not flourish except in a tropical temperature. More near our own day, again, when the clays of the Mississippi Valley were in course of formation, a tropical or sub-tropical flora existed in the extreme north of Baffin's bay, where now the Arctic ice-packs impede our progress to the pole. The warm climates, which favored such vegetation, must have been accompanied by those heavy rains now met with near the equator. Great floods would have robbed the land of its substance far more rapidly than our present rivers.

Volcanoes and earthquakes may also have been more active during some epochs of the past than they are now, and there may be a few agents, once of great importance, which now we cannot recognize; for geologists are far from saying they can decipher every word and phrase on the monuments they examine. But though these considerations may deprive our figures of the accuracy we should desire, still we cannot reduce them indefinitely.

The Amazon now brings down sufficient mud to discolor the South Atlantic for 300 miles from its mouth. If it were to bring down four or five times its present burden the sea would be uninhabitable, except for the mud-fish and the eel. The coral of the

Pacific, again, is most susceptible to impurities in its surrounding water. A very little pollution will destroy the whole colony of island builders. Yet from the earliest geological time we find enormous tracts, often of miles square, which were suited to their exuberant growth.

Even if we were to allow that the rivers of the past could, on the average, bring down ten times the quantity they do now, we should still have a duration of *one hundred millions of years*.

This figure, even thus reduced, is only a rough approximation. We do not try to establish it as a certainty, but at least it proves that the number of years to be included in geological history must be measured not by thousands, but by millions. Many other methods have been proposed for measuring this time, all equally uncertain in their actual results, but all unanimous in giving long periods. If, therefore, the metaphysician desires to scoff at geologists, saying that they are continually at war with one another on the details of their science, let him at least acknowledge that, underlying all such differences, there is complete agreement among them as to many greater and more general conclusions. So much, indeed, is this the case, that it is unnecessary, and even undesirable, to keep on expressing these fundamental facts, unless, as in the present essay, some one explicitly strives to show that there are certainties as well as uncertainties in geology.

GEORGE C. HUNGERFORD POLLEN, S.J., F.G.S.

ST. BRUNO'S COLLEGE,

Scientific Chronicle.

MIND IN MEN, THE LOWER ANIMALS, AND SOCIAL ORGANISM.

There is much that is exceedingly interesting and, we may add, useful, when taken with proper limitations, in an article on "Evolution of the Mind," by Professor D. S. Jordan, of Leland Stanford University, in a recent number of "Appleton's Popular Science Monthly." The article is a proof of the vastly increased attention which is being devoted to the study of psychology; and it has this recommendation for those who do not mistake Science for Divinity, that it speaks reverently of the problems of nature and the moral order, and does not ignore the First Cause. It seems to us to argue more for a principle of design whose plan embraces the co-operation of all animate and inanimate nature towards some hidden end than for mere correlation of small things to great, which some take to be the chief manifestation, if not the key, to the visible and known cosmogony. Professor Jordan extends the attribute, which is called mind, from man down to the lowest organic forms—even to plants. This is the ground upon which many will be found to join issue with him—that is, if he would be taken as meaning that it is the same guiding mental force, differing only in duration and degree, which actuates the individual man and the organized society and government, and the gregarious herds and flocks and shoals of the lower animal species, whether of the earth, the air, or the water. Still less can we assent to his postulations when we are invited to regard plant life and vegetable life and arboreal life as regulated by mental laws operating from within. The laws which direct animal life and the growth and decay of the flora present fixed and unvarying features which are in marked contrast to the variable and unequal characteristics of human development, as affected by the operations of the intellect. It must seem to the slower-minded that the great danger in all theses of mentality or psychology is the tendency to conduct things on the ready-made tailoring principle. The separate mind of every individual seems to present a study in itself, in so far as the powers or traits which are not involuntary are concerned. Millions of human beings act precisely in the same manner with regard to the general laws of existence, but there are as many ways of regarding these actions and the disposition of mind toward them as there are actors. The "follow-the-leader" rule among the lower animals seems to argue that this is not so in that plane of nature. This inductive habit is strongly evident in Professor Jordan's paper, as may be seen by the following passages:

“The study of the development of mind in animals and men gives no support to the mediæval idea of the mind as an entity apart from the organ through which it operates. . . .

“There is no *ego* except that which arises from the co-ordination of the nerve-cells. All consciousness is ‘colonial consciousness,’ the product of co-operation. . . . The *I* in man is the expression of the co-working of the processes and impulses of the brain. The brain is made of individual cells, just as England is made of individual men.

“The development of the character is the formation of the *ego*. It is in itself the co-ordination of the elements of heredity, the bringing into union of the warring tendencies and irrelevant impulses left us by our ancestors. The child is a mixture of imperfectly related impulses and powers. It is a mosaic of ancestral heredity. Its growth into personality is the process of bringing these elements into relation to each other.

* * * * *

“What is true of man is true of animals, and true of nations as well ; for a nation is an aggregation of many men as a man is a coalition of many cells. In the life of a nation, Lowell tells us, ‘three roots bear up Dominion—Knowledge, Will, the third Obedience, the great tap-root of all.’ This corresponds to the nervous sequence in the individual. And as, in general, the ills of humanity are due to untruthfulness in thought and action, so are the collective ills of nations due to national folly, vacillation and disobedience. The laws of national greatness are extensions of the laws which govern the growth of the single cell.”

The argument from the laws of physical life in the lower creation to the moral law in the life of men and nations appears defective, inasmuch as mankind is master of its own actions, whereas the lower kingdom appears controlled by immutable external force. If there be any key to this profound mystery, it must seem as though it has yet to be discovered. The pursuit is, no doubt, a fascinating one, and it is gratifying to observe the spirit in which students like Professor Jordan approach the threshold of the unknown, and perhaps we might say the unknowable.

IS THERE LIFE IN METALS?

RECENT investigations have educed some facts in relation to metals that must cause an alteration in our views regarding the nature of many of those curious natural substances. The common belief hitherto entertained with regard to metals was that they were inert matter, subject to variation with temperature. This idea has been proved to be utterly erroneous. There is a constant movement of the particles of metals, and the particles of the harder metals are endowed with some unknown power which enables them to work through those of weaker ones. The

constant action of steel particles is strikingly exemplified in the case of the Eiffel Tower. A governmental engineer, Colonel Bassueret, has made an examination of the subject, as many people had become alarmed over the perceptible swaying and oscillation of the vast mass of steel. There is no ground whatever for apprehension in the matter. If it be a fact that the swaying of a tall brick chimney is the best guarantee of its ability to resist wind-pressure, how much more must this be the case with an elastic fabric like the Eiffel Tower, whose riveting and joining have been executed on a careful calculation of the degree of expansion and contraction of the material to be allowed for. Any one crossing Brooklyn Bridge on foot may observe certain sliding arrangements at intervals along the balustrades, and the marks on the girders show that a difference of as much as six inches is indicated at each of these spots as the movement back and forth of the metal bars. The same thing is observable in the joinings of the Eiffel Tower. The engineer tells us that there is not a moment during the twenty-four hours that go to make up the day that the mass of metal is not in motion. The motion is rhythmic, and not a steady settling, first one inch, then two inches, and so on, but the whole tower jingles and jumps just as if it enjoyed the realization of its power of motion and wanted others to know and appreciate the fact. The cause of this breathing of the tower, as it may be called, is that the great metallic mass contracts and expands, just as does the chest of a human being. The fact that the engineer, whose duty it was to examine and report as to the safety of the structure, has decided that the motion is an additional proof of the structure's solidity is confirmation of the decision of the experts regarding the great sky-scrapers of the United States, which are really built upon giant skeletons of iron and steel.

It was noticed a long time ago that some of these buildings often shook and shivered, like a person with the ague. The experts examined them, and declared it was in this fact that their safety lay. If there was no vibration, then every shock would weaken the big building so constructed that it could never bend, but break.

Wonderful as this discovery about the Eiffel Tower is, we believe the elasticity of tall brick structures is a fact more surprising still.

GETTING BEHIND THE KORAN.

The only animal enjoyment not forbidden by the Koran is the juice of the grape. This is one of the singularities of Mahometanism, and it has often been the source of wonder to the critics of that system how so abstemious a people as the bulk of the Mussulmans are could be so gross in appetite beyond people who habitually use alcoholic stimulants. The theory has been put forward that the Prophet's reason for laying

down the prohibition was to put a check upon the license which his formula otherwise established, and so make his law, like the American Constitution, "a system of checks and balances," not for moral but merely physical purposes. However this may be, it is well known that Mahometans chafe under the restriction, while those who look at the matter merely from the economical point of view deplore the loss accruing to the Mussulman regions, where the grape grows luxuriantly, by the non-utilization of it in its fermented state. But now it appears that a back-door is about to be thrown open to thirsty Mussulmans and economists both, for it has been discovered that the grape, thanks to Pasteur's discoveries, can be sterilized so that it can be kept perfectly unfermented for an indefinite time. The "Revue Viticole" says:

"A French chemist, M. Rosensteil, has devised a process of sterilizing the must, based on Pasteurization, and thus make of the juice of grape a drink that tastes and looks like wine, while, not being fermented, it cannot fall under the prohibition of the Koran, and can consequently be employed by the natives. We should say that the new drink has a fresh and very characteristic taste, and will find numerous applications among Europeans who object to alcohol—and they are many in Algeria. The temperance societies, too, can take no exception to a product which, all things considered, will sell as well as wine and lacks its injurious qualities."

Algeria is especially rich in its grape crops, and if this dream be realized, the country must have a vast permanent addition made to its natural wealth and its industrial population.

BALLOONS AND MAGNETS IN SUNKEN SHIP-RAISING.

So many ironclad ships have been sunk through misadventure, lately, and so many more may not unnaturally be expected to follow suit, that some more serious attention to the subject of means of recovering the hulls of such vessels seems to be a necessity of the situation. The feasibility of raising such wrecks by means of balloons was mooted a good many years ago, and was, in fact, sought to be demonstrated in the case of the *Vanguard*, a British ironclad sent to the bottom by her consort ship, the *Iron Duke*, off Kingstown, in the Irish Channel, but the experiments were not regarded as satisfactory. A more ingenious idea, it appears to us, is the application of a magnetic power to the sunken mass of iron. A plan for experimenting in this direction was discussed some months ago in *Cassier's Magazine*, but so far, we believe, without inducing anybody to make the trial. It was suggested that the idea be tried on the sunken war vessel, the *Victoria*, of the British navy, which now lies at the bottom of the Mediterranean, in 450 feet of water, off the harbor of Tripoli. The weight of the wreck in water is estimated at 7000 tons, and the suggested method of raising it is as follows: Pow-

erful hydraulic rams and dynamo machines and a series of heavy electromagnets are to be arranged on pontoons at the scene of the wreck. A magnet, lowered over the side and coming within reasonable distance of the sunken vessel, would be drawn toward the latter, and, on touching any iron or steel part of it, would immediately stick to it with a power of 100 tons. As each magnet made attachment, which would be indicated by means of an electric dial on the pontoon, a trial pull would be given to the rope to ascertain that a connection had been made to a firm part of the wreck. Should this not be the case the magnet would come off; its position would be then slightly moved and a fresh attachment made until a firm hold had been taken of the wreck. When all the magnets had been thus fixed, the wreck would be considered ready for raising.

The fact that the experiment would cost about a hundred thousand pounds, at the outset, is a drawback. A few such experiments, and the game would hardly be worth the candle. But in case of war, and the sending of a large number of ironclads to join the submarine navy as a consequence, it may be worth the consideration of Government whether or not a ship-raising magnet plant ought not to form a permanent feature of the naval department.

IMPROVEMENTS IN DIVERS' ARMOR.

A subject cognate to the foregoing is the possibility of so improving the equipment of deep-sea divers as to make their difficult task a little easier and less liable to dangerous risks. From Australia we have news of the patenting of a dress which is claimed to be immensely superior to that now in vogue among those who go down to the company of the fishes. It is known as the Buchanan-Gordon diving-dress, and has already been tried with great success on the Clyde. The invention is a dress which in itself withstands the tremendous pressure of great depths, enabling the diver to breathe a normal air-pressure. It is, in effect, a suit of armor which defies all assaults, yet enables the wearer to move about with ease. The most important part is the helmet, which descends to the waist in one solid piece of copper, and weighs no less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ cwt., while the whole dress weighs 5 cwt. The arms and the lower half of the dress consist of a series of spiral springs covered with water-proof material, which at the same time gives strength and mobility. These springs are made of a phosphor bronze of immense strength, called "Delta metal." By a series of ingenious arrangements the suit can be adjusted to the height of the diver, and a jointed brass support running along the outside of the legs is intended to prevent the horrible accidents which might be caused by the upward pressure of the water. But perhaps the most interesting portion of the dress is the escape-valve. Presuming a diver to be at a depth of 26

fathoms, he would have to stand a pressure of 69 pounds to the square inch ; and, therefore, under the old system an air-pressure of more than this amount would have to be pumped into the diver's dress in order that the escaping air might overcome the external resistance. But in the Gordon process this difficulty is overcome in a very simple manner. The escape-valve, which is perfectly under the diver's control, is attached to a floating hose, the upper end of which can be submerged to any required depth below the surface. This reduces the head against which the air escapes, and thereby permits the pressure of air supplied to the diver to be proportionately diminished. In this dress a diver descended 31 fathoms, or 186 feet, and remained at that depth 50 minutes, subjected to a pressure of more than 80 pounds to the square inch ; yet on coming up he was quite fresh. This depth had never before been attained in Great Britain. A novice, in the first three trials of the dress, descended, respectively, 10, 15, and 19½ fathoms. These are astonishing results, as compared with those obtainable under the system previously prevalent. And the most gratifying feature of all is the lightening of the struggle of the diver to work under the enormous difficulty of a minimum air supply. The exhaustion to which even the strongest men succumb after a protracted spell of work below the surface must make, from repetition, terrible inroads on the physical system. Much of this can now be obviated, it is very gratifying to learn, thanks to this valuable invention.

REVIVAL OF EMPIRICAL SCIENCE IN FRANCE.

A recent lecture by Dr. H. C. Bolton before the New York Section of the American Chemical Society reveals the singular fact that in France, at present, the ancient beliefs in alchemy, occult science, astrology, and other forms of "dark ages" pseudo-philosophy, still flourish. Nay, what is more, there is a university where this false science is taught, and, besides this, there are four societies devoted to the cult ; and, in addition, the study of these matters is combined with that of psychology, spiritualism and evolution. Theosophy is, as a matter of course, included. It is difficult to believe that in modern France, where legitimate science has arrived at such a high plane of eminence, such transparent delusions should meet with very serious encouragement ; still we have Dr. Bolton's word for it that many people devote much time to the investigation of such philosophical will-o'-the-wisps ; and he gives the reasons for it, too, showing a certain amount of plausibility in the elementary reasons for a return to mediæval dreams.

"So eminent a chemist as Sir Humphry Davy," he says, "did not hesitate to affirm that some of the doctrines of alchemy are not unphilosophical. Recent discoveries in physics, chemistry and psychology have given the disciples of Hermes renewed hopes, and the present po-

sition of chemical philosophy has given the fundamental doctrine of alchemy a substantial impetus. The favorite theory of a *prima materia*, or primary matter, the basis of all the elementary bodies, has received new support by the discoveries of allotropism of the elements, isomerism of organic compounds, the revelations of the spectroscope, the practical demonstrations by Norman Lockyer, the experiments on the specific heat of gaseous bodies at a high temperature by Mallard and Le Châtelier, the discoveries of Sir William Crookes as set forth in his monograph on 'Meta-elements,' the discovery by Carey Lea of several allotropic forms of silver, and, most weighty of all, the mass of related facts and phenomena which find their ultimate expression in the periodic law of the elements, so that many chemists of the present day are inclined to believe in the mutual convertibility of elements having similar chemical properties."

We recall to mind that it is not very long since an experimentalist in this country, Dr. Emmens, claimed to have actually discovered a process by which silver and gold could be made convertible, and we believe the Government was persuaded to give the matter some attention. This, however, was put forward as a question of practical chemistry, and not as alchemy or anything connected with the arts of Hermes Tresmegistus. There is nothing startling in the thesis that all metals may have a common basis, but to reduce their infinite variations to this common basis, even if it could be accomplished, would not appear to get us any nearer to the problem of increasing the quantity of the highest.

IS LEPROSY INCURABLE?

The exact nature of leprosy has never been positively determined, and a recent congress in Berlin, composed of men of various nationalities, has resulted in nothing more definite than an agreement that the establishment of leper colonies and the isolation of the afflicted are the only measures that can be taken, with our present knowledge, to circumscribe the ravages of the plague. Two conclusions of an opinionative character were also put on record, but in view of the fact that science never recognizes the god Terminus, we may withhold our assent to them or grant it, according to the measure of our experience and judgment. One of these is, that leprosy is incurable; the other, that it is a disease entirely confined to the human race. All attempts to transplant the bacilli to the lower animals had failed; hence the latter conclusion. The theory, universally held until now, that leprosy was an hereditary affliction, was likewise weakened by the inductive testimony of the scientists who composed the congress. Still, the conclusion that leprosy is an incurable disease scarcely appears justified from the premises. The fact that as yet no cure has been found does not

close the door against the hope of some remedy being found in the future. It was positively stated, a few months ago, that a priest who had lived many years in the East had found a plant whose essence yielded a perfect cure for leprosy; and science has always admitted the truth of the maxim that for every disease of Nature, Nature herself has a remedy in her own pharmacopœia. We have heard nothing definite about the alleged discovery, but we do not relinquish hope that there may be some substantial foundation for the announcement thus vaguely made.

The general results of the congress were summed up in this concluding paragraph of the report:

“The producer of leprosy, as determined by the modern scientific methods of research, is the *bacillus lepræ*, known to the scientific world for the period of twenty-five years through the investigations of Neisser and Hansen. All are agreed that only a human being can be the bearer of this bacillus, and it is a fact that leprosy is contagious. Every leprosy person is a source of danger to those around him, and the danger grows the more closely the patient associates with others and the worse the general sanitary conditions are that surround him. For this reason the existence of leprosy is especially dangerous among the poorer classes. However, it cannot be denied that the transfer of this disease to people in better circumstances has been observed in more than one case. The opinion that leprosy is hereditary has been losing adherents in recent times, while the view that it is contagious has gained advocates. As yet, no method of treatment has been found that is effectual in cases of leprosy. Leprosy is incurable.”

The disease, it may be added, appears to have been widening its area slowly, spreading in localities hitherto spared. Russia, Scandinavia, Iceland, have contended against it for centuries. But lately it has found its way into Eastern Prussia, especially into the city of Memel. Russia has five leprosy hospitals and two leprosy colonies; and the recent congress decided that Germany should follow this example in order to stop its spread.

Dr. Sticker, a member of the German Commission which was sent out to India to study the growth of leprosy and the nature of the bubonic plague, contributed much interesting information regarding the former disease, as well as a thesis about its mode of transmission from individual to individual and place to place. According to his observations, the part of the body from which all leprosy persons during their entire sickness send forth the greatest number of bacilli, and do so with the greatest of regularity and in great abundance, is the nose. On the other hand, it was discovered that the part of the healthy body which is most ready to receive these bacilli, and where the contagion in nearly all instances takes place, is again the nose. Just as tuberculosis begins at the ends of the lungs, so leprosy begins at the ends of the nose. This conclusion seems to point to the origin of leprosy as in the lungs, or at least in the mucous membrane connected with the lungs.

THE AGE OF THE SUN.

The question of the nature and duration of the sun has for long been the great stumbling-block to the evolutionists. In the fact that this immense mass is always incandescent, and constantly also in a state of self-consumption, there is found an argument against the tremendous length of time which they demand for geological and biological development on the globe. The Rev. Professor Cortie, the distinguished astronomer of Stonyhurst, treated the subject recently in a lecture at Nottingham.

The atmosphere of the sun, he pointed out, was composed of the vapors of metals. No metals could exist in a solid state near the sun on account of the tremendous heat it sent out. Huge flames of hydrogen rose occasionally to a great height from the body of the sun. These streamers frequently extended for millions of miles into space. Probably these coronas were due to electrical energy. The first attempts to calculate the heat of the sun were made by Berniere, who set up a huge burning-glass in the gardens of the Luxembourg. By its means the distance of the sun was practically decreased to 250,000 miles. Gold placed beneath this glass ran like butter. If the sun was as near the earth as the moon is, the earth would be drawn into vapor. There was another method of gauging the heat of the sun. The heat in the Bessemer converter was probably the greatest heat they could attain on earth, but the heat of the sun was eighty-seven times that of the converter, and its light was five thousand times greater. The heat radiations were measured by an instrument termed an actinometer. There were various theories with regard to the maintenance of the solar heat. The combustion theory was untenable, whilst that regarding the impact of meteors only partially accounted for the store of heat. There was the fact that the contraction of gaseous masses in cooling produced heat, and this theory was supported by arguments from analogy. The sun was probably formed from nebulae, as shown by their connection with the stars, their spectra and structure. Thus they had the means of determining the age of the sun. The mathematical and physical arguments on which this was founded were at least as probable as the biological and geological arguments for Darwinism. Thus, he could state that Darwinism was not proven, and all arguments founded upon it against Scripture and revealed religion were untenable.

Book Notices.

MOTION: ITS ORIGIN AND CONSERVATION. An Essay by *Rev. Walter McDonald, D.D.* (Maynooth). Dublin: Browne & Nolan. 1898. Pp. xi.-457.

There is something magnetic about this work. First of all, the subject itself has a peculiar attractiveness. Mass and motion—are they not the ultimate constituents of the world of sense? *Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas*. Mass, indeed, is known to us only through motion, so that, in a sense, motion is for us the middle term that carries the mind on to the ultimate material unit, nay, to the ultimate cause, efficient and final—the *primum movens immobile*—of all reality, to God himself. Then, too, motion is the basal condition and intrinsic factor of all that is sublime and beautiful in the universe, from the transcendent music of the spheres to the harmonious play of the atoms as they arrange themselves under its spell in the fairy form of the crystal snowflake. To trace this radical and all-pervading agency to its home, to watch it as it energizes in the world of matter and life, to study it in its analogue in the spirit realms, to account for its origin and conservation by its relation to its Author—surely there is a potency in all this for the philosophical inquirer. And this is what awaits the reader of Dr. McDonald's modestly-called Essay.

But add to this charm of the subject itself the splendid science and art of the author, and you have an additional winsomeness. The writer comes to us laden with treasures from many domains of the world of knowledge, from the vanishing regions of history and the ubiquitous realm of constant experience, from the wide-reaching stretches of physics and chemistry, from the subtle inlands of biology and psychology, from the deeper depths of ontology and cosmology, from the highest spheres of theodicy and theology. And these varied treasures he arranges before his reader's eye with an order and a splendor that unifies it all in the beauty of an art that is seldom met with in undertakings of the kind.

Lastly, too, the bookmakers' instincts have lent themselves kindly to the work, and have given it a finish and a setting that befit its character.

All this charm the earnest Catholic student of philosophy will feel as he reads this Essay, and if he be not well-versed in the physics and metaphysics of the subject he will probably assent to the facts and theories presented. And, first of all, let it be noted that the author addresses himself mainly to Catholics, and so takes "for granted many things that will not be admitted by those who differ from our creed, especially by those who do not believe in the spiritual or in the supernatural. If any such should come across these pages they will find arguments which, for them, will have no weight. Let them be content, if they can, to read,

that they may, at least, be able to judge whether the Catholic system is consistent, and how far it fits in with the teaching of physical science" (p. 3).

"Everything in the world is agitated by light, heat, magnetic and electric forces, gravity at least. What is not moved in some way cannot reveal itself to our senses. The very Sphinx, symbol of utter immobility, is, as we learn from Physics, one seething mass of currents and counter-currents ever crossing one another in endless variety within its flinty surface. . . . But though nothing ever begins to move, in the sense of passing into movement from a state of absolute repose, yet is motion said to *commence* whenever it is *intensified*. A billiard-ball lying apparently at rest on the table is not without its wave-disturbances, neither is the cue motionless as it stands on the rack, nor the player seated on the bench. When he takes the cue and strikes the ball he but adds to the motions that already existed in all three. In that sense only are they said to begin to move" (p. 3).

It is this increase of motion which the author first considers; afterwards he draws "some important conclusions regarding the ultimate source of all movement, as well as with respect to the means whereby motion is kept up after being brought into existence" (*Ibid.*).

In this first and main subject—how precisely an increase of motion (such as is apparent in the billiard-player at work) is brought about—the author finds two theories. The one, which he considers as now prevalent in Catholic schools, he calls the "Dynamic" theory, using the qualification in a somewhat different sense from that which it usually conveys. The other, which he designates as the "Kinetic," he believes to have been taught by Aristotle and some of the greatest Catholic philosophers of the Middle Ages (St. Thomas included), and to be now held by some of the very ablest scientific men of our own day" (p. 15).

The "Dynamic" theory is thus summarized (p. 7):

1. "Motion does not pass from one agent into another without losing its individuality, but is produced *de novo* in every object that begins to move in the sense explained" (*increased* motion).

2. "The immediate efficient cause of motion is a reality called 'force,' which is thus quite distinct from motion, as well as from faculty and substance."

3. "This 'force' emanates immediately from an habitual ever-present power or faculty, which itself is sustained by the substance; the 'force' so exerted passes from one agent to another."

4. "The player (agent) cannot act alone, for all his faculties and 'forces' are contingent, but needs the divine co-operation." The nature of this co-operation is diversely explained by theologians.

The "Kinetic" theory runs thus (p. 8):

1. "There is no such thing as 'force' really distinct from the permanent faculty and the motion which is caused therein. The motion of the faculty is itself the only force activity, action, formal cause of

efficient causality. And motion passes quite readily from one agent into another without losing its individuality."

2. "In other words, motion is to the faculty what the faculty itself is to substance, with two points of difference: (a) That one is motion, the other a quality capable of sustaining motion; (b) that the quality is fixed to its substance, whereas in many cases the motion can pass from subject to subject."

3. "The divine co-operation extends to the original production and perennial conservation of substance, faculty and motion." Each of these is God's, in one sense, and yet belongs to the created *supposit* in another sense.

This theory the author believes to have been held "by some of the very ablest of the old Catholic writers in philosophy" [St. Thomas particularly], as well as by the leaders in modern physical science, and his avowed purpose in publishing his work is "to vindicate for himself and for Catholic professors generally the right to teach in accordance with the Kinetic theory of activity, whatever may be the science in which they are engaged—physics, metaphysics, theology, or anything else" (p. 1). We cannot here enter at length into the author's polemic, but if we may venture an opinion on the subject, we believe that he misconceives and misinterprets (unintentionally, of course) his adversaries' position in an essential element. We read in one place that the author himself was once under the influence of the dynamic theory, and at that time he believed that in the example of the billiard-player "there were involved six different realities; the player's substance, his faculty, the exertion of 'force,' the 'force' exerted, the production of motion in the cue, and the motion produced." In this sum in addition we are reminded, "there is no account taken of the substance of the cue, its capacity to receive motion, and the actual reception of the same" (p. 22). Truly, the author should be congratulated, having escaped from a theory in which so little regard is had for Occam's razor. But do the so-called "Dynamists"—they would most likely object to the title were they asked to assume it—whom Dr. McDonald controverts really insist on the multiplication of all these entities? As regards the first two—*substance* and *faculty*—there can be no question. Dr. McDonald admits, nay, explicitly contends for their real existence in every created *supposit*. As for the next three, indeed we might say the last four, of the six above mentioned "realities," the exertion of "force" and the "force" exerted, the production of motion and the motion produced, the "Dynamists," we believe, regard them as one, viz., the *action* of the faculty. And here we may note what we regard as a radical flaw at the heart of the author's entire discussion. He creates in his imagination a fictitious entity, which he calls *force*, and accredits it to the advocates of "Dynamism." He then waxes quite wroth at the figment, as though it verily claimed a position in the world of reality, and embodying the thing in a name with quotational limits he chases it about from page to page, lunging at it with such

deadly thrusts that the reader feels like crying, "Hold!" Has, then, this "force" any extra-mental existence? Not in the sense in which the author ascribes it to the "Dynamists." It has, however, in the sense in which the author himself admits and strenuously argues for it, that is, as a *faculty*. By the word "forces" philosophers understand qualities or *active powers* [*faculties*], powers, that is, which produce some natural effect" [Pesch, "Phil. Nat.," v. i., p. 70]. And again, forces are the proximate principles of action, inhering in the root principle, the essence [substance] of a body [matter]. And as they are rooted in the essence and, as it were, begotten [procreantur] therefrom, so are they the instruments whereby the essence, the principle agent, operates" (*ib.* vol. ii., p. 45). Now, since *faculties* or *powers* do not migrate from their subjects whereof they are radical properties, Dr. McDonald errs in attributing to the "Dynamists" the opinion that "'force' passes from one agent to another" (p. 8). The author might well have spared himself the whole burden of his negative criticism—the hunting down of this harmless migratory fiction "force."

The production of motion and the motion produced, the third pair of the alleged elements in the billiard-player's performance, the "Dynamists" would again merge in the *action* of the motive faculty of the player, and in the reception of the same in the cue and balls. Here, again, we may call upon Fr. Pesch, against whom the author's polemic is chiefly directed. "Local motion," he says, "may be regarded from a double point of view. Formally taken, it is a state or condition of a thing, and as such is *modally* distinct from the thing moved [its subject]. Considered in its cause, it is the impetus, the *vis motrix*, that is, the *motive power* as *actually energizing*" [in actu posita]. Again, "*motion, action, passion*, though *entitatively the same*, are *virtually* [ratione ratiocinata] distinct. The state, as emanating from the agent [immediately from his faculty], is called *action*, and as received in the term *passion*; considered as tendency, as *via ad terminum*, motion. "Porro dubium non est quin profectio ab agente, et receptio in passo, et tendentia ab illo ad hoc ex conceptu inter se distinguantur" (*ib.* p. 77). Many more such passages might be cited from Fr. Pesch, the most recent of "Dynamists," demonstrative of the fact that his teaching on this subject differs not in its entirety from that of Aristotle and St. Thomas, and that he quite adopts the position which Dr. McDonald shows to have been the mind of the Angelic Doctor: "*Actio et passio et motus sunt una et eadem res*" [cited p. 290]. But a discussion of this obscure and difficult question would carry us too far.

Though we cannot endorse the author's opinions on the above and on a number of other important matters, yet we are glad to be able to say that he has given us a very remarkable and a valuable work—remarkable and valuable for its erudition, its reflection of, in many ways, profound philosophical insight, its great synthetic presentation of principles, and last but not least, its patent illustration of the fact that the English tongue in the hands of a master and a clear thinker can be made

to express the deepest and abstrusest concepts of metaphysics and theology. Probably one of the chief merits of the book is that it will stimulate Catholic writers in philosophy to kindred productions in English, and whilst calling forth criticism, as it should, will be instrumental not only in clarifying philosophical thought and definition, but in bringing the metaphysics of the schools into closer contact with problems of physical science.

F. P. S.

PHILOSOPHIA LACENSIS: INSTITUTIONES PHILOSOPHIÆ NATURALIS SECUNDUM PRINCIPIA S. THOMÆ AQ. AD USUM SCHOLASTICUM ACCOMODAVIT. *Tilm. Pesch*, S. J. Editio altera. Vol. i., pp. xviii.-444. Vol. ii., pp. xix.-406. Price, \$3.85.

INSTITUTIONES PSYCHOLOGIÆ. Vol. ii., pp. xiv.-421. Herder: Freiburg (St. Louis, Mo.). 1897. Price, \$1.80.

The "bankruptcy" of purely experimental science as an answer to the aspirations of the human mind and the one support of a coherent system of morality has been again and again demonstrated within recent times. The demonstration has been formulated and presented to the world not only by writers such as Mr. Balfour and M. Brunetière, but by the score and more of philosophers who have sounded the depths and measured the consequences of the boldest and most captious attempt at establishing morality on materialism—Mr. Herbert Spencer's "Data of Ethics."

The "bankruptcy" of empiricism as a method and theory of physical science itself has been no less frequently proclaimed, but the full proclamation is set forth and justified in works familiar mostly to the professional student of philosophy, in works in German such as Fr. Pesch's "Welträthsel," and in French, like the Abbé de Broglie's "Le Positivisme et la Science Experimentale." Mr. Balfour has, with his keen and fascinating dialectic, argued to the same purpose, and Mivart and Lilly, Martineau, Porter and McCosh have done not a little to point out to the thinking world the "suicidalness" of a science claiming to be grounded on mere empiricism. The continually growing dissatisfaction during the past two decades, especially with the inadequacy of physical science to do more than serve the arts that provide for the wants and luxuries of man's body, has made itself felt in reiterated demands for a philosophy that shall at once supply a basis and a unification to the physical sciences, and shall harmonize with the data of common-sense and with man's moral, religious and social tendencies.

For a time the cry "back to Kant" was echoed from Germany, but the word has been stifled here and abroad in the babel that has been raised by the schools of the "new psychology." The implied, if not avowed, trend of this psychology, however, does but deepen and confirm the inwardness and tendency of pure empiricism, so that the search for a solid substructure to systematized knowledge must be carried farther back. "The prejudice prevailing amongst the Germans," says Trendelenburg, in his 'Studies in Logic,' "that every philosopher must build afresh, and that, therefore, a newly-formulated principle for the

philosophy of the future has yet to be found, must be abandoned. That principle has long since been discovered. It lies in the world-conception set forth by Plato and Aristotle, and handed down from them. Their philosophy should be developed and perfected by a deeper study of its fundamental ideas and individual details, in their reciprocal relations with the objective sciences." (Pesch, *Welträthsel*, p. 85.)

The great Encyclical, "*Æterni Patris*," of Leo XIII., almost two decades ago, sounded unmistakably to the Catholic scholar a return to the Peripatetic philosophy, but to that philosophy unfolded and interpreted by St. Thomas Aquinas, and pruned of whatever excrescences the undeveloped state of mediæval physics had fastened thereon, and enlarged and illustrated by whatever of truth modern science has discovered or proven.

Amongst those who followed most promptly the leading of Leo, few, if any, have been more successful in reviving the old philosophy than the author of the works here under review. His "*Philosophia Naturalis*," first published in 1880, inaugurated the "*Cursus Lacensis*," a most thorough contribution to neo-scholasticism. In that work the fundamental concepts of philosophy, as underlying the sciences of nature, are set forth with great fulness and clearness, defended with a wealth of argument and illustration, and placed in harmonious relation with the proven truths and ascertained facts of the physical sciences. It is a tribute to its sterling merits that a new edition of so large and erudite a work should have been demanded; and that, after the lapse of so many years, so few alterations as have been made in this edition should have been found necessary, is somewhat of an index of the solidity that characterized the original.

As the work is already well known to specialists, we need do no more than outline its matter and scope for the general reader. The portlier volume of the first edition is now divided into two handy and attractive tomes. To the first is assigned the investigation into the nature or essence of bodies; to the second, their properties, the origin and genesis of the universe, the cosmical order and laws. The opening question is studied first inductively by an analysis of the phenomena of extension and activity, efficient and final. The result prepares the student for an examination of the constituent principles of bodies, mineral and organized, and enabling him to appreciate the various theories on this abstruse subject, and to estimate the author's defence of the doctrine of matter and form. From the teaching systematized around these heads in the first volume, the discussion advances deductively in the second to a more thorough study of the properties of bodies—quantity, quality, motion, space, time, etc.—and thence to a survey and critique of the various systems regarding the origin and evolution of the universe, and of our globe in particular. The question of the origin of life on our planet gives occasion to examine the hypothesis of transformism, and the concluding subject of the volume, on the laws of nature, opens out a treatise on the possibility and knowability of miracles. The large comprehension of material in this

volume, and in the following work on psychology, has brought about some overlapping of subjects and repetition of exposition. The *repetita juvant* would, however, base an apology, were such needed in the case.

One of the charges made against the adoption of the neo-scholastic philosophy is its alleged lack of an epistemology—a valid theory of knowledge. The objection proves nothing but the unacquaintance prevailing outside as to the philosophy taught within our Catholic schools. It is true St. Thomas and his disciples down to the birth of modern philosophy elaborated no complete system of epistemology. Such a system has been chronologically conditioned and logically demanded by the mental revolution inaugurated by Descartes. Nevertheless, all the materials for its construction are to be found ready-made in the works of the angelic doctor and the other great schoolmen; and that the work has long since been thoroughly wrought out is a fact familiar to every one at all familiar with the development of Catholic philosophy during the last half century. An exposition of noetics on its logical side is to be found in every text-book of our philosophy, and notably in the “*Institutiones Logicales*” by Fr. Pesch. The psychological elements thereof are set forth by the same author in the second of the two works cited at the head of this paper.

In a former number of this REVIEW the first volume of the author’s “*Institutiones Psychologicae*” was spoken of. In that volume the analytical portion of organic psychology, or philosophical biology, was exhibited. The present volume is devoted to a synthetic elaboration of the same general subject under the caption: “*The Functions of Life, especially in Organisms.*”

Occasion is taken in the opening disputation on the principle of life—the *anima*—and its energies or powers to give a reasonable explanation of the “*faculty hypothesis*,” and to purge the teaching of the schools from the fictions of “*superadded entities*” which the Herbartians and other psychologists of recent times are wont to set up for cheap ridicule and easy demolition. From the next disputation on the vegetative functions, the author passes to the subject that engrosses by far the major part of this volume—the sentient life of the animal and of man on his purely organic side (92–421). It is here that the psychological elements of the neo-scholastic epistemology or noetics above alluded to are fully elaborated. The nature of knowledge in general, and of sense-knowledge in particular, is very thoroughly expounded (occasion being taken here, by the way, to discuss the psycho-physical theories of Weber and Fechner regarding the measurement of the “*quantity*” of sensations by measurement of the external stimulus) (93–180). The student who is capable of following the author in his profound inspection of this large subject will find how thoroughly philosophical is the scholastic theory of knowledge, and how perfectly it harmonizes with all that “*physiological-psychological*” has demonstrated. It could be desired that Fr. Pesch had entered somewhat more fully into subjects discussed by the latter study, as it is just here that the “*old psychology*” is capable of further

development. So many of our scholastic treatises present in pretty much the same terms the deeper metaphysics of the subject, and so few draw even illustrations from the "new psychology," that the student of the former is not prepared immediately to "orient" himself when he comes into the thicket of strange terms and concepts with which the literature of the latter—a literature daily increasing in extent and popularity—everywhere abounds. It is worse than foolish for the Catholic philosopher to attempt to dismiss the "new psychology" by calling it physiology, or even materialism. Far wiser the attitude taken by Dr. Gutberlet in presenting the first edition of his "Text-Book of Psychology" to the public. He alleges as the reason for expanding his work beyond the compass of the other volumes of his course, "the necessity of examining thoroughly the results of recent investigation in the domains of physiology, physical science and anthropology. For, on the one hand, the philosopher and theologian cannot afford to be unacquainted with the state of those sciences; and, on the other hand, those investigations are either in conflict with our standpoint or they offer, as I believe they do when rightly understood, a support to that standpoint. In neither case should they be disregarded. At all events, in the attitude I have taken I have but followed the example of St. Thomas and his great master, B. Albert the Great, who built their systems of teaching in closest contact with the prevailing science of their day." In the second and third editions of his work Dr. Gutberlet lays still stronger stress on this point of view; and the freshness and vigor with which he moulds and develops his matter detracts in no wise, it need hardly be said, from its scholastic solidity.

Fr. Pesch has conceived his work in a like spirit, and in his presentation of the functions of sensation, and more especially of their cerebral localization, as also in his description and theory of hypnotism, has brought the teachings of Catholic psychology into closer touch with questions of a living interest. One only wishes that he had gone farther on these lines.

With the present volume the study of the physical aspects of psychology ends. The third volume will enter on the higher or metaphysical side of the subject as contained in the intellect, the will, and the human soul, both within and without the organism. F. P. S.

REMINISCENCES OF WILLIAM WETMORE STORY, the American Sculptor and Author.
By *Mary E. Phillips*. 12mo. Pp. 305. Chicago and New York: Rand, McNally & Co. 1897.

William Wetmore Story, the son of Hon. Joseph Story, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and Sarah Waldo Wetmore, his wife, was born in the home of his parents in Salem, Massachusetts, on February 12, 1819. He died in the summer home of his daughter, the Marchesa Peruzzi de Medici, in Vallombrosa, Spain, October 16, 1895. His body was brought back to Rome and buried in the Protestant cemetery near Porta San Paolo and the Pyramid of Cestius.

His father was one of the most learned and distinguished jurists of the present century. At the age of thirty-two he was Speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, and before the close of the year he was appointed Judge of the Supreme Court of the United States. The Law School of Harvard was founded by Mr. Dane, in 1829, on condition that Judge Story would accept the professor's chair, and also write and publish a certain number of treatises on the different branches of jurisprudence. He accepted the trust, and was faithful to it until death released him in 1845.

The son was so worthy of the father that the author applies to him the same words which he wrote of his illustrious parent: "The simple recital of what he did is his best eulogium. His works are his best monument. His life preaches the gospel of labor. In it was no hour wasted, no energy undeveloped, no talent misapplied or unemployed. It was spent in no idle dreaming, in no immoral or empty pursuit of worldly pleasures, but it was earnestly devoted from beginning to end to the attainment of pure ends by pure means. Perfection is not allowed to mortal man, but there was in him a singularly exact adjustment of passions and faculties—the motive-power of the one being just equal to the distributive power of the other. How difficult to do justice to him! In his domestic life he was the sunshine of our family circle. He was forgetful of himself, yet mindful of the least interest or pleasure of others; self-denying when the sacrifice was unknown and unappreciated; thoroughly unselfish even in the details of life; generous of kind acts and expressions; satisfied with any portion of the good of daily life which might fall to him; the first to surrender his own wishes to the careless whim of another; and, withal, joyous, lively and beaming. So was he every day and all day. Its morning and its evening twilight were alike dear."

The life of such a man should be written, and the author of the work under consideration has chosen a subject worthy of her pen. Her acquaintance with Mr. Story began only about eight or ten years before his death, and she does not attempt to write his full biography. "Her chief aim has been," as she says herself, "to bring out the strong personality of the man in every phase of his brilliant career, and so help the world to become better acquainted both with his artistic and literary work."

To obtain materials to carry out her purpose she corresponded with friends of his childhood and early manhood, she consulted reviews and criticisms of his work in periodicals, and she drew on her own recollections. The result is a very complete and pleasing portrait of William Wetmore Story, lawyer, author, poet and sculptor.

The book gives very pleasant glimpses of artist life in Rome, where Mr. Story passed nearly fifty years of his life. It introduces the reader to persons distinguished in the literary and artistic world whom it is pleasant to know. It contains descriptions of the sculptor's works from the pens of able critics, and furnishes explanations of certain incidents

in the history of the artistic world hitherto not understood. It will interest Catholic readers especially to know that Pope Pius IX. was one of the sculptor's earliest patrons, and that his success in the artistic world dates practically from the recognition of his merits by the Holy Father. "Mr. Story was passing through one of the most serious seasons of discouragement incident to an artist's life. It was a time, indeed, when necessity demanded substantial recognition, or else a return to the legal profession. From Pio Nono came that word of encouragement that afforded the prompting impulse which lasts forever in the artist's gratitude and in his success." The Pope most generously sent, at his own expense, the artist's finished statues to the London Exhibition of 1862. His merits were immediately recognized, and a great artist was saved to the world.

The biographer has brought to her task that sympathy with her subject and admiration for him which best qualify her for the work.

The book is beautifully made, and the photogravure illustrations which embellish it are interesting and artistic.

J. P. T.

THE ENGLISH BLACK MONKS OF ST. BENEDICT. A Sketch of their History from the Coming of St. Augustine to the Present Day. By *Rev. Ethelred L. Taunton*. In two volumes, 8vo. Pp. 677. London: John C. Nimmo. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The author has written this book in order to give to the world a complete history of the English Benedictine Monks for the last thirteen hundred years. It is the first time that the attempt has been made. Many able writers have handled this subject before, but they all treated it in conjunction with other subjects. Most of them included the history of the Benedictines in the history of English monks in general, and then brought the narrative down only to the suppression of the monasteries under Henry VIII. It is clear that such treatment is unsatisfactory, because the special subject is lost, to a great extent, in the general, and because of the incompleteness of the record.

Father Taunton does not pretend to exhaust the history of the English Benedictines, because so vast a subject would require many volumes; but he does give a complete and definite account of these monks from the time of the landing of St. Augustine down to the present time.

Any one who has even a partial knowledge of English history, and especially of English Catholic history, can imagine the fund of useful and entertaining knowledge that is contained in these two large volumes. The work is an important addition to that group of books on Monasticism which includes such important names as "Montalembert's Monks of the West," "Maitland's Dark Ages," and "Gasquet's Suppression of the English Monasteries under Henry VIII." The reader must not, however, imagine for a moment that the subject only is good. On the contrary, the treatment of it is also excellent. Here the monk is set before us as he really was, and not as some prejudiced or ignorant

mind imagined him to be. Here we see him in all his relations—to his monastery, to his superiors, to his companions, and to the world. From these pages we learn not that he was a lazy, ignorant, dissipated fellow, as so many of his enemies say, but that he was industrious, learned, virtuous, and clean. The monuments which the Benedictines have left behind them, as well as those which they are now erecting, prove that these assertions are true beyond question. The many valuable manuscript documents which have lain hidden too long, but which are now being brought to light, enable us to inscribe the right names on these monuments. The monasteries, which have been houses of prayer and nurseries of all the virtues, as well as refuges for the widow and orphan, and the persecuted and oppressed, speak to us of their charity; the cities that have grown up about these monasteries, often in the midst of a wilderness, bear testimony to their industry; and the institutions of learning which they have founded, together with the books which they have penned, speak to us of their intellectual powers. At last history is being rightly written—not to tickle the ear with fine phrases, nor to please the imagination with fancy pictures; not to prop up the tottering throne of some unworthy, dissipated king or dynasty; not to advance the interests of some grasping, unscrupulous politician or party, but to tell the truth.

J. P. T.

COURSE OF RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION. Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools.

EXPOSITION OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By a *Seminary Professor*. P. I. Dogma.

AUTHORIZED ENGLISH VERSION. *John F. McVey*: Philadelphia. 1898. Pp. xxi., 568. Price, \$2.25.

It were desirable that books on the doctrine of religion intended for use in this country should be the product of writers who from actual, prolonged experience are perfectly familiar with the American temperament and habits of thought; for though the truths of faith are unchanging and unchangeable, the manner in which they are presented and expounded varies, and should vary, not a little with circumstances of times and places, but particularly of persons for whom the exposition is intended. The desirable, however, here, as quite generally elsewhere, is not always attainable, and so we are ready for the next best thing, the translation, namely, from foreign tongues of works that possess solid merit and the endorsement of authorities not qualified to judge in such matters.

Our Catholic literature has been enriched in recent years by several such works, and now we are glad to welcome another valuable addition thereto. The *Exposition of Christian Doctrine* here presented is the first of a triplet of volumes treating respectively of Catholic dogma, morals and worship. The work was primarily intended as a foundation of religious instruction for use both in the Institute of the Christian Brothers in France and in their higher schools and colleges. Its scope and method, however, adapt it, as the Bishop of Maurienne remarks in

his letter of approbation, "not only to members of religious congregations, but likewise to people of the world, as well as to members of the clergy; for the latter will find in it much that they would look for in vain in their ordinary Manual of Theology" (IV).

The matter of the present volume falls into three sections corresponding to the work attributed to the three divine persons—Creation, Redemption, and Sanctification. Under each of these sections the respective articles of the Apostles' Creed are explained. The method pursued is first catechetical—by means of question and answer. "Historical references," explanatory and illustrative, drawn from the Bible, with a succinct "summary" and a "synopsis," follow in the wake of the catechetical treatment. This didactic method facilitates study and adapts the work to the purpose of oral instructions. The "synopsis" must prove of special service in the preparation of sermons and lectures, as the "schemata" into which they are thrown enable the eye to take in at once the whole and the detailed parts and relations of the pertinent subjects.

The translation which has been made by the Brothers of the Christian Schools in this country is as nearly perfect as the difficult nature of the subject permits, whilst the book-maker's art has, by judicious taste in selection of letter-press, paper, and binding, contributed its share to the making of a neat, attractive book.

GESCHICHTE DER WELTLITERATUR. Von *Alexander Baumgartner*, S. J. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis.

The distinguished Jesuit, Father Baumgartner, already well known to all who are conversant with contemporary German Catholic literature on account of his able monographs on literary subjects, has now begun an extensive work in which he will be enabled to present to the world the rich fruits of twenty years of indefatigable study. He announces his intention of writing the History of the Literature of the World, in six volumes, the first two of which lie before us in all that typographical beauty which we have learned to expect from the press of Herder. They are in octavo, and each comprises some six hundred pages. As these volumes are devoted entirely to the literature of the Oriental languages, the reader will estimate the fullness with which the author means to treat his subject. We may add, as an indication of the applause with which Father Baumgartner's work has been received by the learned world, that his first edition has been already exhausted. It is a work, therefore, with a long and brilliant future before it, and, in our opinion, will not be superseded for many a day. The publishers have set the price at \$3.50 per volume, which will bring it within the reach of all who are desirous of thoroughly acquainting themselves with this vast and interesting subject. No teacher of literature can afford to be without it, and any teacher who has mastered it can well dispense with every other guide to universal literature.

The author begins with a concise but eloquent presentation of the

claims of Sacred Scripture to be regarded as "the most noteworthy book of the entire literature of the world, even if considered from a human and natural standpoint." In this light he passes in review and points out the beauty and importance of the separate books of the Bible, dwelling particularly on the poetical portions, and with especial fondness on the Psalms and Job. He then makes a natural transition to the literature of the Babylonians and Assyrians, displaying an intimate familiarity with the very best and latest that has been written on the subject of Assyriology. Thence he passes to consider the remains of Egyptian literature and culture, thus closing the first book. The second book is devoted to the study of the ancient Christian literature of the East, the New Testament, the Apocrypha, the Syrians, Copts, Ethiopians, Armenians, Georgians, with the Talmud as an appendix. The literature of the Arabians, with a careful study of the Koran, forms the argument of Book Third. In Book Fourth we are transferred to Persia, on the literature of which the author dwells with considerable fullness. The Fifth Book is devoted to the literature of the minor Islamic races. The entire second volume is taken up with the study of Hindu and far-Eastern literature, including a close and accurate account of the religions and the culture of those primitive races. This meagre notice will serve to urge the readers who are familiar with the German language to possess themselves of so important a work, and may impel some one who has the necessary ability and leisure to reproduce it in an English dress.

GESCHICHTE DER CHRISTLICHEN KUNST. Von *Frans Xavier Kraus*. In Zwei Bänden mit zahlreichen Illustrationen. Herder : Freiburg and St. Louis.

This is another of those grand works with which the press of Herder is constantly teeming. Neither author nor publisher has spared pains to make it worthy of its great subject, "The story of the development of Christian art in all ages." Truly a subject to awaken enthusiasm at the very name; and we find it here treated in so simple and so masterful a manner that a child may follow it through the numerous illustrations, while the learned have plentiful food for reflection in the erudite text. It is a book, therefore, which, like the masterpieces of the Christian artists themselves, appeals to all descriptions of Christians—the common meeting-ground of the learned and the unlearned.

Dr. Kraus has neglected no detail of his theme. His first volume treats of Christian Art in the ancient world. He begins with the catacombs, and studies the inception of Christian painting and sculpture in their cradle. With Constantine came the beginnings of Christian architecture, the rapid development of which forms the argument of his Fifth Book. The three succeeding centuries beheld the immense strides made in the art of ornamenting the Christian churches, and particular attention is given to the subject of mosaics. Nothing is so minute as to escape the industry of the writer. The smallest objects of art—glass, lamps, enamel, coins, medallions, rings, pyxes, reliqua-

ries—all are considered in turn. Then follows the exposition of Byzantine art in its manifold branches. The first volume closes with a survey of the incipient stages of the arts among the new races of Europe. Thus prepared for the mediæval world, we are taken by the hand and introduced to the great Gothic cathedrals, the painting, sculpture, and a hundred other manifestations of the faith of the ages when the Catholic religion ruled the thoughts of men. The activity of modern times remains to be treated in a section yet to be published, the appearance of which we shall await with the liveliest interest.

The work must be a subject of pride and gratification to every Catholic, and we are deeply grateful both to the indefatigable author, to whom it has been a life-long labor of love, and to Mr. Herder, whose enterprise has so greatly enriched the Catholic literature of our age. We end with a regret, which has grown monotonous from frequent use, that books like this should be sealed to those who need them most of all, the English-speaking Catholics.

LIFE OF THE BLESSED MASTER JOHN OF AVILA. By *Fr. Longaro degli Oddi, S. J.*
 Edited by J. G. Macleod, S. J. London: Burns & Oates; New York: Benziger Brothers. Price, \$1.10.

Whilst Luther was leading the Revolution of the masses in Germany, John of Avila was preaching a Reformation of the individual, cleric and lay, and of society in the Spanish peninsula. No contrast between men and methods stands out stronger, none is so suggestive of principles and consequences bearing on human betterment than that which subsisted between the Saxon monk and the Spanish secular. The one, turbulent by nature, had never learned, even amidst the rigors of the cloister, the true mastery of passion. The other, calm and peaceful of temperament, had from childhood, by penance and prayer, developed in his soul virtues that held his lower nature in the abiding control of reason, his reason in perfect subjection to divine authority, and his whole being in closest union with God. As a consequence, Luther inaugurated a religious and social movement that, born and bred by uncontrolled emotion, led to the overturning of all order, whilst the Apostle of Andalusia drew men, by the rational use of normal methods, to an orderly reformation of mind and heart, and so to a higher and an abiding development of society.

John of Avila was born in January, 1500, and died in May, 1569. The two and more score years of his priesthood were spent in apostolic labors, mostly in Andalusia, though, had his own desire been the morn of life, he had devoted them to the infant church of Mexico. Paul III., in a Bull dated 1540, describes him as: *Virum sanctum, magistrum in theologia, et verbi Dei præconem insignem*. Not unfittingly was he known as "the Master," or the *great Master*, as St. Francis Borgia always called him; for he led in the ways of heroic sanctity souls like St. John of God, St. Peter of Alcantara, St. Teresa, St. Francis Borgia, Luis of Granada, and others who tower above their age in virility and

holiness. Though the guide of many saints, it was only yesterday (November, 1893) that he himself was raised to the first public honors of the altar. The present life, by the Jesuit Father Longaro degli Oddi, was written in Italian in 1753. The materials were at hand in the sketch by the saintly friend of Avila, Fr. Louis of Granada, "who wrote with the sole purpose of setting forth a perfect sample of what a sacred orator should be." Additional material was found in the sketches of the Master's disciples by Louis Mañoz, and in the early Processes compiled in his time for the beatification of the servant of God.

The present English version is faithfully rendered and brought out in clear type and tasteful binding.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE FIVE THRONES OF DIVINE LOVE** upon the Earth; The Womb of Mary, The Críb, The Cross, The Eucharist, and The Faithful Soul. Translated from the French of R. P. Alexis-Louis de Saint Joseph, discalced Carmelite. 12mo, pp. 268. London: Burns & Oates. Received from Benziger, New York.
- SISTER ANNE KATHARINE EMMERICH, OF THE ORDER OF ST. AUGUSTINE.** Written originally in German by *Rev. Thomas Wegener, O.S.A.*, Postulator of the Cause of her Beatification. Translated from the French Edition by *Rev. Francis M. McGowan, O.S.A.* New York: Benziger Bros.
- BEAUTIES AND ANTIQUITIES OF IRELAND,** being a Tourist's Guide to its most beautiful scenery, and an Archæologist's Manual for its most interesting ruins. By *T. O. Russell.* 8vo, pp. 400. Illustrated. London: Kegan Paul, French & Co. Received from Herder, St. Louis.
- THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN,** with notes Critical and Explanatory. By *Rev. Joseph MacRory, D.D.*, Professor of Sacred Scripture and Hebrew, Maynooth College. 8vo, pp. 386. Dublin: Browne & Nolan. Received from Benziger Brothers, New York.
- SCRIPTURE MANUALS** for Catholic Schools (arranged with a view to the Oxford and Cambridge Local Examination). Edited by *Rev. Sydney F. Smith, S. J.* Acts of the Apostles: 12mo, pp. 175; boards. St. Luke: 12mo, pp. 295; boards.
- THE EUCHARISTIC CHRIST.** Reflections and Considerations on the Blessed Sacrament. By *Rev. A. Tesnière,* Priest of the Congregation of the Blessed Sacrament. Translated from the French. 12mo, pp. 187. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- RITUS BENEDICTIONIS et Impositionis Primarii Lapidis Pro Ecclesia Ædificanda, Consecrationis Ecclesiæ et Altarium, et Benedictionis Signi vel Campanæ, ex Pontificali Romano Depromptus.** 16mo, pp. 248. New York: Fr. Pustet.
- HISTORIOGRAPHIA Ecclesiastica** quam Historiæ seriam solidamque operam navantibus accommodavit. *Guil. Stang,* S. Theologiæ Doctor, eiusque in Coll. Americano Lovanii Professor. 12mo, pp. 267. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- OUTLINES OF JEWISH HISTORY,** from Abraham to our Lord. By the *Rev. Francis E. Gigot, S. J.*, Professor of Sacred Scripture in St. John's Seminary, Boston, Massachusetts. 8vo, pp. 384. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- SERMONS FOR THE CHILDREN OF MARY.** By *Rev. Ferdinand Callerio,* Canon of the Cathedral of Novara. Translated from the Italian. Revised by Rev. Richard F. Clarke, S. J. 8vo, pp. 343. New York: Benziger Brothers.

- ANGELS OF THE BATTLE-FIELD. A history of the labors of the Catholic Sisterhoods in the late Civil War. By *George Barton*. Large 8vo, pp. 303. Illustrated. Phila. : The Catholic Art Publishing Co. 1897.
- SAINT JOSEPH'S ANTHOLOGY; Poems in Praise of the Foster-Father, gathered from many sources. By *Rev. Matthew Russell, S. J.* 12mo, pp. 155. Dublin: Gill & Son. Received from Benziger, New York.
- RETREAT CONFERENCES FOR CONVENTS, being a Series of Exhortations Addressed to Religious. By *Rev. Charles Cox, O.M.I.* 12mo, pp. 303. London: Washburne. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- SHORT LIFE OF THE VENERABLE SERVANT OF GOD, JOHN NEPOMUCENE NEUMANN, C.S.S.R., Bishop of Philadelphia. By *Very Rev. F. Magnier, C.S.S.R.* 16mo, pp. 100. St. Louis: B. Herder.
- DATA OF MODERN ETHICS EXAMINED. By *Rev. John J. Ming, S. J.*, Professor of Moral Philosophy, Canisius College, Buffalo, N. Y. 2d ed. 12mo, pp. 386. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- A PRACTICAL GUIDE TO INDULGENCES. Adapted from the original of Rev. P. M. Bernard, O.M.I. By *Rev. Daniel Murray*. 16mo, pp. 239. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW, with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary. By *Rev. A. J. Mass, S. J.*, Woodstock College, Md. Large 8vo, pp. 317. St. Louis: B. Herder.
- THE LIFE OF CHRIST. By *Rev. J. Duggan*, Catholic Priest of Maidstone. 12mo, pp. 243. London: Kegan Paul, French & Co. Received from Herder, St. Louis.
- THE DIVINE REDEEMER AND HIS CHURCH. By *Edward Douglas, C.S.S.R.* With a Preface by Cardinal Vaughan. 12mo, pp. 732. London: Catholic Truth Society.
- VISITS TO JESUS IN THE BLESSED SACRAMENT: Hours and Half Hours of Adoration. By *Rev. Francis X. Lasance*. 16mo, pp. 636. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- ROME AND ENGLAND; or, Ecclesiastical Continuity. By the *Rev. Luke Rivington, M.A.*, Magdalen College, Oxford. 12mo, pp. 193. London: Burns & Oates.
- OUR LADY OF AMERICA, liturgically known as Holy Mary of Guadalupe. By *Rev. G. Lee, C. S. Sp.* 12mo, pp. 298. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co.
- MEDITATIONS ON THE PASSION AND DEATH OF OUR LORD. By *Cardinal Wiseman*. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Bros.
- MANUAL OF ADORATION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. By a Benedictine, Conception, Mo. 16mo, pp. 629. St. Louis: B. Herder.
- PASSION FLOWERS (Poems). By *Father Edmund, C.P.* (Benjamin D. Hill.) 12mo, pp. 210. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- DE CHRISTI ECCLESIA LIBRI SEX. *Auctore Gulielmo Wilmers, S. J.* 8vo, pp. 691. New York: Pustet & Co. 1897.
- THE NEW TESTAMENT. New edition from new plates. 8vo, pp. 495; double column. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- LIFE OF ST. CATHARINE OF SIENNA. By *Edward L. Ayme, M.D.* 12mo, pp. 205. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE CHAPLAIN'S SERMONS. By *Rev. John Talbot Smith*. 8vo, pp. 340. New York: Wm. H. Young & Co.
- THE SCIENCE OF THE BIBLE. By *Rev. Martin S. Brennan, A.M.* 12mo, pp. 390. St. Louis: B. Herder.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XXIII.—JULY, 1898.—No. 91.

THE "ORIGINAL SOURCES" OF EUROPEAN HISTORY.

THE Department of History of the University of Pennsylvania is publishing a series of *Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History*. The issues of each year form a single volume, and constitute the "Series" of that year.

The purpose of the whole series is a good one, namely, to stimulate the interest of the student by a facile recourse to the materials which should form the basis of historical work. While the idea lying behind the series is undoubtedly good, its embodiment in the present work of the editors is not very felicitously planned. Indeed, the series seems to lack any well-defined plan. For instance, the first volume consists of six numbers, having no common relationship and no other bond of union than the title of "Vol. I." No. 1 of this volume concerns itself with the "Early Reformation Period in England"; No. 2, with "Urban and the Crusaders"; No. 3, with "The Reaction after 1815"; No. 4, with "Letters of the Crusaders"; No. 5, with "The French Revolution, 1789-1791"; and No. 6, with "English Constitutional Documents." The remaining volumes exhibit a similar diversity of epochs and themes. This miscellaneous character is partly due to the fact that the work of the editors was districted, at the outset, into widely different fields of labor; namely, English History, Modern History of Continental Europe, and Mediæval History. The scope was subsequently broadened, three additional editors being added to the staff. But while this fact will explain in some measure the variety noticeable in the titles, it will not

account for the lack of consecutiveness, whether logical or chronological, of the titles in any one of the departments. What is true of the first volume is even more strikingly evident in the others.

In trying to estimate the content of this pedagogical product, we may find it convenient to measure its three linear elements of Length, Breadth, and Depth; but in doing so we feel keenly our limitations; for, as our dimensions are partly figurative and partly literal, we may not avail ourselves of the modern pedagogical device of a diagram.

THE CUBIC CONTENT.

The idea lying behind the series of "Reprints" is, as we have said, a good one. Certainly, there is nothing so apt to kindle the enthusiasm of students as to have fresh draughts from the original sources of history held up to their lips. The various issues are unquestionably interesting and stimulating, and will, we trust, be but preludes to more grandiose symphonies. Nevertheless, they are open to a criticism such as we are about to make in this paper—a criticism that is not meant to be cynical, but to be just.

First, they are deficient in *length*. All of the issues are too brief in treatment of themes so suggestive as the ones selected by the editors.

Many are deficient in *breadth*. The treatment is, in some cases, too narrow-minded. The editors who take up the middle ages for the purpose of presenting the various phases of their life and thought seem to lack that sympathetic attitude (of both mind and heart) with the ideas and ideals of the middle ages such as will alone assure a really just interpretation of the spirit of those ages. Still, here as elsewhere, there is great satisfaction to be derived from the fact that no one can truly study that wide epoch of history without becoming constantly more and more gentle in his judgments respecting it. For it is, after all, a vast cathedral whose dim recesses invite exploration, whose grand proportions compel attention, whose ceremonial is strangely impressive. At their first approach, the editors may consider the dimness to be but an utter darkness that suggests, while it conceals, untold horrors; may fancy in the massiveness of the structure a huge Juggernaut-car, whose weight has crushed millions to death; may see in the ceremonial only a hoary mummery that for too long a time supplanted the religion "pure and undefiled" of St. James. Our criticism may be able to show clearly that such an impression was in truth made upon the inquiring minds of the editors. We can only hope that their exploration will be continued—even though in the spirit in which it was begun: for it is impossible that they shall go

very far in that dimness without seeing things a little more clearly; that they shall gaze long on that grandeur without growing up to the measure of the ideals it sought to realize; that they shall become familiar with that ceremonial without being a little softened by it. Let them enter to scoff—who knows but that they may remain to pray?

Some of the issues are deficient in *depth*. The third purpose of this paper may seem an ungracious one—to show that the learning of the editors, however satisfying in certain lines of investigation, is hardly such as would equip them justly for the task of illustrating the spirit of the middle ages. Meanwhile, we assume that it is their misfortune rather than their fault that they so totally misapprehend the religious tenets of the peoples they have undertaken to study. This misapprehension, nevertheless, is responsible for many grave errors both of fact and of inference, as it will be part of our purpose to prove. Certainly, one of the editors, Mr. Dana C. Munro (whose name we might as well mention now, as we shall be compelled to mention it frequently hereafter in order to avoid tedious circumlocutions), seems very thoroughly to have misapprehended the Catholic doctrine and practice of the middle ages. In translating the Life of St. Columban, however, he has done a good work for his students, and deserves congratulation.

The middle ages were bad in many respects. And some centuries were worse than others. And some countries were worse than others. And some features were worse than others. Still, the middle ages were good in many respects, and in some countries and in some centuries were much better than in others. The Christianizing of the barbarians was a slow process. And side by side with many a heroic virtue walked many a horrid vice. Traditions of barbarism yielded, in some cases, but slowly and incompletely to the gospel of meekness, just as some of the traditions of barbarism—dueling, for instance, or the vendettas of the Kentuckians, or the lynch law of the South—have succeeded in defying Christianity and common sense even down to our own day. So, too, the quasi-mediævalism of our legal procedure, hampering and foolish at times, as eminent jurists have recently lamented; outrageously careless at times of the natural rights of witnesses; just as outrageously careful at times of the panoply surrounding the judge and the attorney, which secures them, under the ægis of the old fiction called “contempt of court,” from just reprisals on the part of the accused, the juror, the witness, the public:—this quasi-mediævalism in legal procedure is an apt illustration of the long life persistently enjoyed by certain anachronisms.

The student of the middle ages should be taught early to make such easy reflections as these. The Reprints from the Original Sources of European History should silently inculcate a similar lesson—the lesson, namely, of how to discern the good in men and in institutions as well as the evil. And it is in failing to do this that the present series of reprints offers the justest ground for severe criticism. The impression left on the mind of the reader is that the middle ages were

Of woes unnumbered”

“the direful spring

to the civilization of modern Europe—that all the evil in our institutions, and none of the good, can be tracked, as a wild beast into his lair, back to the dim forest-land of the middle ages. Is this a just treatment?

With which preface we take up for consideration, first, the dimension of

LENGTH.

This first dimension is to be accepted in the most literal sense, for every one of the numbers comprised in the series is very short. The shortest length is 16 pp.; the longest is 40 pp. (this length constituting a “double” number). Within brief limits such as these, are given Original Reprints, together with an Introduction and a varied editorial commentary, on such large themes as the “Early Reformation Period in England” (20 pp.); “The Fourth Crusade” (20 pp.); “Urban and the Crusaders” (16 pp.); “The Pre-Reformation Period” (double number, 34 pp.).

This fact leads us to wonder whether the series be intended to interest the boys in our secondary schools, or the grave seniors in our universities? We are not a little astonished to find, from the prefatory note introducing the series, that its “most considerable use has naturally been with college classes,” and that “one or more of the issues has been used in twenty-four of the principal universities and colleges, and four divinity schools.”

A similar idea was worked out in the series of “English History by Contemporary Writers,” edited by Mr. Powell, of Christ Church, Oxford, and published by the Putnams. To illustrate the vast difference in limits between the two series, let “The Fourth Crusade” (20 pp.) of the University editors be compared with “The Crusade of Richard I.,” published by the Putnams. This latter handles a clearly-defined theme within the generous limits of 395 pp. It quotes from twenty-five contemporary sources, describes these sources fully in an appendix, is replete with foot-notes, gives in an appendix some fifteen carefully-pre-

pared thematic notes, and is furnished in addition with seven genealogical tables, a chronological table, a map of Palestine, prepared especially for that issue, and ten pictorial illustrations. The series of which it is a single issue is unpretentious, being "planned not only for educational use but for the general reader, and especially for all those to whom the original contemporary authorities are for various reasons difficult of access."

The absence of pretentiousness is a singularly attractive feature of the pedagogy of England; its presence is a singularly and obtrusively repelling feature of the pedagogy of America. The editors of the "Reprints" we are now reviewing seem to take their task too seriously. They have loved too well the academic gravity of the professorial chair. Their pen is too often dipped in learned ink. The more ponderous a tome, the more gladly they shoulder it. The more forbidding a title, with the greater relish they spread it out for the reader's bewilderment.

Doubtless, the student for whom they burn the midnight oil must be vastly impressed with the learning displayed; but we fancy that the initiated may occasionally enjoy a dry smile as he finds here a title quoted, not in the scholar's traditional short-hand, but with a school-boy's fullness; there, a learned note conveying a piece of incorrect information; here, an editorial generalization founded on a few facts apparently just acquired; there, an ungrammatical sentence, an ambiguous punctuation, a misspelled word. And he will, perhaps,

"With one long sigh of infinite release
From pedantries past, present, or to come,"

close the pamphlet to welcome back the Alp-like calm of the great explorers in "Original Sources"—men like Baronius, D'Achery, Martene, Baluze, Mansi, the Bollandists, Janssen—explorers who are re-explored in our day with a dubious intelligence on the one hand, and on the other with a childish sense of ownership of the new "finds."

The large scope of the pamphlets and the meagre treatment given to the themes suggest, however, considerations more to our present purpose than those we have been thus far indulging. A principal aim of the instructor in history should be to place the student as much as possible in the very atmosphere of the period he is treating. The ray of truth is apt to suffer refraction when it leaves one medium and enters another. We cannot be fairly said to know a man—and still less to have a reasonable basis for estimating his actions—until, by familiarity with his pursuits, his

training, his environment, his ideas and ideals, his purposes and plans, we have begun to take his point of view at least speculatively. To understand a people we should live for a time in their midst. Maitland illustrates this contention in his "Dark Ages" by such an appropriate parable that we are tempted to quote him: "I cannot help wishing," he says, "that the reader who has formed his idea of the dark ages only from some modern popular writers—I do not mean those who have written professedly on the subject—could be at once fairly thrown back into the midst of them. I cannot help thinking that he would feel very much as I did the first time that I found myself in a foreign country. A thousand novelties attracted my attention; many were strange, and some displeasing; and there was more or less that seemed foreign in everything. For this I was prepared; but I was not prepared for another feeling which very soon, and quite unexpectedly, sprung up in my mind, 'How much is different, and, go where I may, forever changing! True; but how much is the same everywhere!' It was almost a surprise to me to find that the sun and moon went on much the same way as at home; that there were roads, and rivers, and fields, and woods, and towns, and cities, and streets, and houses filled with people who might, perhaps, talk some other language, and dress in some other fashion from mine, but who had evidently much the same notions as to the necessities of life, and the substantial of society; and, without losing all my pride, or patriotism, or prejudice, I got a new idea of the unity of nature. I felt that He had 'made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth'; it brought with it a kind of home-feeling, a sense that, wherever I wandered, I was but moving in the hollow of His hand among my own brethren."

Now, the present series of "Reprints" can hardly fail to give the student a sense of being in an ethnological museum, whose specimens he is called on to inspect closely and to analyze with care, rather than the "home-feeling" so touchingly described by Maitland. It seems to be the purpose of the editors to exclude the latter and to evoke the former sense in the breast of the reader. "The examples of historical material," they declare, "which it is proposed in this series to reproduce in an accessible form, must be treated as illustrations of historical method. They are all worthy of careful study, and may be examined and dissected somewhat as the botanist analyzes his flowers." (We propose, as the editors suggest, to treat some of these "Reprints" "as illustrations of historical method"—nay, we are determined to do so; we "will,

that's flat," as Hotspur remarks.) But a constant sense of being in school and learning how to pursue an historical method, or of being present at a clinic in order to see how to "do it" yourself—this is somewhat foreign to that sympathetic *rapproch* with the objects of his study which one should try to beget in his mind when he desires to estimate a strange people and a distant epoch. Is there not danger that while dissecting the flower we may forget, or fail utterly to catch, the beauty of its splendid color, or of its delicate form, or of its fleeting perfume?

Surely, the series is too fragmentary in its treatment of large subjects! Twenty duodecimo pages will scarce cover in any fashion whatever the "Fourth Crusade." Nor will the contention that "method" and not completeness is aimed at diminish the strength of an argument whose best force lies in the very object-lesson furnished by that "method" itself. The whole effort of any present-day training in historical methods should be in the direction of removing, rather than confirming, the caricatures of the past, which even some "eminent" historians have done a little to perpetuate; which the greatest, however, have done much to revise; and which the original researches of present-day critics have almost succeeded in obliterating, if they have not as yet succeeded in substituting the true portrait. That effort is producing "original reprints" in great abundance, but in a form wholly different from that under review. "The Crusade of Richard I.," to which we have already alluded, illustrates well the method. Its purpose is to place the student in the atmosphere of the olden days. It does this by furnishing a consecutive narrative of events described in the words of contemporary writers of different sympathies. The testimony is manifold, but the picture is one; and it is vivid and interesting. "But is it true?" one may ask. That will largely depend on the critical judgment exercised by the editor, and on his spirit of fairness; but assuming that he is fitted for his task, there is the highest reason to hope that the picture is more correct than that which centuries of systematic prejudice have handed down to us.

The present Series is therefore open to the objection not only of lack of co-ordination of subjects and extreme fragmentariness of treatment, but of the imminent peril of wholly misleading the student by giving him a snap glance at a few phases of the epoch he is studying. The view he will get in this way will, perhaps, be a vivid one; but it is very apt to be a wholly distorted one. It used to be a source of merriment to Americans to read the "Impressions of a Tour in the United States," written by the

sojourner of a month in our midst, and gravely put forth as our true portrait. The British bird of passage had a vast domain to traverse, and not infrequently travelled "as the crow flies." Or if the sojourner really "sojourned" a brief moment in our midst, doubtless his recollection of us was not more vivid than our recollection of him—and that was, as the author of the "Book of Wisdom" graphically puts it, "as the remembrance of a guest of one day that passeth by." Dickens, a shrewd and keen observer, whose whole previous training had fitted him for the task he undertook, painted our portrait in his "American Notes" and "Martin Chuzzlewit"; but at the time, somehow or other, we failed to see the humor of the situation. The humor we are indeed able to recognize now; but we are also able to recognize that the humor is that of caricature and parody. All of Europe, nevertheless, still trusts the tale.

What impression may we hope to receive in a journey post-haste through the vast domain of mediæval history? In vain shall we have "analyzed" a small bundle of "Original Reprints." In truth, the picture of a few houses will not give us a just estimate of a metropolis; a few character-sketches will, as likely as not, caricature a great people; a handful of legislative enactments will not present adequately the spirit of the laws—an essay by Montesquieu on the subject would be a useful addition. Nevertheless, while the world has been laughing ever since at the old philosopher who, wishing to sell his house, exhibited a brick from its walls as a sufficient description of the property—still, the world has been but doing the same thing in the writing of history. It has been perpetually generalizing from a few facts—just as the student will be apt to generalize from a few "Reprints."

However, while arguing thus concerning one of the dimensions of these pamphlets—that, namely, of *Length*—it is but fair to recognize the existence of a second dimension. The outline may not be artistic, but the area may be satisfactory withal, if the Length exceed but very slightly the

BREADTH.

This dimension must be accepted rather in a metaphorical than in a literal sense. In either sense, alas! it proves very disappointing in the series of *Reprints from the Original Sources of European History*. All of the issues are deficient in Length; many of them are, in addition, extremely narrow.

Let us illustrate. Who has not, in his reading, again and again come across references to "monkish legends," "monkish tales,"

“monkish chronicles?” Doubtless, story-telling consumed a great amount of time that could have been better spent in the scriptorium, or in the fields, or in the oratory. And the truth of history suffered somewhat from the imaginative flights of some members of the monastic fraternity. It is not our purpose to apologize for the story-tellers, in whatever sense that compound word may be taken; without prejudice to our present plea, it might even be granted—for it is quite irrelevant—that they almost succeeded in supplanting all fact by fable, all literature by legend. The student is to form an opinion for himself, by a recourse to original sources, of the character of these fables and legends, and he is accordingly supplied with Vol. II., No. 4, of the present Series. This issue is entitled “Monastic Tales of the XIIIth Century.” He turns to the Table of Contents and reads:

I. Tales of the Virgin.

1. Virgin saves matron and monk, who elope with treasures of monastery.
2. Virgin takes the place of nun, who has fled from the convent.
3. Woman is punished for despising a statue of the Virgin.
4. Horrible death of a blasphemer of the Virgin.
5. A robber is delivered from hanging, because of his prayers to the Virgin.
6. The devil thwarted by prayers to the Virgin.

The *menu* thus far promises well; we shall have a toothsome repast—so toothsome that our watering mouth forthwith orders on this first course, even before our eye has scanned the remaining courses, which in broad outline consist of Tales of the Devil, Tales of Relics, Tales of Confession, Tales of the Host.

The “Tales of the Virgin” are introduced as follows:

In the popular estimation the worship of the Virgin held the first place. She was the mother of mercy, the intercessor. God, the Father, and God, the Son, might be wroth against men, but could not withstand the pleadings of the holy Virgin. To her nothing was impossible.

The impetus given to the worship of the mother of God by Bernhard, of Clairvaux, had been increased by the preaching of his Cistercian followers and had spread to the whole Church. In the XIIIth century the people were taught the *Ave Maria* as well as the Lord’s prayer and the creed. Attendance at Church in her honor on Saturday evenings was prescribed by the Council of Toledo in 1229. The celebration of the feast of the Immaculate Conception was becoming common, although it was not recognized as necessary. In fact, the popular enthusiasm for the worship of the blessed Virgin far outstripped the careful theories of the schoolmen as to the exact amount of reverence due to her (the *hyperdulia* of Thomas Aquinas).

In the following tales we find her commanding the demons, rescuing those who have done her honor, and revenging herself on those who have neglected her. The last trait is especially instructive as to the attitude of popular religion in the XIIIth century. When heresies were so rife, and the Church was in such sore straits, even the mother of mercy was compelled to exact sternly the honor due to herself. The last example illustrates the belief in the efficacy of the same prayer many times repeated (by reason of which the rosary came into use). In other tales we find the Virgin powerless to punish the wicked, because they pray to her assiduously.

We have said that many of the issues lack *Breadth* as well as *Length*. Some of the monks were great story-tellers—but would the student see in the above the lines of a portrait or of a caricature? Are we gazing at a Velasquez or a Cruikshank? It is the art of a caricaturist to exaggerate enormously, not necessarily the prominent features of a face, but simply those features which, whether prominent or not, lend themselves to a humorous treatment. And as humor is a question of taste—and taste is a product of temperament, of training, of associations, of schools, of cliques, of habits—the caricaturist studies rather the faces of his customers than those of his victims who are sitting, wholly unconscious of the fact, to have their portrait drawn. Some customers are hugely amused by Roman noses—and the artist will accordingly devote his attention to exaggeration of the bridge. Others laugh immoderately at long ears—and the artist will accordingly place an ass's head on human shoulders. Our University artist has—perhaps correctly—estimated that his customers in the "Divinity Schools" which are subscribing for the series of "Reprints," will appreciate the insinuation of Roman noses and asses' ears, so obviously discernible in his "Monastic Tales of the XIIIth Century."

The pamphlet, therefore, lacks breadth—it is decidedly narrow. It achieves the finest irony of the pedagogical method which it illustrates. For the purpose of that method is to present the past with all the vivid realism of the present; the plan of that method is to select a broad topic and dispose of it in a few "Reprints"; the result of that method is to furnish readers with an "Illustrated Puck" magazine of history, brimful of unconscious humor. After reading these "Monastic Tales," even a gray-haired man might be pardoned for a generalization very like Puck's, "What fools these monks be!" The student unable as yet to stroke the soft down—what must be his inference? And yet we are told in the preface to the series that "The sequence of past events, the form and spirit of institutions, the characters of men, the prevailing habits of thought, obtain their greatest reality when we study them in the very words used by the men to whom the past was the living present." It is all most exquisite irony. The pamphlet was certainly never seriously intended for the student of history, but for the class of rhetoric, to which it should be relegated.

The pamphlet is not historic, but polemic. The editor is about as well qualified for his self-assumed task as Mr. Robert Ingersoll is for his Reprints from the Bible. Both deal in original sources, and both produce a parody, for both have shrewdly estimated their audience. And we venture to think that Ingersoll's

audience was never more entertained by his travesty of the literature of the Hebrews than is Mr. Munro's audience by *his* travesty of the literature of the monks. Certainly, these Christians who share the beliefs of the old monks must be like them—stupid, ignorant, lazy, fat, believers in childish fables, idolaters, Mario-laters; a curious people like the Athenians of old, of whom St. Luke records that they “employed themselves in nothing else but either in telling or hearing some new thing.” But if the students in the “Divinity Schools” are almost forced by this pamphlet to generalize thus, do not the students of Mr. Ingersoll generalize with quite as much justice, when they arrive at the conclusion that all Christians who trust in their Bible are equally besotted in mind, equally childish and minister-ridden? We could construct—and with less trouble than Mr. Munro experienced in compiling his “Monastic Tales”—quite a startling Table of Contents for a pamphlet of *Marvellous Tales from the Bible*. “What fools these Christians be!” But, leaving aside the Tale of Jonah and the Whale, the Tale of the Ten Plagues of Egypt, the Tale of How a Prophet Prayed for and Obtained Rain after a Drought of Three Years, and did Many Other Wonderful Things, and Finally Went to Heaven in a Chariot of Fire; leaving aside the Tales of the Miracles of Christ, Tales of the Miracles of the Apostles—tales, tales, tales without number; leaving aside all these appetizing morsels for the palate of the infidel, and confining ourselves to “the Virgin” of Mr. Munro, we shall construct out of that Bible in which—we assume—he trusts, a little Table of Contents for a pamphlet that might find a ready sale amongst unbelievers. It is almost as funny as his own Table.

BIBLICAL TALES OF THE VIRGIN.

1. The Virgin is visited by an Angel, who tells her that she is to become the Mother of God.
2. At the Virgin's Approach a Child Leaps in its Mother's Womb.
3. The Virgin is visited by Three Wise Men from the Far East.
4. The Virgin causes her Son to change Water into Wine.

To this refreshing series of Tales we could write an introductory note something like that of Mr. Munro :

In the popular estimation of the early Christians the Virgin held the first place. Their tales represent her as really the mother of the God they worshipped, and therefore using the commanding power of her position to exact obedience. Their tales, accordingly, abound in the marvels wrought by her, as the Table of Contents shows. The tales at times sink to the meanest levels—as witness No. 4, in which she is represented as using the almighty power of her son to remove the embarrassment of a kins-

man of hers, at whose marriage-orgies the wine is failing. Neither do they lack ludicrous features—as witness No. 2, in which we are astounded at finding a child still in the womb, leaping in token of recognition of the babe still in the Virgin's womb.

The impetus given to her cult by other marvellous tales, such as that she was taken up, body and soul, into heaven after her death, has lasted down to the present day. And Christians are still found who, in addition to a sufficiently ample Book of Wonders, believe her to have been a Prophetess. A tale we have omitted through lack of space, represents her as declaring that all generations of men should call her "blessed"; and, in order to verify the prophecy, Christians in every age have thus styled her, so insistently, indeed, that she is always called—if we except a small fragment of "protestors" against her cult, whose numbers, never large, are decreasing daily (not a few of the protesters ending logically by protesting against the cult of the Son, as well)—she is always called, as we were saying, not the "Virgin," but the "*Blessed Virgin*."

It is instructive to notice that these tales belong to a period of Biblical composition when the very divinity of the Son was itself most hotly combated, and when such an interposition of the figure of the mother might naturally have been considered disastrous to the prerogatives of the Son.

Omnis comparatio claudicat. The parallel we have just drawn fails in the particular that, whereas the Tales of the Virgin found in the New Testament are of obligatory credence, those narrated by the monks—especially those quoted by Mr. Munro—are far from it. But our contention is rather strengthened by this fact. If Christianity may be made to appear ridiculous by presenting only one phase of its belief, and by presenting that phase with an elaborate commentary of false logic and misapprehension constituting an appeal to the prejudice of the reader: *a fortiori* can Monasticism be made ludicrous by a similar presentation of but one of its features—a feature presented in an exaggerated light, and with a preparatory appeal to all the latent prejudice of the reader.

Is this a sample of the historical method whose great result is to be, as heralded by the Prospectus of the series, to clothe with their greatest reality "the form and spirit of institutions, the characters of men, the prevailing habits of thought"? Do we gather any real idea of the monks or of Monasticism from this farrago of "Tales"? Was Monasticism a farce? and were the monks asses?

In one respect our parallel was singularly appropriate. Mr. Munro, in making asses out of the monks, does but follow the example of the Roman rabble who, in their *graffiti*, represented Christ Himself with an ass-head. Caricature is not history.

The trend of all modern critical study of the middle ages is in the line of a rehabilitation of the monks and of monasticism. The greatest of the historians are those who have done the most work in that process. The traditional rags of misapprehension, of prejudice, of ignorance, are being dragged from off the heroic

figure of Monasticism. Is it not then pitiful to go again to the historic ash-heap, easy of access as it is, and in the name of a new method of historical study, drag home to a great modern University an armful of the discarded rags, and dress up a lay figure with them, and parade it before the eyes of boys—*VENERABILIS juvenus*, to which the teacher by his very vocation owes a special reverence—as an illustration of the clothes his forefathers wore (for Monasticism means, very nearly, the Christianity of the middle ages)? Are the youth of our colleges, not overly given nowadays to respect for parents, for teachers, for anything in the heavens above or on the earth beneath or in the waters under the earth, to be taught in such a formal way the duty of irreverent laughter at a great factor in the civilizing of the world? Are they to be given such an object-lesson in the art of throwing mud at an institution of which the Anglican minister and historian, Maitland, could write as follows: "It is quite impossible to touch the subject of Monasticism without rubbing off some of the dirt which has been heaped upon it. It is impossible to get even a superficial knowledge of the mediæval history of Europe, without seeing how greatly the world of that period was indebted to the Monastic Orders; and feeling that, whether they were good or bad in other matters, monasteries were beyond all price in those days of misrule and turbulence as places where (it may be imperfectly, yet better than elsewhere) God was worshipped—as a quiet and religious refuge for helpless infancy and old age, a shelter of respectful sympathy for the orphan maiden and the desolate widow—as central points whence agriculture was to spread over bleak hills, and barren downs, and marshy plains, and deal bread to millions perishing with hunger and its pestilential train—as repositories of the learning which then was, and well-springs of the learning which was to be—as nurseries of art and science, giving the stimulus, the means, and the reward to invention; and aggregating around them every head that could devise, and every hand that could execute—as the nucleus of the city which in after days of pride should crown its palaces and bulwarks with the towering cross of its cathedral." This Maitland was not an ecstatic admirer of the art of the Church—of its architecture, its painting, its sculpture, its music, its poetry; not a dreamy and romantic soul; but a cool historian who wrote thus only after demolishing the reputation of a Robertson for accuracy. He was a critical student of mediæval history, a man who asserted nothing without a recourse to, and a demonstration from, the "Original Sources," of which his great work on the "Dark Ages" is little more than a collection. He

confronts historians like Robertson, Milner, Jortin, Mosheim, D'Aubigné, not with argument, but with the "Original Sources" which they had garbled, mistranslated, copied at second-hand—a veritable *exposé* of their pretension and assumption of consulting original sources. His book on the "Dark Ages" was published over fifty years ago, when the modern vogue of critical history had not assumed its present pre-eminence; and, having gone out of print, became a rarity. Its republication in our day should make it convenient as a reference-book to Mr. Munro and his students. We suggest this for the reason that, however well-known it is, we can still scarce conceive that Mr. Munro has indeed read it, although, by virtue of its title, it lies in his pathway so obtrusively that he must have stumbled over it. Had he read it he would have learned a sympathy with his subject such as would not have tolerated the travesty he has made. *À propos*, we cannot forbear to continue the quotation at the point where it was interrupted. Maitland's summary view of Monasticism presented a grand picture which, he says, "I think no man can deny. I believe it is true, and I love to think of it. I hope that I see the good hand of God in it, and the visible trace of His mercy that is over all His works. But if it is only a dream, however grateful, I shall be glad to be awakened from it; not indeed by the yelling of illiterate agitators, but by a quiet and sober proof that I have misunderstood the matter. In the meantime, let me thankfully believe that thousands of the persons at whom Robertson and Jortin, and other such very miserable second-hand writers have sneered, were men of enlarged minds, purified affections, and holy lives—that they were justly revered by men—and, above all, favorably accepted by God; and distinguished by the highest honor which He vouchsafes to those whom He has called into existence, that of being the channels of His love and mercy to their fellow-creatures."

What an idea Mr. Munro gives us of the monk of the thirteenth century! We should conceive of him as in his dotage. What is the fact? The Rev. Mr. Duffield, a Presbyterian who could style St. Venantius Fortunatus a "troubadour," is nevertheless amazed in contemplation of this very thirteenth century. Writing of the *Dies Iræ*, he says: "All Christendom rejoices in it as a common treasure, the gift of God through a devout Italian monk of the thirteenth century. It was in an age full of vitality that this 'hymn of the giants' was written—the most interesting century in the history of Christendom, Matthew Arnold says. In all directions we encounter the play or collision of great forces. . . . Popes like Innocent III. and Gregory IX., founders of religious

orders like Dominic and Francis, theologians like Aquinas and Bonaventura, may excite our admiration or our censure, but they are men of such magnitude as are not to be found in other centuries in the same number. They were live men, and they have made a lasting impression upon the world by the force of their vitality." Rather than present a long catalogue of names and achievements of the monks of this century, we have preferred to quote the century as looked at by a professed antagonist of Catholicity. Were the monks of the thirteenth century a pack of dotards?

"But," it may be objected, "the fact remains that the 'Monastic Tales' are taken from this century." Granted; but the picture thus drawn is a "shadowgraph" (with the accent strongly on the *shadow*). We cannot see in it flesh, or bone, or nerve, or sinew, warm heart, or active brain—but the shadow of all these, vague and forbidding. We should not like to grasp hands that resembled at all such shadowgraphs; we should not like to commune with hearts whose beating we infer only by an alternate softening and deepening of shadow.

Mr. Munro is a collector of pictures that will fit only the narrowest frames. His limits of space perhaps allowed him no room for even a slight perspective. He has not varied in the subject—and this makes his collection rather monotonous; we grow fatigued looking at a succession of pictures, all of the same size, all on the same theme, all lacking perspective, all of the same school, all of them amateurish. Surely the thirteenth century could have furnished more variety in art! Duffield, whom we quoted on that century, hints at an amazing variety of artists—live artists, grand artists, artists formed in an heroic mould. Mr. Munro's *salon* suggests that he is a collector of *genre*-paintings the apparent purpose of which is to insinuate that the artists were idiots. From his point of view, as well as from the point of view of his visitors, doubtless they were idiots. If the collection were intended only to amuse himself and a little coterie of his artist-friends, we might not admire his taste, but we should at least concede his liberty in the matter. But Mr. Munro has assumed the *rôle* of Lecturer on Art; and his visitors are his pupils—boys that know nothing about the subject of art, and must gather their judgments from his collection of paintings. What must we think of his pedagogy? He styles his collection "Monastic Art of the XIIIth Century"—and omits *all* the better artists, *all* the best artists; does not even hint at them or their works by name, or spirit of *technique*, or achieved and undying reputation. It is as

though some lecturer on art of the next century were to ransack the garrets of the art-schools of America in this century, to find the long-forgotten attempts of the pupils to master *Impressionism*; and having acquired enough of these Impressionist pictures, should group them in a little room under the categories of Landscapes and Marines; and should then place over the door of the room the legend, "American Art in the XIXth Century." His pupils would no doubt be amused highly by his lecture—but would they receive a just "impression" of the subject? He has succeeded in making his pupils laugh, but at the expense of truth. And he will plead in vain that he really found these Impressionist-paintings in the art-schools of the previous century, authenticated by dates still legible on the canvases. He should have found other examples of art in the nineteenth century—he could easily have found enough to fill the Louvre as an exhibition-hall—and he should, as a lecturer to young students, have guarded them against hasty generalization in ridicule of the art of their forefathers.

We are now discussing what we have called the Dimension of *Breadth*, as found in some of the pamphlets. No secular university should permit a sectarian belligerent to use its neutral ground as a base of attack on the enemy. Nor should a few officers of the great University of Pennsylvania be permitted to drag its ægis, in this tolerant and scholarly age, over a polemic disguised by so very thin a veneer of "History." Mr. Munro's introductory note to the "Tales of the Virgin" reads like a Puritan sermon of the rare old times. In his introduction to the "Tales of Confession," too, he has boiled down into a paragraph and a sentence the elaborate historical inquiry which Mr. Lea found a difficulty in compressing within the limits of three generous volumes, and even Mr. Lea gave short "shrift" to some phases of the inquiry. He differs from Mr. Lea, however, in that he gives "original sources" on only one side of the question; and he differs again from Mr. Lea in the fact that Mr. Lea's logic is not on a par with his learning, whereas, we conceive, Mr. Munro's logic is not distanced by his learning *in re* "Confession." Here is the introduction to the "Tales of Confession":

"The theories as to the necessity and efficacy of confession varied greatly. But the tendency to hold all Christians to a full confession of all sins increased, as the members of the Church realized what a powerful weapon such confession would place in their hands. At the fourth Lateran Council the confession of all sins to a priest was made obligatory once a year. Soon after this the formula of absolution changed from the deprecatory form to the statement that the contrite penitent was loosed from the sins which he had confessed. By confession, sins, otherwise mortal, were reduced to

the rank of venial. The two essentials were contrition and confession. If the first was present, confession to a layman was sufficient in case no priest could be found; and, as we learn from Caesar of Heisterbach, in cases when immediate confession was impossible, contrition alone was sufficient to loose from the consequences of sin. But confession must follow at the earliest possible moment.

“The following tales show the efficacy of confession—even to a layman; the fact that all sins, even the most trivial, must be confessed; and the danger of backsliding after confession.”

Our limits of space and time forbid a longer discussion, under the dimension of *Breadth*, of “Monastic Tales of the XIIIth Century.” We shall encounter it again under the dimension of “Depth.”

Turn we now to another issue of the Series, Vol. I., No. 2. Its title is “Urban and the Crusaders,” and Mr. Munro is its editor. The theme is disposed of in 13 pages, exclusive of Introduction and Bibliography. In illustration of its *Breadth*, we quote from the Introduction :

“The privileges (granted to the Crusaders) were of gradual growth. Urban promised remission of sins. His successors found it necessary to add material inducements to the spiritual. As the zeal for the Crusades flagged, the privileges increased. Finally, when Innocent IV. preached a crusade against a Christian king, Conrad IV., he ‘granted a larger remission of sins than for the voyage to the Holy Land, and included the father and mother of the Crusaders as beneficiaries in the assurance of heaven.’”

An ordinary reader might be pardoned for supposing that when “Urban promised remission of sins,” he did so by granting an absolution antecedently to the commission of the sins thus remitted, and as a *quid pro quo*—as the “bounty” offered to those who would enlist; that contrition and confession were no longer necessary to the Crusaders; that he gave them *carte blanche* to commit sin, and provided them with a “through-ticket” to heaven. Catholics are accustomed to make a few easy distinctions, clearly intelligible to their minds and as a fact well understood by them, when the question of “absolution” is under discussion. They believe, for instance, that the priests (including the Pope, who is a priest) can absolve from sin, *provided that the subject of such absolution be properly disposed*. The sinner who is not sorry (and sorry from *supernatural* motives) for his sin, cannot be absolved. But even after absolution of the guilt there remains a *temporal* punishment for which “satisfaction” is to be made either in this life or in the next—and here come in the penitential codes, indulgences, etc., of the Church. Easy distinctions such as these are usually very tedious to the Protestant mind, which is further perplexed by questions of censures, suspensions, interdicts,

which sometimes a simple priest, sometimes only a bishop, sometimes only the Pope, may absolve from. In short, the Protestant "gives the thing up," and will not endure being instructed in the details of what Catholics do, and of what they do not, believe. Nevertheless, a professor of history may not, in his desire to condense, state or imply what is not true; may not, because he "gives the thing up" in despair of ever understanding it, appear to charge the largest body of Christians in the world with hideously stupid, un-Christian, immoral and damnable doctrines or beliefs; may not, above all, do this in his quality as an instructor of youth, to whom, in that very quality of teacher, he is under a special moral obligation of charity, justice, candor, truth. He is under a special obligation to see that his pupils do not misread his "original sources." If the expression "remission of sins" occurs in his documents, used in a certain technical sense, he should point out the fact clearly, lest the student confound technical with ordinary phraseology. Our editor quotes the Privilege granted by Pope Urban II. :

"If anyone, through devotion alone, and not for the sake of honor or gain, goes to Jerusalem to free the Church of God, the journey itself shall take the place of all penance."

This he calls in his Introduction a "remission of sins." He had better have called it, in the technical language of the next document he quotes, a "*full* remission of sins." And he should then and there have explained that the phrases "remission of sins" and "full remission of sins" have a technical meaning in the language of the Church wholly different from that which a non-Catholic would be apt to ascribe to them. They really mean the same as "partial indulgence" and "plenary indulgence." If the student is to understand correctly the exact "privileges" granted to the Crusaders, he should next be instructed in the fact that an "indulgence" is not a remission of either the guilt or the eternal punishment of sin committed; nor is it a permission to commit any sin whatsoever, of any kind or degree. The guilt and the eternal punishment of sin are removable only by sincere and supernatural sorrow (which includes a firm purpose of amendment), together with confession of sin (if possible). But Catholics furthermore believe that even after the remission of guilt and eternal punishment a temporal punishment remains—the justice of God requires a further "satisfaction" either on earth or in purgatory. Nathan told David that his sin was forgiven, but that, nevertheless, the child should die—a sore stroke to the father's

yearning heart. "Satisfaction" is therefore an integral part of the sacrament of Penance. The temporal punishment due to sin contritely confessed and forgiven is wholly or partly satisfied for by the rigors of the old penitential codes, or by the milder "penances" inflicted by the confessor, taken in conjunction with the grant of an "indulgence" for some pious work performed. An indulgence, therefore, always implies the antecedent performance of some act of self-denial or piety, and is, practically, a "penance" still, but in a milder form. Without entering upon a demonstration of the reasonableness of the Catholic practice in this matter, we have merely desired to point out to the editor that the phrase "remission of sins" is a technical one—somewhat similar to that in the British Constitution which declares that "The King can do no wrong." Being a technical phrase, it should have been explained amply, lest the student misconceive utterly the "privileges" granted to the Crusaders.

When, therefore, Urban II. declared that the journey to Jerusalem should "take the place of all penance," he granted a plenary indulgence in the sense we have explained above. This is clear from the report of his sermon delivered at the Council of Clermont:¹ "Nos . . . immensas pro suis delictis pœnitentias relaxamus. Qui autem ibi in vera pœnitentia decesserint, et peccatorum indulgentiam, et fructum æternæ mercedis se non dubitent habituros." He makes "true penitence"—or, in other words, *internal* and *supernatural* sorrow—a condition of the granting of the indulgence.

If the editor had really edited his documents, he must have seen all this. For the very next document² he quotes contains the grant of "that full remission of sins which our predecessor, Pope Urban, granted." The document ends with such a fulness of explication of the technical phrase "remission of sins," that the editor who prints it should have called the special attention of his readers to it after first digesting its purport himself. If not, what is an editor for? The document ends thus:

"Following the example of our predecessor, and through the authority of omnipotent God and of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles—which is vested in us by God—we grant absolution and remission of sins so that those who devoutly undertake and accomplish such a holy journey, or who die by the way, shall obtain absolution for all their sins which they *confess* with *humble* and *contrite* heart, and shall receive from the Remunerator of all the reward of eternal life."³

¹ *Mansi*, t. xx., col. 823.

² *Privileges of Eugene III.*, 1145.

³ Italics ours.

No one, therefore, could receive "remission of sins" without true contrition, and, if possible, oral confession. The simple statement made by the editor would imply that the popes granted "remission of sins" without reference to any other condition than that of crusading. The papal documents take great care to insist on the requisite conditions of contrition and confession. We have just seen how Eugene III. expressly requires contrition and confession in order that the "remission of sins" granted by him should be obtained.

Writing on the same subject, Gregory VIII. grants the same privilege, but safeguards its interpretation in the same way: "Eis autem, qui *corde contrito, et humiliato spiritu, itineris hujus laborem assumpserint, et in pœnitentia peccatorum, et fide recta decesserint, plenam suorum criminum indulgentiam, et vitam pollicemur æternum. Sive autem supervixerint, sive mortui fuerint, de omnibus peccatis suis, de quibus *rectam confessionem fecerint, impositæ satisfactionis* relaxationem, de Omnipotentis Dei misericordia, et Apostolorum Petri et Pauli auctoritate et nostra, se noverint habituros."¹ We have italicized the pertinent phrases. Especial attention is, however, called to the *impositæ satisfactionis relaxatio*, which is in the nature of a commutation of whatever "penance" might be imposed, or what is called in technical language "satisfaction" (an integral part of the Sacrament of Penance). A commutation was therefore made of all degrees and kinds of penance into the *single* "penance" or "satisfaction" of the journey to Jerusalem. He plainly looked on such a journey as a penitential pilgrimage, for the last sentence of the Bull runs thus: "Nec eant in vestibus pretiosis, et cum canibus, sive avibus, aut aliis quæ ostentationi potius et lasciviæ, quam necessariis videantur usibus deservire, sed in modesto apparatu, et habitu, in quo pœnitentiam potius agere, quam inanem affectare gloriam videantur."²*

So, too, Innocent III., in the Bull *Ad liberandum*:³ "Nos . . . omnibus qui laborem propriis personis subierint et expensis, plenam suorum peccaminum, de quibus liberaliter fuerint *corde contriti et confessi*, veniam indulgemus. . . ." A translation of this part of the Bull is printed in Mr. Munro's pamphlet. He should have called attention to the words "full remission of the sins of which they have *truly repented* with *contrite* hearts, and which they have *confessed* with their *mouths*." We conclude with 468 additional illustrations:

¹ *Mag. Bull. Rom.*, t. i., ad an. 1187.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Mag. Bull. Rom.*, an. 1215.

The Bull (*Malitia*) of Innocent IV. to the Dominican Inquisitors: "Cum autem hujusmodi Crucis verbum per vos proponi contigerit, relaxandi omnibus *vere pœnitentibus et confessis*, qui ad audiendum verbum ipsum *devote* affuerint, quadraginta vel viginti dies de injunctis pœnitentiis, libera sit vobis et singulis vestrum de nostra concessione facultas." He grants to the preachers the faculty of absolving or remitting a part of the penance; in short, the power of declaring to *contrite* and *confessed* penitents who have *devoutly* assisted at the sermons, a remission of from *twenty to forty days of the penance imposed* for their sins. He declares this privilege to be the same as that granted to the crusaders who go to Jerusalem (Sec. 2). The "remission of sins" has dwindled very considerably from that monstrous image which the simple phrase as quoted by Mr. Munro evokes in our minds.

So, too, Alexander IV. in the Bull *Firmissime* grants to the Friars Minor, Inquisitors, "*vere pœnitentibus et confessis* plenam veniam peccatorum,"—that is, a "plenary indulgence"; to others who help in various ways, "tres annos de injuncta sibi pœnitentia relaxamus"—that is, a "partial" indulgence of three years; to those who may die while prosecuting the work, "eis peccatorum omnium, de quibus *corde contriti ac ore confessi* fuerint, plenam veniam concedimus"—that is, "a plenary indulgence at the hour of death" (as the present-day phrase has it).

So, too, Urban IV., in the Bull *Licet*, grants a *partial* and a *plenary* indulgence in the same terms (which had by that time become thoroughly crystallized into a set formula).

So, too, Nicholas IV. in the Bull *Illuminet*, grants to the crusaders "plenam peccaminum suorum, de quibus *veraciter* fuerint *corde contriti, et ore confessi* veniam." Further on we read: "Porro si forte aliquos eorum post arreptum iter hujusmodi, ex hac luce migrare contigerit, ipsos nihilominus plene percipere volumus *Indulgentiam* prælibatam"—that is to say, he grants a "Plenary Indulgence." To what a ridiculously slight shadow of its former self has not the "remission of sins" dwindled? The "plenary" indulgence gained so easily in our days was a privilege gained hardly enough in the middle ages.

The pupils might be further instructed in the nature of that "commutation of penance" in vogue in the Church. They would find an easily intelligible analogue in the "commutation of punishments" contemplated by the civil legislators in their grants to the President and the Governors of States, of the pardoning power, or of the power to shorten a term of punishment for "good

behavior." The great physical fatigues necessarily endured by the crusaders might well stand in lieu of a pilgrimage to Compostella or to Jerusalem. Both included much hardship, and both could be inflicted as a "penance" for sin. All this, and much more, might be placed before the eyes of the callow youth of the colleges and divinity schools, lest their consulting of the "Reprints and Translations" result in a complete and ludicrously wrong-headed misinterpretation of the documents drawn from "Original Sources."

The student should also receive good example in the matter of crediting to a denominated source all quotations made. What means this paragraph of the Introduction?

"Finally . . . he 'granted a larger remission of sins than for the voyage to the Holy Land, and included the father and mother of the Crusaders as beneficiaries in the assurance of heaven.'"

A quotation not credited to any one in particular, and still put in inverted commas, is apt to perplex even an ordinary, unscientific, uncritical, unmethodic reader. The student of historical methods, who learns from this pamphlet how to consult original sources, should learn as a first thing how to estimate their value, and then how properly to acknowledge indebtedness to them. Who makes the statement which Mr. Munro puts thus in inverted commas? Does Mr. Munro assert this of his own knowledge? by his own industrious delving into original documents? or does he depend on the critical work of the author whom—or rather from whom—he quotes? As he gives no documents to illustrate the statement, he might at least give the name of the author of the statement and the name of his book (in which, haply, some such illustrative document might be given or referred to).

A propos of quotations, we find the Angelic Doctor mildly reproved for carelessness in quotation. In Vol. III., No. 6, which treats of "The Pre-Reformation Period" (edited by J. H. Robinson, Ph.D.), occurs a long extract from the Angelic Doctor's discussion as to "Whether heretics are to be tolerated." Following his usual style, the Angelic Doctor begins with the argument *pro*, which includes three proofs from the New Testament, the first proof being the words of St. Paul to Timothy.¹ These words are, as a matter of fact, as follows: "Servum autem Domini non oportet litigare, sed mansuetum esse ad omnes, docibilem, patientem,² Cum modestia corripientem eos, qui resistunt veritati, nequando Deus det illis poenitentiam ad cognoscendum veritatem,³

¹ II. Tim. ii., 24-26.

² V. 24.

³ V. 25.

Et respiscant a diaboli laqueis, a quo captivi tenentur ad ipsius voluntatem.”¹ St. Thomas, however, desiring to compress the gist of the three verses into an argument *pro*, omits whatever does not make for the argument, and rearranges the first verse so as to avoid the use of the word “non.” He thus succeeds—not through negligence, but by an “economy” of space and purport that should command the respect of the modern pedagogue—in presenting the argument in a clear, consecutive phraseology such as young students require for easy comprehension. This is his pungent presentation of the argument taken from the words of the Apostle: “Servum Dei oportet mansuetum esse, cum modestia corripientem eos qui resistunt veritati; ne quando det illis pœnitentiam Deus ad cognoscendum veritatem, et respiscant a laqueis diaboli.” In a foot-note our editor remarks: “Quotations are often very carelessly made (*sc.*, by the Angelic Doctor), as in the opening one from second Timothy.” We can scarce imagine how, in a pedagogical sense, the quotation could have been made with greater care. But even if the quotation had been made with the utmost carelessness, the remark of the editor would be very amusing in view of the number of quotations from the Bible made by the Angel of the Schools in his “*Summa Theologica*.” Has the editor glanced over the *Index of Biblical Authorities* accompanying the “*Summa*?” Printed very closely and finely, it would fill several issues of the “Reprints.” In the whole Bible there are but five books from which he does not quote—Abdias (one chapter), Habacuc (3 cc.), Sophonias (3 cc.), Aggeus (2 cc.), Philemon (1 c.); and all of them added together are not equal in length to the short book of *Tobias*. From the first chapter of *Genesis* he makes some thirty-one quotations, and explicates them in various places of his *Summa* in the aggregate over eighty times. We glance at the references in the *Index* to the second chapter of *Genesis*, and we find a similar fertility. Of the fifty chapters in *Genesis*, he omits but nine. We glance at *Exodus*, and find not a single chapter omitted of all the forty. Of the twenty-seven chapters of *Leviticus*, only one is omitted. Instead of a foot-note calling attention to the “carelessness” of St. Thomas, it would have enlightened the student if attention had been called to the marvellous familiarity with the whole Bible, displayed in the midst of the middle ages, at a time three centuries in advance of the wonderful “discovery of the precious book” by Luther, of which d’Aubigné and other Protestant historians speak in holy amaze-

¹ V. 26.

ment. As this travesty of history is cropping up again and again in our days—even in these days of a critical recourse to original sources—it would be more profitable for the editors of the “Reprints” to issue one number correcting certain popular fallacies sure to be in the minds of the college students—more profitable in the cause of truth than a bushel of the pamphlets actually issuing from their press.

This thought leads to a slight digression, but a suggestive one, withal, and not wholly inappropriate. In his “Manual of Historical Literature,” Mr. C. K. Adams, of Cornell University, says of D’Aubigné’s “History of the Great Reformation,” that “it is probably more used by Protestant readers than all other histories of the Reformation combined.” Now, we have just seen some of the Biblical lore of St. Thomas, of whose “Summa Theologica” there is, we take it, not a *Quæstio* that does not bristle with quotations from the Bible. D’Aubigné informs his readers that Luther as a young man had “for some time applied himself to learn the philosophy of the middle ages in the writings of Occam, Scot, Bonaventure, and Thomas Aquinas”; and, says Maitland, who furnishes us with the quotations we purpose using, this remark is found on the same page that records Luther’s “Discovery of the Bible.” This page came under Maitland’s eye quite accidentally, and he seemed to take not a little satisfaction in his ignorance of a “book which,” he says, “I do not know that I have seen, but the name of which I have often heard, and which I have reason to believe has been somewhat popular of late. The head-line of the page before me is

THE UNIVERSITY.

DISCOVERY.

D’AUBIGNÉ’S REFORMATION.

LUTHER’S PIETY.

THE BIBLE.

Among the contents of the page thus headed, and in the column under ‘Discovery. The Bible,’ we find the following passage relating to Luther :

“‘The young student passed at the University library every moment he could snatch from his academic duties. Books were still rare, and it was a high privilege in his eyes to be enabled to profit by the treasures collected in that vast collection. One day (he had then been studying two years at Erfurth, and was twenty years of age) he opened one after another several books in the library, in order to become acquainted with their authors. A volume he opens in its turn arrests his attention. He has seen nothing like it to this moment. He reads the title—it is a Bible! a rare book, unknown in those days.’” [Here Maitland has a foot-note calling attention to a foot-note on the page of D’Aubigné he is quoting, which purports to give the authority for the astounding statement just made by D’Aubigné. The foot-note to which Maitland calls atten-

tion simply says that Luther once came across a Latin Bible! It reads: “Auf ein Zeyt, wie er die Bücher fein nach einander besieht . . . kommt er über die lateinische Biblia . . . (Mathes. 3). “Neither more nor less than” this is the foot-note “which,” says Maitland, “the English reader (and for such, I presume, the translation is made) will, of course, suppose to be a voucher for the fact that the Bible was unknown in those days.”] The page of D’Aubigné continues: “His interest is excited to a high degree; he is overcome with wonder at finding more in the volume than those fragments of the Gospels and Epistles, which the Church had selected to be read in the temples every Sunday throughout the year. Till then, he had supposed these constituted the entire Word of God; and now behold, how many pages, how many chapters, how many books, of which he had not before had a notion.”

“Is it not odd that Luther had not by some chance or other heard of the Psalms? But there is no use in criticising such nonsense. Such it must appear to every moderately informed reader, but he will not appreciate its absurdity until he is informed that on the same page this precious historian has informed his readers that in the course of the two preceding years Luther had ‘applied himself to learn the philosophy of the middle ages in the writings of Occam, Scot, Bonaventure, and Thomas Aquinas’—and of course none of those poor creatures knew anything about the Bible.” Thus Maitland, whom we should have hesitated to quote from *in extenso*, were we not convinced that despite the fact that he is now a classic on the dark ages, and the stronger fact that he lies so obtrusively across the path of any writer who treats of the middle ages, he nevertheless seems unfamiliar to our editors.

The digression has led up to the following suggestion: That the editors issue some Numbers whose tendency will not be to mislead the already prejudiced students of the “Reprints”; will not confirm the errors of readers of D’Aubigné, whose classic “is probably more used by Protestant readers than all other histories of the Reformation combined,” as Mr. Adams tells us; but will *ex professo* strive to remove the wide-spread ignorance and misapprehension of the reading public with respect to the middle ages. This would prove a wide field for the learned activities of the editors. The public still read D’Aubigné, and his fables are to them as Gospel truth. They still read Robertson, whose ludicrously false statements were exposed in detail by Maitland, but whose work on the middle ages Mr. Adams—who clearly could not have opened Maitland once, save to copy out the title-page—has the assurance to recommend to the confiding searcher after historical truth in this wise: “This was, perhaps, the first really philosophical view of the middle ages ever written. In calmness of judgment, in breadth of scholarship, and in comprehensiveness of treatment it still has no superior among the shorter treatises on the middle ages. . . . The ‘proofs and illustrations’ form nearly a

half of the whole volume, and are not the least important and interesting portion of the work. They abound in facts of the utmost interest and importance. . . ." Perhaps the public still read Milner—the brother and the dean—whose work is even yet esteemed a standard one, and whose treatment of the discovery of the Bible is as delightful as D'Aubigné's. Maitland says he was curious to find out how Milner treated this episode in Luther's life. This is what he found, capitals and all: "In the second year after Luther had entered into the monastery, he accidentally met with a Latin Bible in the library. It proved to him a treasure. Then he first discovered that there were MORE scripture-passages extant than those which were read to the people: for the scriptures were at that time very little known in the world." Maitland was an Anglican divine of a mild and even temper, but this seems to have staggered him. "Really," he says, "one hardly knows how to meet such statements, but will the reader be so good as to remember that we are not now talking of the dark ages, but of a period when the *press* had been *half a century* in operation; and will he give a moment's reflection to the following statement, which I believe to be correct, and which cannot, I think, be so far inaccurate as to affect the argument. To say nothing of *parts* of the Bible, or of books whose *place* is uncertain, we know of at least *twenty* different *editions* of the *whole* Latin Bible *printed in Germany only* before Luther was *born*. These had issued from Augsburg, Strasburg, Cologne, Ulm, Mentz (two), Basil (four), Nuremberg (ten), and were dispersed through Germany, I repeat, before Luther was born. . . . It had been printed in Rome, . . . at Naples, Florence, and Piacenza; and Venice alone had furnished eleven editions. No doubt we should be within the truth if we were to say that beside the multitude of manuscript copies, not yet fallen into disuse, the *press* had issued fifty different editions of the whole Latin Bible; to say nothing of Psalters, New Testaments, or other parts. And yet, more than twenty years after, we find a young man who had received 'a very liberal education,' who 'had made great proficiency in his studies at Magdeburg, Eisenach, and Erfurth,' and who, nevertheless, did not know what a Bible was, simply because 'the Bible was unknown in those days.'" These last shafts are pointed with the words not of Milner, but of D'Aubigné, of course, but they reach vulnerable places in the armor of both.

"Do the duty lying nearest you" is a piece of advice credited to the genius of Goethe. Why lead students into the misty mysticism of "Cæsar" of Heisterbach; into the scholastic labyrinth

of the “Summa”; into the legal pitfalls of “Ordeals, Compurgation, Excommunication, and Interdict;” into the diplomatic tangles of the “Period of the Later Reformation”; into this bog and that mireland, into this mist-land and that morass—when all the while the hapless pilgrim, whom you are guiding thither, is bearing on his shoulders an inestimably heavy burden of *impedimenta*—verily, impediments to anything like a reasonable interpretation of anything he shall see or hear in those wonderful fairy-lands of the middle ages? Why, O why? Say rather, why not first of all seek to relieve him of a part, at least, of the weight of ignorance, misinformation, traditional misapprehension, religious prejudice, under which he is bearing up with a fortitude and a constancy that must appeal to any pedagogue’s sympathy?

All this digression has been made *à propos* of the reproof administered to the Angelic Doctor because of his carelessness in quoting the Bible. We showed that, in re-arranging the text, he was consulting for the needs of his pupils—that he was not careless, but concise. This fact will shine out more clearly if we look at another arrangement of the self-same text by the same great master in the same great “Summa.” He is now discussing, not the question of heresy, but that of “modesty,”¹ and the text accordingly appears condensed as follows: “*Servum Dei non oportet litigare, sed mansuetum esse ad omnes, cum modestia corripientem eos qui resistunt veritati.*” He here inserts the words “*non oportet litigare,*” which he had previously omitted as not bearing on the question of the toleration of heresy; and he omits the closing phrases he had previously quoted as bearing on that question. This man seems to have known all his Bible by heart, and *litteratim*, too!

The stricture of the editor was doubly unfortunate. First, it would easily lead a boy raised up in the atmosphere of a Protestant tradition that considers the middle ages as hideously ignorant of the Bible, to look on St. Thomas as but one out of innumerable illustrations of this ignorance. The boy’s error is confirmed instead of lessened by the editor’s foot-note, and the “Reprints” have succeeded in strengthening his false view of the learning of the middle ages, while their professed intention is to give him a juster, because a closer, view. It is unfortunate, in the second place, as an illustration of the qualifications of the editor himself. In trying to guide others he discovers to the world that he but needs a guide himself; for he drags his

¹ 2, 2, q. 160, a. 1, 3.

pupil with him into the same pitfall. "If the blind lead the blind, . . ."

Once more the suggestion may be made, not inappropriately, to the editors of the "Reprints," that some of the issues be mere reprints of the mediæval illustrations given by Maitland. His book must be quite as unfamiliar and inaccessible to the pupils as it evidently is to the editors. As we are not just now engaged in issuing a series of reprints, we may not give the illustrations which he gives in abundance, of the wonderful familiarity of the dark ages with the Bible—wonderful when we consider that a single Bible cost as much in the olden time as five hundred would cost to-day; wonderful when we consider that students of the "Book" had not then the paraphernalia of helps to Bible-study possessed by students of to-day; wonderful when we consider that scriptural phraseology formed then the warp and woof not alone of the sermons preached, the lectures delivered, the bulls published, but even of the every-day conversation of life. The thoughts of those days were conceived and expressed in the diction of the two testaments, as in the readiest medium at hand. Let the editors be assured that their pupils are sitting in a worse than Egyptian darkness with respect to all these truths. It is not the fault of the pupils, to be sure; it is a misfortune of theirs, attributable to a three-centuried perpetuation of partisan abuse of the middle ages. But that misfortune carries with it a lesson not to be fairly ignored by an editor who discourses to them concerning those ages. If he is to let them see clearly, he must first take away the smoked glasses through which they are unconsciously looking. The case might be put in even a stronger figure: if he is to let them see at all, he must first remove the bandage from their eyes.

We trust we have left behind us what St. Paul calls "the things of a child," and with them the childish pleasure found in throwing stones. If, then, a person living in a glass house amuses himself by casting stones at us, and we stoop to pick up one which has fallen harmlessly at our feet, for the purpose of throwing it back again, we trust we shall not be misapprehended as though we did so for the pleasure of the exercise; we do so merely to show said person a fact he seems to be strangely ignorant of—namely, that he lives secure, but not safe, in a very frail habitation. Our editor has amused himself by casting a stone at St. Thomas; and the stone is heavy; not through the force of gravitation, but through that of "quotation." Meanwhile, curiously enough, the editor himself does not credit, with a scholar's accuracy, his extract from the Angelic Doctor. This is the way he refers

to his authority: "Sancti Thomæ Aquinatis Summa Theologica, Quæst. XI., Art. III., Latin." The word "Latin" is added, plainly, for the information of the student, not of any professor who may chance to use the pamphlet. The fact, too, that the reference is given in full, and not in the scholar's short-hand, shows clearly that the reference is meant to aid the student, if he desires to consult the original work, whether to verify the whole extract, or to obtain fuller information on the matter in hand. But unless the student has a rare piece of good luck, he will fail to find the original by such an inaccurate reference. If he find it, he may thank good luck and not good guidance. For the "Summa Theologica" is not a small work. Exclusive of indexes, it would fill about seven thousand such pages as those of the "Reprints," and would suffice for 200 such numbers of the present series as the one we are now reviewing.¹ The reference given by our editor would apply to five different *Quæstiones* discussed, as widely separate in space in the *Summa* as they are in purport. Any one at all familiar with the "Summa" knows that it is divided into Pars Prima, Pars Secunda (which is subdivided into Pars Prima and Pars Secunda), Pars Tertia, and a Supplementum to Pars Tertia. The reference of the editor would apply equally to all these divisions, for he fails to specify; and the student would, therefore, find a Quæst. XI., Art. III., in the Pars Prima, treating the question *Utrum Deus sit unus*; in Prima Secundæ, *Utrum fruitio sit tantum ultimi finis*; in Secunda Secundæ, *Utrum hæretici sint tolerandi*; in Pars Tertia, *Utrum hæc scientia* (sc., Christi), *fuerit collativa*; and in the Supplementum, *Utrum solus sacerdos habeat sigillum confessionis*.

About this point, we can fancy our readers getting about as impatient with us as the critical editor whom we are criticizing. "Of course," we can hear them saying, "everybody knows all this." It is very clear, nevertheless, that our editor was quite oblivious of these details of accuracy. As to the short-hand in which St. Thomas is always referred to by those who quote from him, it is also very clear that our editor could not regard it in any other light than as a Chinese puzzle. We are merely trying to illustrate the parable of the "glass house"—an illustration deriving most of its force from the very brittle material of the vessel bombarding a Gibraltar that bristles with heavy ordnance and is honey-combed with galleries known only to its defenders.

The series lacks *Breadth*. Amongst all the Original Sources

¹ The Pre-Reformation Period, 34 pp.

at which the editors have sought to slake their thirst after historical truth, is there not one that furnishes limpid water? After all their fatiguing pilgrimages thither, can they not return with other than polluted waters to offer to their thirsty pupils? Did nothing good come out of Galilee? Could they not find the footprints of some saintly men and women? Could they not see the evidences—although in ruins, perchance—of some stately edifices? Is all their fetching and carrying to result in poisoning the taste and the blood of their young recruits?

We grow weary with perpetual evil; we faint for soul-food; we have groped too long in darkness; show us a little good; break to us a morsel of the bread of life; show us a star in the blackness! Were the dark ages all evil? Were our forbears all either fools, or knaves; either ferocious or fearful; either cunning or idiotic? Had they no earnest faith, no true piety, no profound learning, no heroic charity? Had they no thought for the refining influences of civilization—had they no painting, no sculpture, no architecture, no poetry, no music?

Vol. III., No. 6, of the "Reprints" tells us something about the "Pre-Reformation Period." The first subject it treats of is "Early Consciousness of the Abuses of the Church"; and under this heading we have a long extract from a ribald poem attributed to Walter Mapes, in which the Pope is a devouring lion who

" . . . laieth his bookes to pledge and thirsteth aftir gold";

the Bishop is a "Cauffe" that

" . . . dothe runne before in pasture feild, and fenne,
And gnawes and chews on that where he list best to be,
And thus he filles himselfe with goodes of other men";

the Archdeacon

" . . . is likewise the egell that dothe fie,
A robber righty cald, and sees a-farre his prairie," etc.;

the "Deane," like Pickwick in Sergeant Buzfuz's eyes, is "a being erect upon two legs, and bearing all the semblance of a man," and yet is not a man, but a monster;

"Withe fraude, desceipt, and guile fraught full as he may be,
And yet dothe hide and cloke the same as best he can,
Under pretence and shewe of plaine simplicitie";

the priest receives an ampler description of sordid villany; the "Abbottes" come next in the procession of abuse—

"Of whom their flock to leade to hell not one dothe misse";

the procession closes with the "Moncke"—

"Wurse than a moncke there is no feende nor sprite in hell."

We have selected but a few lines out of this long and complete hierarchy of evil, this ample page of detailed villany, hypocrisy, robbery, lechery, and whatever other rhymic syllables may be found in the catalogue of sin. But we have been mindful of the modesty of nature, and have spared the reader some of the lewd indelicacy of the "poem." Henry Morley prints a long extract from it in his "Shorter English Poems," and is more delicate than our editor. *À propos*, what lecturer or writer on the subject of the evils in the Church but shows an evident liking for the filth he is handling? This liking is not confined to "converted monks" and "escaped nuns."

The editor introduces the poem with a few remarks: "The student of the Reformation often forgets that it was not left for Luther first to point out the abuses in the Church. The poem . . . was written some three centuries before Luther's birth and enjoyed great popularity in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries," etc. Poor student of the Reformation—what a forgetful memory must be his! And have the labors of the pedagogues come to this? "The Vision of Piers Plowman" and "The Creed" of the same, edited with such care and so many sign-posts set up in the way to point out villanies that might otherwise escape unnoticed, and edited for young students, too—has it served no other end than as a warning to the student that his memory is defective? And has Chaucer sung in vain? and has Taine written his "English Literature" in vain? And the three-centuried "conspiracy against the truth" called History; and the modern literature of England and America, predominantly Protestant in all its ramifications; and the power of the pulpit, the rostrum, the school, the periodical press—has all this impugned Catholicity in vain? It is a poor spur—this lesson of the past—to prick the sides of the editor's intent. He might have accepted defeat graciously, and have dedicated his services to the critical crusade known as "History" by the finest students and scholars of the present era. That crusade is leading brave and venturesome and candid spirits back to the Holy Land of mediæval faith and heroism, to win it back from the barbarians who have so long thriven over its ruins.

But enough concerning the *Breadth* of the "Reprints." One dimension remains for consideration—that, namely, of

DEPTH.

It is difficult, in reading the "Reprints," to resist a growing sentiment against the qualifications of the editors for their self-imposed task. Their expressed purpose is to beget in the minds of their readers a realization of "the sequence of past events, the form and spirit of institutions, the characters of men, the prevailing habits of thought" of the broad tracts of history they seek to cover. The first "realization" likely to come to the *non-imberbis* portion of their readers is that of the editors' lack of realization of the "spirit of institutions," etc. They are courier-guides, and their pupils are tourists; and leaving the warmth and glare of the street, they are prepared to "do" some mighty minster of the olden time—some anachronism that still lasts to confound the modern architect with proportions whose correctness he divines but cannot prove; to confound the painter with canvases whose glowing life at once displays and hides the secret of a lost art; to confound the sculptor with a majesty at whose feet he sits and ponders; to overawe the poet with rainbows visibly crystallized in the broad shafts of light that glorify at once, and are glorified by

"The painted windows, freaking gloom with glow,
Dusking the sunshine which they seem to cheer";

to delight the antiquary and the historian with well-nigh illegible records in stone; to confound and to amaze and to delight all true artists and scholars and students and men of culture. The tourists and their guides have left the warmth and glare—the garish day of this nineteenth century—and are trooping merrily into the cathedral of the middle ages. They have left the warmth outside—and their first sensation being one of chilliness, they wrap themselves up more thoroughly in pleasant prejudices. They have left the glare outside—and they recognize in the unaccustomed "dim religious light" only the "darkness" of which they were forewarned. "How could the monks ever read their prayers in such a light?—why, we can't read even the title-page of the guide-book!" The guide explains that the monks didn't really pray—they only pretended to do so, in order the more thoroughly to hoodwink the superstitious people who wandered in to assist at the mummeries going forward. "And what queer statues—are they saints?" The guide explains that they are the robber-barons who built the minster and made it their graveyard. "And what is the meaning of all that stuff carved on the marble slabs?" The guide has prepared himself beforehand for such a question

by consulting a guide-book “inaccessible to most tourists”—a sort of “original source,” as it were—and with a pitying shrug of the shoulders explains that it is a lot of “barbarous Latin” which the learned men of this day find some difficulty in translating, but whose general sense is so and so. Meanwhile, their eyes becoming a little more accustomed to the gloom, they discern here and there a figure kneeling, in some dim recess, as though actually in prayer. “What are those people doing?” they whisper in amazement. “They are Romanists,” answers the guide simply. “Dear me! let us go out and get some lunch—what a queer church, and queer people, and what queer times they must have had!—and how awfully cold it was in there!—and *so* dark!”

Yes, it is all queer; and while it was essential to a completed “culture” that you should suffer the boredom of sight-seeing, you are mighty glad to have it all over. Your education is now finished—quite; and you are now thoroughly equipped to write, to lecture, to teach, with the added authority of “one who has been there and seen it for one’s self.”

We have found how vividly the religious life of the thirteenth century—that “heroic age” of monasticism—is portrayed in Vol. II., No. 4.¹ Mr. Munro showed us how queer—how very funny—it all was; and lest we should pass that pamphlet over through a careless neglect of its promising title, another editor (Vol. III., No. 6) commends it to our attention as follows: “Here the reader will find some specimens of a literature which tells us more of the religion of the people than can be derived from any other source.” Sure enough, what a queer people they must have been.

But there are some queer things about Mr. Munro’s work, too. First of all, his punctuation is queer. The first of his “Tales of the Virgin” is entitled: “Virgin saves matron and monk, who elope with treasures of monastery.” If the art of punctuation was not devised, like the deceitful beacons of the “wreckers” of old, to lure the unsuspecting to destruction (of sense and sanity), this title means that the Virgin saves a monk and a matron who, having been saved thus, elope, etc. The reader of the tale finds that the comma has quite deluded him; for, as it now seems, the elopement took place first and the saving afterwards—the “Virgin” performing the part of a *deus ex machina*. Together with this utter disregard of the distinction to be made between a

¹ *Monastic Tales of the XIIIth Century.*

restrictive and an unrestrictive relative clause, the sentence revels in a misuse of the "historical present" such as its author, a professed historian, should have been at special pains to avoid. Another example is found in the first of the "Tales of the Devil," whose title runs thus: "Devil confesses that he entered a woman, because she was delivered to him by her husband." What is intended to be conveyed by the comma? As the sentence stands, it means, or ought to mean, that the Devil confesses because the woman was delivered to him by her husband. The writer desired to say, we surmise (for we have not read the tale), that the Devil did not confess because, etc., but that he entered the woman because, etc.

Satis superque of this kind of editing, or we should feel inclined to scrutinize at some length the farrago of editorial nonsense found in the "Monastic Tales of the XIIIth Century." We refer the reader back to a slight quotation made already *à propos* of the tales of the Virgin. *Quot sententiæ, tot errores*—and ludicrous ones, too. The learning is unquestionably profound which hides so thoroughly from the recognition of the reader the gigantic but lovely figure of S. Bernard under the masquerading name of "Bernhard." This is the pedantry of Freeman run mad. The students, too, being well versed in the technical phraseology of Scholasticism, will immediately perceive the meaning of the editor's reference (wholly unexplained) to "the *hyperdulia* of Thomas Aquinas." Students in our colleges and universities are, of course, "well up" in such things nowadays. They universally understand the "infallibility" of the Pope to mean that he cannot sin—and this, too, despite their equally profound knowledge of Latin. *Impeccable* and *infallible* are the same thing to them—and they are equally indifferent to both. In illustration of this fact, we venture to record here two anecdotes. It was at this very University of Pennsylvania that we once sat under a Rev. Professor of History, himself a broad-minded, scholarly, and devout man.

A propos of some historical question, he took occasion to enlighten the students as to the real meaning of "infallibility," and he explained the Catholic doctrine ably and clearly, taking special care to differentiate "infallibility" and "impeccability." We glanced around at the faces of the students, and, although some eighteen years have passed since that day, we recollect clearly our feeling of amazement at the total indifference to the whole explanation manifested by the impassive faces of the class. Nevertheless, it was at the same University that a young man who was preparing to enter a Protestant seminary to study for the

ministry remarked to a Catholic friend that, after all, the Catholics were not so unreasonable as a certain sect of Protestantism; for that whereas that particular sect claimed impeccability for all its members, the Catholics asserted that only one man—the Pope—could not sin!

"THE LIFE OF ST. COLUMBAN."

Before concluding this review of the series it is a real pleasure to be able to change the note of censure for one of sincere praise. "The Life of St. Columban" (Vol. II., No. 7) is a double number of 36 pages. Short as the "Life" is, it nevertheless is a full translation of the classic work of the Abbot Jonas. It therefore is what it pretends to be—an ample "original source." It does not err by the selection of a large theme and its compression into inadequate limits. The very selection itself is evidence of *Breadth*—an evidence singularly lacking in the issues we have been considering. And its *Depth* is not unsatisfactory; for the Introduction and the occasional editorial notes are happily conceived. Not falling, therefore, under the same criticism as the other issues, it has been given the distinction of a separate and discriminating title in this paper, and constitutes a class by itself. Mr. Munro is to be congratulated on his labors in this number. The translation is a piece of very attractive and thoroughly idiomatic English; so much so, indeed, that one would scarce fancy that he was reading a translation. St. Columban's life is a romantic as well as an instructive and edifying Number. Let us have more of such happy journeyings to the Original Sources of European history.

May we, in this connection, venture on a word of suggestion to the editor? It is a pity that work otherwise so admirable, should suffer from blemishes of proof-reading. Educational literature should aim at the highest excellence in the matter of a correct typography, for the average student is quite unable to judge of such a matter for himself. He is too young to have had much experience in the ability of the printer to make nonsense of a passage, to misspell words, to drop or change a numeral whose significance a mere printer may be excused for not apprehending. The student's mind—even though he be advanced to the dignity of a collegian—is still very much of a *tabula rasa*, ready to receive and, unfortunately, to retain, an erroneous as well as a correct spelling, date, statement. In the "Life" we have noticed three misprints, as well as some few slips of the pen. For instance, the word *Patrologiæ* occurs twice, and is twice misprinted *Patrilogiæ*.

Again, the printer has dropped a numeral from the foot-note on p. 36, so that "eleventh day before the Kalends of December" appears in the foot-note as "November 1st," instead of "November 21st." Again, in a foot-note on p. 5 occurs the expression "County of Ulster" instead of "Province of Ulster." These things are, indeed, trifles—but trifles make or mar perfection.

A few suggestions in the matter of the editorial comment of this issue, and our "censure of wisdom" shall have expressed itself—"and there an end." In the *Introduction* the editor says: "The language of Jonas is almost classical. But, unfortunately, he had little of the classical feeling for purity of style, and his writings are bombastic in the extreme." The classical feeling for purity of style, if Jonas had it not, he at least seems to have striven to attain. And the word "bombastic" seems hardly a discriminating adjective to apply to a style richly decked out in purple and gold, when one recalls the rolling periods in laudation of Archias and Milo or in denunciation of Catiline and Verres. Latin is not English, nor were the classical trappings of rhetoric at all similar to those of modern English. The Romance tongues still possess a verbal and phrasal luxuriance wholly indigenous, and not easily or very successfully transplantable into our colder clime and ruder soil. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that "it is difficult to put his Latin into English," or that the editor found himself "unable to determine the exact connection of some clauses with the context—if they have any." In such cases he "translated literally, hoping that others might see a connection which" he missed. We venture to suggest that it would have proved additionally serviceable in such cases if the editor had printed the whole passage in the original Latin, as a foot-note. The reader might have been able thus to gather some connection.

The first sentence of the translation reads: "St. Columban, who is also called Columba, was born on the island of Ireland"—which is correct enough. Still, there was room here for a foot-note that should safeguard the student from confounding two great saints, both of whom were born in Ireland and in the sixth century; both of whom left their native land and became wonderful missionaries; both of whom had most romantic histories, and both of whom have entered largely into history and literature. The student might easily confound the two—especially in view of the fact that the one "qui et dicitur Columba" is not thus known in our literature, while the one "qui dicitur Columba" without the "et" is widely known as both "Columba" and Colum-cille—but most widely as simple "Columba"!

On page 7 is another foot-note correcting what Mabillon and others consider a misstatement of Jonas, who says that Sigibert was king of both Austrasia and Burgundy. Jonas here (*perhaps!*) made a mistake, and the editor of the “Vita” in Migne points it out with fullness and candor, but shows how naturally Jonas fell into the error. Our editor despatches the matter (as it seems to us) too sententiously, as follows: “Wrong; Sigibert died 575, and was king only of Austrasia.” He might have stated the correction from Migne as gently as he found it made there, if not for the sake of the reputation of Jonas, at least for that sentiment of modesty in learning which young students so sadly lack, and in the cultivation of which they should ever find a strong object-lesson in the example of their teachers.

On page 5 is another note calling attention to a translation of a Biblical text found in the “Vita.” The text is: “Ignem veni mittere in terram, quem volo ut ardeat” (Luc. xii, 49). The editor has translated it: “I am come to send fire on the earth; and what will I, if it be already kindled?” The foot-note says: “I have followed the King James version for the translation. The Vulgate, which is quoted here, reads *quem volo ut ardeat.*” Of course, the Vulgate does not read *quem volo ut ardeat*, but *quid volo nisi ut accendatur*. There are several known variants of the text—the one approaching nearest to that of the “Vita,” as far as we have been able to learn, being *quam volo ut ardeat*, used more than once by S. Jerome. But all this is of less consequence, as it seems to us, than the frank avowal that the editor has disregarded his original entirely in rendering it into English. But, doubtless, if S. Columbanus had had the King James version he would have preferred it to whatever version he really had—or, perhaps, even to the Revised version of to-day, which differs here from the King James version. And elsewhere the editor makes an English rendering which varies greatly from the original Latin found in the “Vita”—and without noting the fact for the information of the reader. Was S. Columbanus an Anglican parson?

Neither does he transfer to his own pages the Biblical references found in Migne; so that the student is left in ignorance of the wide extent of those references, and therefore of the Biblical knowledge of S. Columbanus (or, it may be, of the abbot Jonas).

Another note which we desiderate in the translation. In the “Vita” we read: “Huic soboles nulla erat, ut Juvencus de Zacharia et Elizabeth ait:

The editor renders thus: "He had no children; in order that, as Juvencus says of Zachariah and Elizabeth, 'the gift might be more welcome to those who had already given up hope.'" A foot-note would have helped the reader to the fact that a hexameter verse was being rendered. All these suggestions concern slight matters, it is true; but they nevertheless make for perfection in the laborious work of editing.

THE DIMENSIONS.

Our tape-line, literal and figurative, has done its work—and the result seems to require a revision of the *Dimensions*. The *Length* should have been styled *Brevity*; the *Breadth, Narrowness*; and the *Depth, Superficiality*. The editors have journeyed—a vacation-trip—to the Great Lakes of the "Original Sources of European History"; have dipped their tourist-cups into the silent depths; and have returned with these cupfuls as specimens of the scenery. If the water were more limpid, doubtless it would invite to deeper draughts. But who wishes to be poisoned with muddy water?

The length of the pamphlets would have been ample for much more restricted themes than the ones selected, and the palates of the students would not have been over-surfeited with bulky "Reprints." "The Life of St. Columban" is an illustration of appropriate *Length*. It takes up one definite and self-restricted theme, and despatches it, therefore, in limits necessarily placed by that theme. Neither is it unsatisfactory in the other dimensions. It required some breadth of mind to select it; and its fine descriptiveness of the age and the spirit of the age it illuminates, together with its unique authenticity and authority as an "original source" for the study of that age, is a testimony to the depth of insight required for such a task as its editor undertook to perform.

The series as it stands, therefore, will bring home to our minds the conviction that we are, as Lowell so searchingly puts it in "The Cathedral," children

"Of an age that lectures, not creates,
Plastering our swallow-nests on the awful past,
And twittering round the work of larger men,
As we had builded what we but deface."

H. T. HENRY.

THE RESTORATION OF CATHOLICITY IN
GENEVA.

II.

THE year 1813 was destined to be a memorable one in Genevan annals. When the Allied Armies approached the French frontiers, Geneva, which had already for some time been a centre for most of the mental and intellectual ferment, stimulated by such writers as Madame de Staël, Benjamin Constant and Sismondi, did not even await the departure of the body of French officials, who were summoned back to their own country, ere a National Provisional Government was hurriedly formed, with the avowed object not only of temporary administration, but of bringing back the former independence of a Republic; and when the Austrians, under General Bubna, entered the city, they found its new automatic administration in full working order. A delegation from this Town Council was despatched to Bâle, where the Allies were stationed, to beg their favorable consideration for the town, and one of their number remained with the army as it moved onward, in the hope of serving in some way the interests of his country by doing so. The instructions of these deputies, in so far as they had received definite ones, appear to have been to present to the Sovereigns of Europe the following claims: 1st, they asked for the recognition of the political independence of Geneva by the Powers; 2d, that it should be made into a Canton and form part of the recognized "Swiss Confederation," and 3d, that a certain amount of territory should be added to it.

Strange as it may seem, however, it was the existence of this last claim which proved their bane; for the good people of Geneva were by no means agreed as to the amount of foreign territory not only that they wished to claim, but even that they were willing to accept! For the chief preoccupation of Genevan legislators was how they could best preserve their city—their dear virgin Protestant Rome—in its primal, or at least seventeenth and eighteenth century, simplicity of doctrine; and it occurred to the venerable Consistory, as a terrible and much-to-be-avoided evil, that if they became possessed of a large amount of Catholic territory, such as Gex, the Chablais and part of Savoy, which for their own unscrutable reasons the Powers desired to present them with, the preponderance of Catholic subjects, and therefore Catholic

voters, would become considerable, and tend to swamp the Calvinistic element which ruled their town. The more bigoted among them, therefore, were strongly disposed to hold out against any (political) part or fellowship with the surrounding districts, and, while acquiescing in a federal union with the other Swiss cantons, to preserve the narrow limits of their primitive townships undisturbed. In fact, they looked back with regret to the "good old times" when Calvin reigned undisturbed within a very narrow limit, and even suburbs and boulevards were cut away to make room for the most rigid city walls which ever resisted an "escalade."

But to render the dilemma still more perplexing, not only did the Powers propose to insist on presenting Geneva with a large tract of unwelcome Catholic territory, but the rest of the Confederation—Switzerland—required of Geneva that before joining them she should draw together and make compact her somewhat fragmentary domain; while a further counsel of prudence warned them not to wound the susceptibilities of France by assisting in her threatened dismemberment. There were three more or less distinct parties in Geneva: Those who refused any aggrandizement of territory, at any price; those who were willing to accept just what was necessary to connect certain outlying districts with the townships, and those who, with large ambitions, proposed the acceptance of the whole neighboring district round the lake. Of course, in a town like Geneva, the whole political question was in reality a religious one; and the extreme party indignantly asked, "What could be done if the proposed territory was made one with themselves, that is to say, 110,000 Catholics as against 32,000 Protestants?" It would be a case of suicide, they argued, for "it is not on account of its extent that Geneva is something; it is on account of its religious influence. To encroach upon that influence is to destroy it, and to destroy it is to decapitate Geneva."

It may easily be inferred that to bigoted minds but one step further was needed to recall to them the fact that Catholicism had, in very truth, begun to reassert itself among them, and they began to cry out that "the devouring cancer" which had begun to eat them away for the last fifteen years (under French protection) must now be rooted out. The Church of St. Germain, they decided, must be taken from the Catholics.

When the French officials quitted Geneva, and the Allied Armies entered in their stead, the first belief and hope of the Genevese was that the Catholic curé and his *vicaires* would retire in their

train, and they manifested their disappointment at his continued presence by hootings and insults to the priests as they passed along the streets. "You will not go, then! you are waiting to be hunted out," they yelled after M. Vuarin and his companions, as he has recorded himself in his memoirs. It was a perilous moment—not for himself, but that he saw his labors of ten years past about to be brought to nought, church and schools closed, nuns banished, his people left spiritually destitute. He looked round, and saw no reasonable hope of support; neither the Protestant Provisional Government nor the semi-infidel Austrian general would give him even the half-hearted encouragement of the departing French; so, with his marvellous clear-sightedness and audacious quickness of action, he decided to take a very bold step. When the government deputy left Geneva for Bâle, to plead their cause before the Allied Sovereigns, M. Vuarin left too, almost simultaneously, in one of the frequent and secret journeys to which he was addicted, and to which he had accustomed his entourage. On arriving at Bâle he procured a letter of recommendation to the Prince de Schwarzenberg, general-in-chief of the Allied Armies, and then proceeded on his way. It was a bold game, but a hazardous one—the Swiss deputies and the Catholic curé, each unknown to one another, hastening along the same road, the one with such helps as might be won for them by their semi-official position, yet, even so, greatly impeded in their journey by "the want of forage and other necessaries," which induced some of their number to turn back half-way; the other, a solitary, unprotected individual, more than unpopular both in creed and person, fighting his way through these same "obstacles" by sheer force of will. A fortunate, we may say providential, accident helped the brave jurist at this juncture in a manner as unexpected as effectual. While on his way to the headquarters of the Allies he arrived at some small town (its name has not transpired) and found himself unable to proceed further. Putting up for the night at the principal hotel of the place, he met and made acquaintance with a Russian Pope, also on his way to headquarters; and the latter was so charmed with our curé, whose manners indeed, as we have already remarked, were exceedingly dignified and gracious, that he offered him a seat in his own carriage. Nothing could have been more fortunate; and, thus protected and escorted, M. Vuarin passed through the long tract of country, half-impassable under its winter snows, and wholly infested by bands of pillaging and devastating Cossacks, not only in safety, but with honor, his courteous protector beguiling the way with every attention and civility.

Thus helped on his journey, M. Vuarin arrived safely at Vesoul, obtained an audience of Prince Schwarzenberg, and was very cordially received by that personage, who presented him with letters to Prince Metternich and to General Bubna, requesting this latter to take the curé of Geneva under his protection, to pay him his salary as the former government had done, and to see that he received, during the Austrian occupation of Geneva, all the consideration and respect due to his rank and merit. He added to these letters a safe-conduct back to Bâle, where the Allied Sovereigns were then stationed.

Armed with these documents, our intrepid curé returned to Bâle, where he arrived on the very same day that the Protestant Genevan delegates were admitted to an audience with the Sovereigns on behalf of their city, and great was their astonishment when they beheld their ever-active and almost ubiquitous enemy, the Catholic priest, *there before them!* Two days afterwards he presented to Prince Metternich a note on the preservation of the Church and the Catholic institutions in Geneva, and the Prince, in reply, promised them the protection of Austria, presented the petitioner to the two Emperors (of Austria and Russia), and showed his royal master the note in question, thereby evoking a substantial donation in favor of M. Vuarin and his charities. Contrary, too, to the frequent accusations of M. Vuarin's enemies, who reproached him with being hostile and indifferent to his country, it appears that the good curé took advantage of his favorable reception by the Powers to say a word in favor of Genevan independence; and so he returned victorious to his anxious and beloved parishioners.

When the repartition of Europe took place, and

"L'Angleterre prit l'aigle, et l'Autriche l'aiglon,"

while many an older and nobler nationality was swept away, Geneva, the Protestant Rome, received what she had petitioned for—her independence and union with the Swiss Confederation. Very little territory, after all, was conceded to her; and well, indeed, that it was so, for her first independent efforts were again, as before, to extirpate the "canker" of Catholicism which, thanks to its energetic representative, had hitherto so bravely weathered the storm. M. Vuarin redoubled his activity to meet this new danger, travelled incessantly here and there, corresponded with Vienna and Turin, engaged the interest and co-operation of the Papal Nuncio, and among other interesting relations received and entertained, and won the warm sympathies of the venerable Monsignor della Genga, afterwards Pope Leo XII. Casting about to

find one who, better than himself, could represent the Catholic interests of Geneva in the political world, among the Councils and Courts of the Allied Powers, his choice fell upon one whose very name told eloquently of that cause, Count Paul-François de Sales, greatnephew of St. Francis. The character of this nobleman may be guessed by a charming little anecdote which is related of him. When some one asked the Comte de la Ferronnays "whether M. de Sales was as pious as his celebrated uncle, the great Bishop of Geneva?" "St. Francis?" replied he; "St. Francis was but a feather-brain (un égrillard) in comparison with his greatnephew!" In more and more prosaic words, he was "an old-fashioned Savoyard, devoted, intelligent, thoroughly and unflinchingly Christian"; and M. Vuarin himself had, so to speak, made him, having been the one to draw him out of the obscurity of a country gentleman's retired life, to become the diplomat and the courtier. Once the interests of his congregation were in the hands of this faithful friend, M. Vuarin felt and expressed himself comparatively safe; but a long and doubtful period was to supervene, during which, for many months, the very existence of Catholicism in Geneva was destined to hang in the balance.

The reunion of a considerable portion of Catholic territory to Protestant Geneva, in 1816, began a new era in the administration of that city. The arbitrary reparation of Europe by the Allies resulted, in many countries, in a lamentable subjugation of Catholic territories to Protestant Governments, as in some of the submerged German States. All States have a natural tendency to override and oppress the Church; still more, of course, those Protestant Governments which cannot, by their very nature, brook the principle of doctrinal authority which is involved in the very idea of the Catholic Church. Consequently, while the laity belonging to these severed communes accepted their change with little concern, having already been accustomed to look on Geneva as their chief centre of material interests and prosperity, their clergy bitterly resented it. They were, in the first place, the more educated portion of the community; they were Savoyards; they were members of a French diocese, and they could not but feel themselves exiled from both patriotic and religious comradeship, to be placed under a hostile and even persecuting power, which was continually preoccupied with plans for stamping out Catholicism in its own city. The Genevan authorities, too, began by posing hostilely from the outset, and thus two camps were speedily formed.

M. Vuarin himself, the cleverest head, as well as the recog-

nized chief among the clergy, tried hard, in vain, to persuade the authorities to use some moderation in their dealings with the Catholic party. "If you wish us to agree," he said one day to some member of the great Council, "govern like philosophers." "Like philosophers, M. le Curé?" exclaimed his astonished questioner; "you are not thinking of what you are saying!" "Yes, gentlemen, like philosophers," insisted the curé. "Have, as private individuals, your own religion, and practise it; but, as magistrates, be neither Catholic nor Protestant; be philosophers, that is to say, be impartial; by which I do not mean to infer," he added, smiling, "that you should govern like unbelievers!"

Could anything be wiser or fairer than this recommendation? Nevertheless, his interlocutors did not take the hint, and difficulties of the gravest kind were constantly arising, especially on such important points as the question of secular or religious primary schools, the observance of feasts or days of obligation, the marriage laws, including those touching mixed marriages and divorce, and that of ecclesiastical nominations. As an instance of the extremely biased tone of the administration, an appropriate anecdote here speaks for itself: On the 29th of January, 1817, the Feast of S. Francis of Sales, Patron of Savoy, some Protestant inhabitants of Vandœuvres went, out of bravado, to work the ground in the Catholic commune of Chonlex. The Adjoint, or assistant to the Mayor, requested them to desist, and on their refusal, summoned them to retire, and called for the assistance of the *garde-champêtre* and two other guards to turn them out. The intruders were forced to retire, leaving their implements of work in the hands of the communal authority, after a determined resistance, which provoked the latter to issue a summons against them. What was the Adjoint's amazement when, far from his authority being recognized or upheld, he was arrested himself, together with the three guards, accused of *infringing the liberty of the subject*, imprisoned, fined and degraded from his post. What wonder that a Catholic population were indignant at this open insult to their leaders and their religion? We are informed that the same insult has since been constantly offered by the Protestant members of the community to their Catholic brethren in these districts.

It must not be supposed for a moment that the constant polemics and semi-political struggles in which M. Vuarin was engaged were allowed to infringe in any way upon his parochial duties. On the contrary, he was talked of as "curé jusqu'au bout des ongles." In the year 1817 a terrible famine broke out over the whole of Europe, and Geneva suffered like the rest, espe-

cially M. Vuarin's flock, which, being principally composed of work-people, servants and so on, were the class which suffered most. Both he and his *Sœurs de Charité* expended sums which can only be described as enormous, for the relief of actual want, while on the other hand Geneva, as one of our authorities bitterly remarks, "thought less of relieving the poor than of humiliating the Catholics." It was almost another case of the "soupers" in Ireland. The Protestant charities of Geneva drew the line at "strangers," which, for the most part, meant the unhappy Catholic Savoyards, and refused absolutely any concurrence with the *Sœurs de Charité*; while, when they sent help to the starving villagers of Savoy, it was with tempting suggestions, such as, "If you were Protestants, you would not be in this misery; it is a Catholic Government (Piedmont) which is leaving you to die of hunger."

Every new incident, every turn of the wheel, as it were, showed more and more clearly the deliberate and undying antagonism of Geneva and its rulers to the Catholic element in their midst, and M. Vuarin could not but feel that he himself was the sole pivot and centre upon which that element depended, and that, his own influence and personality once removed, whether by death or other occasion, the whole fabric which he had so patiently built up would probably fall to pieces. His earnest desire, therefore, was so to establish both Church and nuns that they would stand alone on a firm footing, and to this end he sought to establish and endow in perpetuity his little community of Sisters. An unforeseen circumstance helped to bring this about. In 1818—just when the terrible famine had proved a more than usual drain on the always precarious, though abundant, resources which M. Vuarin gathered so indefatigably from far and near—a very eligible house, close to the Church of St. Germain and to the Sisters' temporary abode, was for sale. It was, as they felt, a chance which might not occur again, and the good curé was extremely anxious to avail himself of it. Although, therefore, he had little available money in hand, he trusted in Providence on that score, and commissioned a trusty friend to commence negotiations in his own name, well knowing that the house would never be sold to the Catholic curé. The price was fixed, the bargain almost concluded, when the ever-watchful authorities warned the seller to "look well as to who is the real purchaser. You will be compromised in the eyes of your fellow-citizens," they said, "if you help to install nuns in Calvin's city." So, when the contracting parties appeared before the notary, and the signatures were about to be appended to the deed

of sale, the seller demanded, before signing, "*the name of the real purchaser.*" As he suspected, it was M. Vuarin; and quick as thought the rejoinder came. He refused to sell. Finally the nominal buyer was forced to become a genuine purchaser, and to re-sell, in his turn, the property in question, involving double expenses of tax and stamp duties. Fortunately they effected the transfer quickly, and registered the sale, for no sooner was the affair known than the lawyer was summoned before the Syndic to answer for his part in the affair, and overwhelmed with reproaches and abuse. The Council of State was immediately convoked, and at its first sitting passed a law *interdicting strangers from acquiring property in the Canton of Geneva.* It was rather like "locking the door when the steed was stolen." Then the enraged magistrates attacked the curé openly. "In what quality had he become a house proprietor in Geneva?" they asked him. "I bought because I had the right to do so!" he replied. In vain they sought to make him commit himself to some assertion as to whether he considered himself a citizen or a stranger; he declined to say. "If he would not reply, they would declare his purchase null and void," they threatened. "Null?" queried the priest, "but, M. le Syndic, you doubtless forget that we are not in Turkey or in China? There are laws and courts here; if you believe my action to be invalid you can attack it legally, and I can defend myself." They dared not bring the question into open court, not being sure of their ground; but one of their number was deputed to examine into the affair, and they found, to their chagrin, that by a law of the 16th November, 1816, "all persons were citizens of Geneva who, domiciled on the old or the new territory, and professing the Christian religion, was proprietor of any portion of territory whatsoever on the soil of the republic on the 16th of March, 1816. Now the curé of Geneva had been domiciled in the chef-tien, or chief town, of the Canton since 1806; he "professed the Christian religion," and the tax-record showed him to be a land-owner in three different communes under Genevese rule. So his claim was unimpeachable, and the Sœurs de Charité received their new house. It was paid for and endowed by some of the generous contributions his eloquent pen evoked from Catholics on all sides, only one of which we can here note—a sum of 3000 francs from Pope Pius VII., who, in a Brief in which he "regrets being reduced to the necessity of offering so small a sum," assures his devoted son that "We know with what devotion you cultivate that lately-planted vine, . . . and We heartily embrace this occasion of showing Our affection for you."

During these semi-private and personal disputes between M. Vuarin and the Genevan Government, a greater and even more important one was in course of discussion between Rome and the Powers. Geneva, for her own ends, demanded the transfer of her Catholic parishes from the diocese of Chambéry to that of "some Swiss bishops," and those who knew best, M. Vuarin among them, opposed the change. The question has played so important a part in Genevan ecclesiastical affairs of late years that we cannot pass it over here, and a memoir, drawn up by M. Vuarin, in the name of the clergy of the "separated" communes, who deputed him to carry it to Genoa, where the Pope was then residing, shows better than any more recent explanation their feelings in the matter, as well as the attitude of those who, both before and after this time, held the same ground.

After recalling the events which led to certain parishes from France and Savoy being united to the new Canton of Geneva, and the Article which provided for their remaining under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Chambéry, the memoir goes on to recapitulate the dangers likely to arise from this supremacy of "Protestant Rome" over Catholic country places, and the greater need which therefore arose for strict and continual surveillance by ecclesiastical authority—a surveillance which could not, so they argued, be adequately maintained by any Swiss bishop—the memoir proceeded in words to the following effect :

"The diocese of St. Francis de Sales, where priests abound, whose ecclesiastical traditions are in full force and vigor, is the only one which can fulfil this mission. Fribourg cannot do so; it is far away, geographically speaking, poor in priests, relaxed in discipline, lies at the mercy of a Protestant 'Helvetian Diet,' unprotected, as is Chambéry by a Catholic State (Piedmont), and moreover differing essentially from all the habits, ways of thinking and language, from the orphaned parishes."

Such was the memoir presented by "the wise and venerable priest of this anxious and troubled church" to the chief pastor, and much diplomatic discussion followed between Nuncio, Genevese delegates, cardinals, and diplomats, great stress being laid on certain ecclesiastical abuses which were then prevalent in Switzerland, as a result of the obstructiveness of the various Cantonal administrations, and which, we may add, have at this day, more especially in the diocese of Fribourg, given place to a thoroughly pious, strict, and well-ordered discipline in that city, called by its neighbors "le petit Rome," under the sway of a succession of wise and saintly bishops.

Through all the long struggle—a conflict lasting for *years*, with the usual "red-tapeism" and lengthy correspondence (in one place

we find a Roman cardinal receiving an important letter from the Genevan Council, which he left for nearly two years unanswered)—it was recognized on all hands that M. Vuarin was the centre and chief of the opposition. He had his supporters in every court—Rome, Vienna, Turin, Paris, Sardinia, the Swiss Nunciature. As his bishop (of Chambéry) wrote :

“You conduct your operations like a real general, my dear friend ; you have your outposts, your spies, your auxiliaries but alas ! I fear that all will be of no avail.”

Following his example, then, his opponents essayed to fight him with his own weapons ; they commissioned one of their principal men, a Syndic named M. de la Rive, who had always been friendly with the curé of Geneva, to *talk him over*. Various tête-à-tête dejeuners and amicable discussions are recorded in M. Vuarin's letters, at this time, between M. de la Rive and himself, and the former argued plausibly enough :

“The union with a Swiss diocese would pacify everything as if by enchantment ; we would give you a seminary in Geneva itself ; we would arrange for an endowment (des bourses) ; you should go yourself to Fribourg and arrange the terms of union with the new bishop. What matters it to you that your captain should live at Fribourg or at Chambéry ? He is your captain all the same !”

To all these arguments M. Vuarin remained deaf, and however acceptable they may appear to us at this day, we can hardly judge, as he did, of their reasonableness at that moment. The fight continued, the Powers intervened on the side of the Genevan magistrates, and at last, on the 20th September, 1819, a Papal Brief, “*Inter multiplices*,” transferred the Catholic parishes of the Canton of Geneva from the diocese of Chambéry to that of Lausanne and Fribourg.

It was a terrible blow to M. Vuarin, as also to the Archbishop of Chambéry, whose consent was not even asked, but who submitted in the humblest and most whole-hearted manner. Unfortunately for M. Vuarin, the Papal Nuncio, who resided at Lucerne, and had always been most friendly with him, was changed about this time, and his successor, a certain M. Glütz, was, so we are told, a time-serving and subservient courtier, submitting to and currying favor with the Genevese Government. On the publication of the Papal Brief he immediately repaired to Geneva, treated its curé with insolence and disdain, and formally announced the transfer of the parish to its new diocese without observing any form of courtesy either towards Mgr. de Solle, of Chambéry, or his priests. Mgr. Yenni, of Fribourg, however, the new diocesan,

was more considerate, and immediately placed himself in correspondence with Mgr. de Solle, who referred him for all business details to M. Vuarin, "that worthy ecclesiastic in whom you will find all the information acquired by experience and sound judgment." He parted from his former subjects with a letter which, as Joseph de Maistre wrote of it, was "a masterpiece of goodness, of attachment, and of stifled sorrow." His orphaned Genevan clergy replied in the following touching words :

"As of old the Jews, exiled to a strange land, turned their eyes towards Jerusalem to call down upon their nation the former mercies of the God of Israel, so we prostrate ourselves in spirit before the shrine of the Apostle of the Chablais, and we say to him, 'Count us still among the number of thy children!' You have blessed us already, Monseigneur! As Bishop, as Father, as Friend, as Aged One in the shadow of the Altar! Bless us again! Each one of us asks this grace of you! *Non dimittam te, donec benedixeris mihi!*"

And now we approach a most important period in the history of Catholicism in Geneva. Its new bishop, Mgr. Yenni, of Fribourg, though a most saintly man personally, was, in his official capacity, both lamentably weak and also unhappily inclined to yield on every side and to the utmost possible limit to "the powers that be." In fact, his character was the strongest possible contrast to that of the curé of Geneva, whose failing was rather on the side of extreme sternness and unyielding severity. Accustomed, too, as was the bishop to the restraints and state of absolute subservience in which the Church in Vaud, Neuchâtel, and Berne (the Protestant portions of his diocese), and even in Catholic Fribourg, was held, he found, as he constantly asserted, that "really the Catholic religion was freer in the Canton of Geneva than in all the rest of his diocese"; and when its Council of State (only the mouthpiece of that all-powerful factor, the Protestant Consistory of Pastors) essayed to treat with, or rather to hoodwink him into making dangerous concessions with regard to Catholic liberties, he fell blindfold into the snare, in spite of all the warnings of the wiser and more experienced M. Vuarin, with results which were destined to be fatally far-reaching in their effect, even down to the present day.

During the visit before referred to of the Papal Nuncio, M. Glütz (formerly Vicar-General of Bâle), a proposition had been made to him by the Gevenese Government of an "arrangement" or *modus vivendi* to be entered into between themselves and the ecclesiastical authorities. He was found to be so easy-going and temporizing, during their discussions, that on his departure the concessions discussed were crystallized into a formal "conven-

tion," and submitted as such to Mgr. Yenni, who, to M. Vuarin's horror and despair, accepted and signed what was virtually the forfeiture of Catholic independence in Geneva. The principal heads of this agreement were as follows :

1. The bishop of the diocese was, before nominating new parish priests, to submit their names to the Council of State, and if they objected to the nominee, to put him aside and choose another.

2. At the installation of each curé or rector, the Genevan Council was to send an officer of their own to introduce and present the pastor to his new flock.

3. Every curé was to take the following oath before the Town Syndic : "I swear to do nothing contrary to the safety and tranquillity of the State, to preach to my parishioners submission to the laws, obedience to the magistrates, and union with my fellow-citizens. I swear to obey the established order of things as conscientiously as I will obey, in religion, the orders of the Church and of my ecclesiastical superiors."

4. The Council on its part promised to maintain two or three theological students, *chosen by itself*, at the Fribourg Seminary, and to contribute a certain sum yearly to that institution.

5. The Council promised a yearly stipend to the bishop.

It seems that these last two articles had induced at least the Nuncio to forget far weightier questions at issue. The convention was accepted and signed by Mgr. Yenni, under a verbal reserve of subjection to Rome's approval, which was never referred to at Geneva, nor obtained from Rome. The bishop, indeed, refused to permit a suggested clause relative to the publication of Papal Briefs or Bulls, but bound himself personally, and without enjoining his successors, to communicate his pastorals to the Genevan Government before sending them out. The latter body then supplemented their convention by passing the following Cantonal laws :

1. That the Bulls, Briefs, and other acts emanating from the Court of Rome cannot be received or published in the Canton without the permission of the Council.

2. That no pastoral, instruction, or other writing, containing clauses contrary to the Federal agreement, etc., be printed or made public.

3. That the Council can order the retention of ecclesiastical stipends for various infractions of law.

And it appears that these laws were so rigorously enforced that for several years the priests of Genevan parishes knew the acts of Rome only through public papers or posters ; but, their government having also arrogated to itself the right of issuing to

them the bishop's pastorals, the village curés sent back to Fribourg the first of these documents which reached them through that channel, with a declaration that they "considered as not received all publications of that nature which reached them through Protestant magistrates."

Perhaps, however, those among the bishop's entourage who were not such hardened defenders of the Church's rights as was our good M. Vuarin may have considered the above concessions well given in exchange for an event which speedily followed the conclusion of the above negotiations. After three hundred years of spiritual eclipse, Geneva once more received a solemn pastoral visit. Monseigneur de Fribourg, in full canonicals, received ceremoniously by a delegate of the government and lodged at its expense, came to Geneva in the month of August, 1820, and there administered the Sacrament of Confirmation in the ancient Church of St. Germain. Later, the curés of the Canton assembled before him, welcomed him duly, but declined to take the oath referred to in the new convention unless authorized by Rome to do so. After some delay, the Sovereign Pontiff, reassured upon a doubtful point, gave the required permission; and M. Vuarin, who government *hoped* would prove refractory, submitted, and remained the diligent, active, *hated* incumbent of the parish of Geneva. Not that he would not have been welcomed elsewhere. Over and over again did he receive offers of ecclesiastical dignities. As far back as 1817 Mgr. de Solle had made him the most pressing offers, sending him a nomination as Vicar-General of Chambéry, and giving him to understand that he was named in ecclesiastical circles as the first bishop of the about-to-be-restored See of Annecy—the See of St. Francis—than which nothing could more effectually touch the heart of a Savoyard. The bishop of Troyes, on the other side, had long ago entreated him to accept a vicar-generalship under himself; the Duc de Noailles, one of his most intimate friends, wrote to him from London: "The day will come when you will have to yield to the Hand above, which draws you in spite of yourself to the episcopate." Count della Margarita, the First Minister of Charles Felix of Piedmont, offered him "a mitre in his own country, Savoy," over and over again, "but he always refused," wrote the count in his "Memoirs," "saying that a good soldier cannot quit the battlefield, and that he would not exchange his poor parish in the midst of Protestant Rome for the first bishopric in the world."

And so it was—as he so often repeated to those who would fain have persuaded him to bring his splendid zeal, his active brain,

his grand capacity for organization, to the service of other and less thankless fields of labor, in the words he had used in the beginning: "When one is named Curé of Geneva, one goes there, one stays there, and one dies." The Government of the town hated him, and would have "moved heaven and earth," if possible, to procure his dismissal; Rome remarked him little at this time—we had almost said neglected him; to his Bishop he was a somewhat irksome zealot, too eager, too uncompromising, for the weak and gentle Prelate. Those who genuinely loved and admired him were far away, and they called him unceasingly to their side; but he stood steadfast, alone, like a great, strong, silent rock in the midst of beating waves and howling winds, ever uplifting the voice of rebuke, of warning, of stern, uncompromising truth. One friend—like himself "the voice of one crying in the wilderness," with words of warning, of rebuke, of prophecy, to that unstable generation which was tossed to and fro in the tempest of the great Revolution—one friend appears always with him in spirit, with words of counsel and encouragement; Count Joseph de Maistre. Many and many a time did this great writer and profound thinker give words of comfort to him who was in the thick of the fight; words instinct with that profound penetration which has won for him the title of "prophet."

"A thousand thanks, dear apostle," he writes, after the separation of Geneva from Chambéry, "for the interesting details you give me. Undoubtedly, this Brief pains one at the first glance, but on looking closer, one seems to perceive, without being quite able to penetrate through it, that there may be in the whole affair something hidden, some unknown mystery favorable to the truth. The Pope, my dear abbé, is led to-day as he was yesterday; and sometimes, even in being weak, he leads us to great results, *of which he is himself ignorant*. Look at the barricades which are falling on all sides. The Council of Geneva, while singing of victory, translates and registers the Papal Brief. Let them translate *Fidelis Christi* as 'faithful in Christ'; all that Protestant jargon does not touch the facts. Have you not seen that the Separation of the sixteenth century purified Catholicism, *and that the true Reform took place among us?* The same miracle, or an even greater one, is on the point of being worked now; *Rome goes her way and advances while drawing back.*" (*Avance en reculant.*)

M. de Maistre seems to have insisted often upon the latter sentence, which we find repeated again and again in his letters, for the comfort of his correspondent. When M. Vuarin writes to him of the unhappy "convention" just drawn up, he answers:

"Believe me, all that is not worth much. . . . It remains none the less true that the Roman Church has set foot in Geneva, that its Government is obliged to treat with *the Beast which advances while drawing back*, as I have had the honor of telling you already. *Macte animo*. Go your way, and let the 'Laws' pass by."

Again, some time later—and it was the last letter M. Vuarin

was ever to receive from his faithful friend, who even then had, as it were, one foot in the tomb—de Maistre writes :

“Remember what I had the honor to tell you three months ago ; in recoiling, she advances.”

Sometimes, indeed, a gleam of success, of momentary triumph, or what in his own tongue would have been called “*malice*” (which does not mean the *maliciousness* of ours), came into the weary struggle of years ; as when his Government decreed the keeping, by Catholics as well as Protestants, of December the 31st as a National Festival—the anniversary of their independence. They sent their commands to M. Vuarin for a special thanksgiving service, thinking to annoy him, and Catholic magistrates went in state to hear him preach. He gave them such a sermon on their duties and privileges as made the town wonder and the congregation stare. “It would have been impossible to have been more vigorous, more true, more pressing than you have been, nor to profit more cleverly by a unique circumstance to seize the batteries of your enemy and turn them against himself,” wrote de Maistre on this occasion.

In the year 1823 Pope Pius VII., once exile, and victim of many persecutions and intrigues, laid down the tiara which had proved so thorny a crown, and entered into rest. His successor, elected some months later, proved to be no other than the Cardinal della Genga, who had, ever since his sojourn in Geneva in 1814, taken the keenest interest in its new-born church, and held its worthy pastor in personal friendship and high esteem. M. Vuarin was rejoiced at the event, and took no time in offering his congratulations to the new Pontiff, expressing at the same time a wish that he might be allowed to report the actual condition of affairs in Geneva to the Pontiff by word of mouth. Leo XII. replied by a very cordial Brief, addressed to his former friend, saying :

“You express a desire to come to Us in this city. Come ; your arrival will be very pleasing to Us ; and this is not only a permission which We address to you, it is a command. Bring with you all the documents which may be necessary in order to make known to Us exactly the state of the Church in your countries, that We may be able to procure its welfare. Inform Us of your departure ; Our intention is to be responsible for all the expenses incurred in your journey, undertaken for the interests of the Church.”

In response to this invitation, therefore, M. Vuarin wrote that as soon as the Easter season, with its pressing obligations of work and pastoral cares, was past he would present himself before the

Holy Father; and accordingly, after assisting at the Synod of Fribourg, presenting his bishop with a long memoir on the dangers and necessities of his parish, and preparing for his journey by a month of prayer and meditations, he set forth. It was not known at that time, even to his spiritual superiors, what an unheard of and audacious proposal he had it in mind to lay before the Sovereign Pontiff; in point of fact, the real object of this journey was never known until long after M. Vuarin's death; but from his posthumous papers, to which we have already referred, the whole transaction is now clear to us. M. Vuarin went to Rome to petition the Pope to re-establish the See of Geneva.

His journey was performed in company with a very close and intimate friend of his, who for many years—their correspondence ranges from 1819 to 1834—exchanged views and sympathetic comments on the subject nearest to each heart, no other than the celebrated Abbé Lamennais. At first sight the brilliant intellect of the great writer and theorist would seem to have but little in common with the stern, hard, practical worker and parish priest, yet friendship there was, and the 28th of June, 1824, found them entering the Eternal City. They attracted a certain amount of attention on their arrival, in ecclesiastical circles; Lamennais, the well-known writer whose words had thrilled all France, making his first appearance in the centre of that faith which he was then supposed to be defending, a small, thin, melancholy looking figure, "of mean presence," like St. Paul, while his companion more readily appealed to the impressionable Romans by his tall, imposing, dignified bearing, and his already widespread reputation as the man who for twenty years had fought single-handed, so to speak, against Protestantism in its own stronghold, and brought back the faith, in full light of day, in the rebel city of St. Francis.

So together these two went about, to dinners and audiences and the rest, and were fêted and caressed for a time by the diplomats and the great ones of the earth. The embassy notes and private informations of this date told their principals how the curé of Geneva had come there "to solicit some favors for his parish," while secret police from his own country sought in vain to penetrate into the designs which brought him there. At his first audience with the Pope he presented a memoir explaining the dangers, difficulties and evils besetting the Church in Geneva, and its need of a more intimate, watchful and personal guidance; all which observations the Pope agreed with, and appointed two of his secretaries to examine into the matter. The memorandum set forth that in view of the various disadvantages arising from the

Catholic parishes in and around Geneva being annexed to the diocese of Fribourg, one of three solutions might be adopted. Either they might be transferred to the restored diocese of Annecy in Savoy, or to that of Belley in France, or the old diocese of Geneva might be restored. The first two proposals, he argued, were unadvisable—we presume from political reasons; therefore the third alone remained, and the not inconsiderable difficulties attending its adoption might, he went on to suggest, be obviated in the following way: The bishop of Fribourg should be privately made aware that the Holy See wished him to send in his resignation of the new portion of his diocese to the Genevan Government, under the plea of over-fatigue, without in any way implicating Rome in the action. The Genevan diocese once vacant, the Pope would name a bishop and provisionally endow him, so as to avoid all present expense to the government, which would then probably accept this arrangement in preference to the possibility of seeing a Savoyard or French authority called in. M. Vuarin here took care to place on record his formal resolution that under no circumstances would he himself take any other office than that which he now held, and he said this advisedly, that none should accuse him of coveting the mitre in Geneva.

The plan seemed a feasible one, and was approved by those appointed to examine the matter; so, as the consent of Mgr. Yenni was the preliminary step to be taken, the Pope at once charged M. Vuarin to select and intrust a discreet intermediary to sound the bishop of Fribourg on the question. So certain were all parties of the bishop's compliance with the Pontifical request that M. Vuarin was actually named "delegate of the Holy See" in the event of difficulties arising between the resignation of one bishop and the appointment of the other; and in this full confidence M. Vuarin returned to Geneva, loaded with presents and favors, and expectant of speedy success. What was the surprise of all parties when, on the matter being laid before Mgr. Yenni, he flatly refused to resign his sway over Geneva unless *officially* requested to do so by the Holy See. The condition was inadmissible. Some further correspondence followed, but in the end the whole project fell through, and thus was closed an episode of great and lasting importance in the ecclesiastical history of Geneva.

Soon after his return to Geneva (in 1825), M. Vuarin made another very exact and painstaking census of his parish, accompanied, as usual, by copious distributions of pious books, and even more complete than the former ones in every detail. His commentators justly marvel at the minute and voluminous record he

made here, for the fourth time, so overflowing with information, and apparently so quickly drawn up, though, indeed, not without redoubled energy on his part and the usual modicum of insults from outsiders. To quote from a few of the statistics thus laboriously gathered, we find that in a population of 4900 Catholic souls some 398 mixed marriages, almost all contracted without dispensations, and by Protestant ministers, had given Geneva 654 children, of which 563 were being brought up as Protestants and only 91 as Catholics. This was in Geneva alone; the country parishes showed almost the same proportion of defections; and, horrified at the results of his investigations, after so many years of labor among them, the curé of Geneva laid the state of affairs before Mgr. Yenni, and urged him to seek to stem the tide of evil by a vigorous pastoral and other measures. The timid bishop issued an appeal to the Genevan Government on behalf of his Catholic children frequenting Protestant schools, but very injudiciously confessed to acting at the instigation of M. Vuarin, and received a blunt refusal for his pains.

We are necessarily laying so much stress upon the more human and secular side of M. Vuarin's character, that perhaps his more devout one is somewhat obscured. Yet many an anecdote, besides the affectionate testimony of his familiars, could bear witness that he who preached to others did not forget to work at his own sanctification. One of these relates how, during a clerical meeting under the Bishop of Belley, M. Vuarin had apparently been enlarging upon his difficulties among the inhabitants of his "Protestant Rome," and the Bishop remarked, in the graceful way for which he was renowned, "But, my dear Curé, you should remember, sometimes, the saying of Henri IV. : one catches more flies with a spoonful of honey than with a barrel of vinegar!" "Flies! yes, Monseigneur," answered M. Vuarin, quickly, "but not wasps!" And he went on to enlarge somewhat warmly on the way he was misunderstood outside of Geneva, because, away from there, people could not understand the situation, nor the circumstances in which he was placed. Some minutes afterwards his conscience reproached him with having failed in respect towards the Bishop; so, drawing the latter aside, he threw himself at his feet, entreated his pardon, confessed, and received absolution.

It is said that those who knew M. Vuarin as the wary diplomat, the busy correspondent, the successful *intriguer*, if we may venture the use of this unsavory word in another sense, would have supposed him entirely given up to worldly affairs, and negligent, perhaps, of what should be his chief work; but those who knew

him as *Curé de Genève* only, absorbed in his services, his poor, his parochial administration, could only wonder how a daily life so fully occupied could find space for any extraneous interests. It was the old story of the truly busy man finding time for everything; and, like most hard workers, he made the most of every opportunity that came in his way. For instance, the not infrequent visitors who made their appearance in his study, to say a word on business, to take a seat at his ever hospitable board, or even merely to pay an idle visit, often found themselves, to their own extreme astonishment, set down before a paper-laden writing-table, with the remark, "Here, mon cher ami, just copy this document for me!" or "Look out this reference which I want to find," or "Write to so and so in my name on such a subject," to fill up the idle half-hour before dinner or other occupation; his curates, of course, being the most usual victims.

In 1826, the then reigning Pontiff, Leo XII., proclaimed a Jubilee—the first accorded for fifty years; and M. Vuarin, with his usual *audacity*, sought and obtained official permission to publish it in Geneva, much to the surprise of every one. The fullest advantage was taken of this time of grace, in sermons, services, special and distinguished preachers invited to attract the multitudes (among whom the Irish Jesuit, Fr. Macarthy, is specially mentioned), with courses of instruction for all classes. A long and painful illness precluded M. Vuarin himself from taking any active part in the proceedings, and was followed by a second attack some time later, which in all probability laid the foundation of his final malady. Meanwhile, every renewal of strength brought fresh energy of mind to cope with the undiminishing difficulties of his pastorate. It is amusing, nowadays and under other circumstances, to read of the mingled hatred and terror with which our apostle inspired all classes among the Genevese. From the Town Council, who plainly told Mgr. Yenni that "their refusal to appoint a third curate for the ever-growing Catholic population in Geneva was not prompted by motives of economy, but solely from a desire to prevent M. Vuarin from exercising his very baneful influence over any more of the cantonal priests, whom he already influenced too much, as well as to avoid facilitating *his dangerous journeys*," down to the humblest women in the street, who threatened their refractory children with "le Vuarin" in precisely the same manner as their grandmothers had invoked "the wolf" or "the black man," one and all professed to shudder at his very name. Even attempts, or, at the least, threats against his life, were not wanting. "I hate you! I abhor you! Take care!" wrote a

Genevese tradesman to him. And an eye-witness related to his biographer that he had seen a child fly in affright to its mother's arms at the sight of a priest in the street, crying, "Ah, maman, *the Vuarin!* I've seen the Vuarin! And he did not hurt me!"

Fortunately for himself M. Vuarin only enjoyed such incidents, and positively delighted in recounting them to his friends, as well as in despatching witty or sarcastic replies to the numerous epistolary attacks he received. He relates among other things, in his notes, how, the Council of State having named a commission for examining into the prisons, he was included among the chaplains, and being present at one of the meetings, the Calvinist ministers invited him, out of malice, to "put up a prayer," doubtless thinking he would be at a loss to do so. M. Vuarin, however, coolly knelt down, blessed himself out loud, and began the "*Veni Sancte Spiritus*" in French. "It would be difficult to paint their horror," he writes; "they thought that I was going to *say Mass!* and did not recover themselves until I got up from my knees. After this *terrible catastrophe* I was not invited to any more meetings."

In vain did the "Venerable Company" (by which name was known the Calvinist ministers' Council) strive to relieve their shoulders from that ever-present "Old Man of the Mountain," the Catholic curé. A diplomatic suggestion to Rome that a priest of such merit should receive a mitre or a Cardinal's hat received the rejoinder from Leo XII., "I make a cardinal of M. Vuarin? Certainly not! I can find cardinals everywhere, but where could I find another Curé of Geneva?" And M. Vuarin himself declared to the King of Piedmont, who begged him to accept a bishopric in Savoy, "I have espoused the Church of Geneva! I do not divorce!"

If his bishop, Mgr. Yenni, failed in some degree to appreciate the almost defiant courage of the man who, like some outposted sentinel, stood alone to brave the storm of hostility which beat against the Church in Geneva, Rome at least knew and recognized his true worth—from Leo XII., who gave him the affection of a personal friendship joined to the approbation of a Pontiff, to Gregory XVI., who watched with fatherly tenderness the career of "his dear son of Geneva," and who, when a noble lady to whom he was giving audience, mentioned M. Vuarin's name, cried out, "Ah! the Curé of Geneva! he is very dear to Us! His life is a sublime one!" And later still, the saintly Pius IX., who, while Bishop of Imola, wrote of him in a letter still extant, as

"Of all the curés having charge of souls, the most zealous, the most devoted, the most attached to the Church, that I know of in the whole Catholic universe."

His friendship with the unhappy Abbé Lamennais is full of interest, but cannot be touched upon here, and the mere enumeration of contemporary celebrities with whom he corresponded fills several pages in his "Life." Not content, too, with the labor of this more than ordinarily voluminous correspondence, he contemplated and prepared materials for two important works, the "History of the Diocese of Geneva," and a "Biography of Leo XII.;" for which latter work he received all the necessary documents from its subject, from Gregory XVI. and from Cardinal Pacca, and which still await the light of day in a manuscript of more than twelve hundred pages.

Much of his theological warfare with the Calvinists was carried on by means of pamphlets, which, some printed in Geneva, anonymously, and others, under various pseudonyms, in Savoy and elsewhere, pilloried untiringly and sarcastically each attack or false step of the foe; and not a few questions of the day were discussed, condemned, or held up to ridicule by his mordant pen. "You are an admirable *warrior*," wrote his friend Lamennais to him; and the secular government, realizing how much easier to deal with was the timid and vacillating Bishop of Lausanne than his bellicose curé, wrote ever of the latter as "that violent and fanatical priest," for whose removal they vainly "moved heaven and earth" for twenty years and more.

But though from time to time the vigorous resistance and perpetual conflicts of the Curé of Geneva with "the powers that be" did not receive all the support and approval he might have hoped for from his bishop, and though, in the words of his biographer, he "did not consider ecclesiastical submission to mean inertia and blind indolence," he was always profoundly loyal to his diocesan. It was thus that, soon after Easter, in 1837, he felt the certain coldness and unfriendly tone between himself and Mgr. Yenni must be put an end to; and going out to Fribourg, he solicited and obtained an interview with that prelate in which these two men of God, recognizing each the sanctity and good-will of the other, embraced with tears, and began a new and more affectionate relationship which lasted to the end of their lives.

It was during this or the preceding year that, perhaps wearied out with the unceasing execrations of which he was the object, M. Vuarin made an offer to his bishop and to the Genevese authorities that he would resign his post as curé on the following conditions:

1st. The concession to the Catholics of another church, or the enlargement of St. Germain. [N.B.—The Catholic population

now numbered more than 7000 souls, and their only place of worship, St. Germain, held only 1000.]

2d. Government recognition of a third *vicaire*.

3d. Authority to hand over his own house as a permanent possession to the Sœurs de Charité.

4th. The respect due to the Catholic cemetery to be guaranteed.

5th. That in the public Town Hospital two rooms should be set aside for patients nursed by the Sœurs de St. Vincent.

These very moderate demands were not granted, and M. Vuarin remained in his *cure*, continuing, though with gradually failing strength, to add one good work to another. Four Christian Brothers were again brought to teach his schools, and, after some opposition, installed there. A Catholic hospital and an orphanage were begun, on a property which he had bought at Plainpalais. But he was no longer able to journey hither and thither, soliciting alms for his various good works; his strength was failing, and on the 12th of September, 1839, he was stricken down with an apoplectic or paralytic stroke. It was the beginning of the end, but the end was a very lingering one; at first able to say Mass, then only to appear in his church from time to time, to give Benediction or speak an affectionate word to his beloved congregation. "The good God has placed me under arrest," he would say, sadly. His time was filled by prayers and meditations, and when his head was weary he would creep to the door of one or other of his *vicaires* and beg them to come out and pray with him. Then, nearer to the end, a trial came which has been known to more than one of God's saints. He was plunged in the darkness of an utter spiritual desolation. The most bitter hopelessness, the most tormenting scruples, devoured his soul. Day and night he could neither sleep nor rest; in his anguish he petitioned everyone who came near him to "pray for him, pray for him," sending even in the middle of the night for his favorite *vicaire*, M. Marilley, to come and stay beside his bed and join in prayer with him.

It was a long agony—agony rather of soul than of body; perhaps the "purgatory in this life," for which so many holy souls have prayed; and the watchers by that suffering death-bed have left it on record how, from the impetuous, somewhat passionate and too easily moved man he had always been, his character became completely changed, and he was humble, patient, docile; grateful for every slightest service done him, silent under the severest pains. At length, on the 5th of September, 1843, those about him remarked his more than usually alarming state. To

the Sister who nursed him by day, as she put all in order and "hoped that he would have a good night," he patiently answered, "As the good God wills," and, with a presentiment she could not account for, she charged his servant to call her should any change occur. The change came—she was called at midnight, and the agony began. At six o'clock a Mass was said for him, and then M. Marilley confessed and anointed him, after which "Go and say your own Mass, and bring me the good God afterwards," whispered the dying man; but scarcely had his *vicaire* left the room when the final moments approached; another priest present gave him the last absolutions, and immediately afterwards he expired.

"It is beautiful to die so loved," was the exclamation of a Protestant who witnessed the grief of his people, a grief worthy of his life-work among them. The holy body was embalmed and exposed to public view for seven days, in a *chapelle ardente* made for the occasion in his house; after which some twenty thousand people, from all Savoy, Gex and Switzerland, lined the roads leading to Geneva, to join the funeral procession. The Bishops of Lausanne and of Annecy and about two hundred priests formed the congregation within the church, and the procession to the cemetery was "a Catholic demonstration such as Geneva, even in old times, had never before seen." First the schools, led by Christian Brothers and Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul; then the young girls of the parish, in white. Four Sisters of Charity headed the ladies of the parish, in mourning; then the young men, also in black; then two hundred priests, surplice on arm, and then the two Bishops, and the coffin, borne by twelve of the principal gentlemen of the parish; then, four deep, the whole Catholic population of the canton, some twelve or fifteen thousand people. "If the Pope had died among us," said one of them, "it would not have been possible to have done more."

* * * * *

It is painful to be obliged to add here how much of the noble work in which M. Vuarin spent his life has been undone by the persecutions of later days. Sœurs de Charité, Christian Brothers, Catholic hospital, all are gone. The Church of St. Germain, and a still grander pile, the beautiful Church of Nôtre Dame, built since his death, are in the hands of the wretched handful of schismatics who took their being from the boastful demonstrations of an apostate monk—may he still, even at this eleventh hour, find place for repentance!—Hyacinthe Loyson.

T. L. L. TEELING.

CORONA SPINARUM.

IN the mediæval nomenclature of trees and plants there is to be found a great store of sacred association which gives expression to the vivid faith of the time and surprises us with its acquaintance with the botanical products of other countries. Among these sacred names we would naturally expect to find a large number of dedications to our Lord ; but it is rather astonishing to discover that we might form from them a history of His life from the cradle to the Ascension, and read in nature, among its trees and herbs, memorials that spoke to our forefathers of each period of His days on earth. The Annunciation, the visit to the home of Zacchary, the Nativity, the Circumcision, the death of the Holy Innocents and flight into Egypt, the whole of the commemorations in Lent, Holy Week, Easter, the Ascension, and much more, could all be illustrated from this pious nomenclature of olden time, of which remains are to be found in use still in the folk-lore of every christened land. In days when life was more rural and reposeful, men made earth a garden, with the stream of the Passion forever flowing through it ; and at every season of the year and in countless varieties of ways they especially recalled, in the identity of some tree or herb mentioned in Holy Writ or in legend, or else in figure or emblem, the several stages of the concluding scenes in the earthly life of their Redeemer. Trees and flowers, birds and stars, were all found to assist them in giving expression to the emotion of their hearts, and this gave an interest to natural objects and provided a medium for poetic expression which is entirely healthy and elevating to the mind. Among the flora sometimes the names are found to have originated in the attempts to identify some natural object mentioned in the Bible, and often in this the old folk-lore nomenclature is entirely accurate and as close as the critical study of modern botany can attain ; at other times it is as types or emblems that the names are given, serving a purpose as fruitful as scenes depicted upon the sculptured or painted walls of some cathedral church, from which they were oftentimes borrowed. In relation to our present study upon the Crown of Thorns we shall see illustrations of this, and we might gather examples from other departments of natural history than that of botany. Many legends were told with regard to various familiar birds, such as the sparrow, cross-bill, magpie, stork, robin, etc.,

in connection with the Passion, to attract attention to their habits and invest them with a teaching that forms the poetry of life, if nothing more. The robin especially belongs to our subject, for it was said to have dyed its breast with the Saviour's blood while endeavoring to pluck a thorn from the Crown that pierced His brow—a story often used by the poets, as in the following lines of John Hoskyns-Abrahall :

“ Bearing His Cross, while Christ passed forth forlorn,
 His God-like forehead by the mock crown torn,
 A little bird took from the crown one thorn
 To soothe the dear Redeemer's throbbing head.
 That bird did what she could ; His blood, 'tis said,
 Down dropping, dyed her tender bosom red.
 Since then no wanton boy disturbs her nest ;
 Weasel nor wild-cat will her young molest ;
 All sacred deem that bird of ruddy breast.”

Among the memorials of the Passion of our Lord, if we except the Cross itself, there is no emblem more recalled in the sacred flora than this of the Crown of Thorns, beloved not only by Christian artists and poets, but by all earnest-minded people, since none other, perhaps, brings to so acute a crisis the insult offered to the King of Kings and the cruel pain that He was willing to endure.

Many authorities, such as Durandus, Eckius, Lampergius (“Palæotti,” xiii., p. 148), St. Vincent (“Palæotti,” iii., p. 31), etc., consider that this crown was not a simple circlet around the head, as art has made us usually to think, but a kind of *pileus* or cap, the thorns not only turned around the brows but laced and “plaited,” as the Gospel says, over the head as well, after the fashion of Eastern crowns, something like what close-fitting, old-fashioned marriage-crowns resembled—*le casque du Fils de Dieu*, as Philippe Diez calls it ; and we shall see that, if we make reference to the venerable remains thought to be those of the Corona Spinarum, they tend to confirm this idea. In one treasury of Nôtre Dame Cathedral, in Paris, they possess a portion of the Crown, which singularly lacks in any resemblance to what we may have imagined, and is certainly not what one would expect. The reliquary containing it is a circle of crystal, which was mounted in a handsome silver-gilt monstrance during the Lent of 1896. Within is a ring of rushes, bound together with others, at several points, to keep them in place, some broken and others doubled up, but there are no thorns. It is not the sort of wreath that appeals to the eye, nor does it fulfil what artists usually depict or carve ; but this want of appropriateness that strikes the be-

holder at the first glance ceases upon more attentive study and becomes a strong witness in favor of its authenticity. No one wishing to form a false relic of this Crown would have made it of rushes, without thorns, and too large for the head, as measurements show this must have been. The explanation, however, becomes clear when we unite this Nôtre Dame relic with those found preserved in other churches. Elsewhere we find sprays of thorn or single spires, but nowhere else rushes (save a few fragments at Autun, Arras, Lyon and Chablis, this last known to have been taken from the main portion when, in 1791, it was sent to the Church of St. Denis). The explanation is that this rush circlet was the foundation around which the thorns were entwined; it had therefore to be larger than the head in order to permit of the spiny stems to be twisted around it, and probably carried over and fastened in its thickness. It would then be pressed down upon the Saviour's brow by means of a spear-shaft, or something similar, as is often suggested in early art.

As far as it is possible to say, the rush employed appears to be very like that now known as *Juncus Balticus*, which originally grew in warm countries, and possibly does still in the Jordan Valley. The *Juncus maritimus* is too large and the *Juncus acutus* seems to fulfil only some of the conditions. Tradition seems to have been existing in mediæval time that rushes had been used, for the pious pilgrim, Sir John Maundeville, does not omit their mention when he relates the thoughts upon the subject in his day, for he says that some believed that our Lord was crowned with "Jonkes of the see, that is to say, rushes of the see, that prykken als scharpely as thornes." We may find memorials of this in some names existing for local sedges and rushes. For instance, in parts of Germany the soft, pliant stems of the bulrush or poolrush (*Scirpus lacustris*), which we employ for seating chairs, etc., has the name of unserts herrn kron, a name whose significance has been entirely forgotten, and in England we had for the same the title of holrysche or holy rush, no doubt with identical intent. So, too, in southern France the pink-leaved *Carex cæspitosa* (Sin.) is called "Joune de la Passiun," and in other parts of France and Belgium the *Typha latifolia* is the same. The latter is our reed-mace, and both it and the *Carex cæspitosa* also refer to the mock sceptre or mace placed in the Saviour's hand by the soldiers, and which early Italian painters and writers generally figure as the *Typha*. So, too, the wood rush or sweet bent (*Luzula campestris*) has still, in Surrey, the name of Good-Friday Grass, and in Cheshire of God's Grace (probably God's Grass), from its appear-

ing at the Passion-tide and reminding the men of old of the rushy circlet of the coronal of pain.

Before going further, it is worth our while to consider the history attached to the relics of the Crown of Thorns, and of this portion at Paris in particular, since the record of its veneration and preservation there since 1239 is quite incontestable. It appears that this and other instruments of the Crucifixion are said to have been found by St. Helena in the fourth century in a pit at the foot of Calvary, at least forty feet below the summit. It is also said to have been a Jewish law that nothing should be allowed to remain above ground of the instruments used to put a person to death, lest they should continue the memory of the crime and earth should be polluted by their presence (see *Maimonides*, "Sanhedrim," xv.); moreover, they were to be buried in a place apart from the body of the criminal. Now, no spot is more probable to have served this purpose than the place where the wood of the Cross was found, together with the other memorials of the Crucifixion, for all that would be needed was to throw them off the rock into this deep pit at its foot. One of the most interesting, because least altered, sites within the great Basilica that covers Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre is a chapel at the back of the site of Calvary and sixteen feet below the level of the pavement; it is dedicated to St. Helena. Thirteen steps descend again from this to the bottom of a pit, now known as the Chapel of the Invention or Finding of the Holy Wood, where the visitor finds himself about thirty-eight feet below the summit where the Crucifixion took place. St. Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, in A.D. 409, admits the existence of the Crown of Thorns as a notorious fact. St. Gregory of Tours, in the sixth century, speaks explicitly concerning it. At the time of the first Crusade in 1100, Alexis Comnenus wrote to Count Robert of Flanders about the numerous distinguished relics that were preserved in the Treasury of Constantinople and jealously guarded and venerated there. In 1204 the French and Venetians possessed themselves of this city, and Beaudoin, Count of Flanders, was elected Emperor of the East by the Crusaders of the two nations. In 1238 Baudouin II. de Courtenay, pressed by the Bulgarians and surrounded by foes, had to borrow money, and placed the great relic of the Crown of Thorns in the hands of the Venetians as a pledge. He desired, however, that it should be in the possession of his native land, and wrote to King Louis of France expressing this wish, and eventually it was obtained. The wreathing-thorns had probably been previously bestowed and scattered among various potentates,

as we shall see later, and what remained was this rush circlet, now at Nôtre Dame. The king and his court went to meet his ambassadors as they returned bringing the relic to Paris, awaiting them at Villeneuve l'Archevêque, five leagues from Sens, on August 10, 1239, and in eight days, amid an immense concourse, he brought it to his capital. In 1241 St. Louis began to rebuild his Palace Chapel as a fitting shrine for this and other relics, and in seven years La Sainte Chapelle was completed at the cost of 40,000 livres of that time. Up to 1656 the relic remained here; the keys of the Chapel were kept by the king himself, or by a noble deputed by him to guard them, but who was unable to lend them without the royal assent. Its subsequent history is told in the inscriptions upon the reliquary in which it is now preserved in le Trésor de Nôtre Dame. The first is "La Sainte Couronne de N. S. Jésus Christ conquise par Baudouin, à la prise de Constantinople en 1204, engagée au Venètiens en 1238, fût reçue avec grande piété par St. Louis a Villeneuve, près Sens, le 10 Août, 1239." The second, "Transférée de la Sainte Chapelle à l'abbaye de St. Denis, en France, par ordre de Louis XVI., en 1791, rappertée à Paris en 1793, dépouillée à l'hôtel des Monnaies et portée à la Bibliothèque Nationale en 1794, elle fut enfin restituée a l'église de N. Dame, par ordre du gouvernement, le 26 Oct., 1804." And the third adds, "Reconnue le 15 Oct., 1805, par P. Dienz; et C. N. Warenplot, vicaire général de Coutanees, Chargés en 1791 d'enprendre une parcelle pour Port Royal, elle a été transférée solennellement à l'église N. Dame par J. B. Cardinal de Belloy, archevêque de Paris, le 10 Août, 1806."

At the same time that St. Louis was erecting La Sainte Chapelle in Paris the Pisans were constructing their architectural marvel, the Chapel of Santa Maria della Spina, dedicating it to the patroness of their city and to enshrine another portion of the Crown, viz., some of the thorns. Now neither beauteous building contains the relic for which it was designed, which even from a historical point is a subject for regret.

There are more relics of the thorns than of the rushes to be found scattered about Europe; we read of the Emperor Justinian in A.D. 527 giving some to St. Germain, Bishop of Paris; about A.D. 690 the Emperor Otho made the gift of one to King Ethelstan of England, which was afterwards preserved in Malmesbury Abbey, Wilts. About A.D. 800 the Patriarch of Jerusalem sent Charlemagne some, which Charles le Chauve gave to the Abbey Church of St. Denis, a fact recorded around his tomb. Earliest of all is the spray at Trêves, sent to that city by St. Helena herself;

St. Louis acquired others, which were once preserved with the unique portion he already possessed. In the Church of St. Michael, Ghent, is a Sancta Spina, once the property of the royal family of the Stuarts, and said to have originally been the gift of St. Louis to them. In 1587, when Queen Mary was put to death by order of Elizabeth, she gave on the scaffold this heirloom of her house to the Duke of Northumberland, who, meeting a like fate to that of the Queen, bequeathed it to his daughter, by whom it was entrusted to the keeping of the Father-Provincial of the English Jesuits. By his order it was placed in its present rich reliquary of rock-crystal and sent for safety into Flanders, where so many English ecclesiastical treasures were deposited at the Reformation. Upon the foot of the cross-shaped ch^âsse is to be read, "Hæc Spina de Corona Dom Sancta Fuit primo Mariæ reg. Scot. mart. Ab ea dato comiti Northumb. mart. Qui in morte misit illam filiæ Suæ Elisæ, quæ dedit soc., hancq. will. ornavit auro." At the monastery of De la Spina in Spain; at Louvain; Electoral Palace of Munich; Rome, and many other places, may be found relics of this portion of the Crown of Thorns.

Mrs. Jameson remarks that the "Italian artists, with their usual refinement, have generally given a wreath of thorns small and sharp, with branches soft and pliable, and more fitted to have been plaited for such a purpose; while those north of the Alps have conceived an awful structure of the most unbending knotted boughs, with tremendous spikes, half a foot long, which no human hand could have forced into such a form." But the explanation of this is probably to be found in the folk-lore nomenclature of the locality or country where the artist lived; for, as we shall see, a large number of thorny trees and shrubs bore the name of the Crown of Thorns—some in the effort of exact identification, but many others with no further purpose, and in some instances with no further possibility, than serving as a wayside *pieta* did, to take the thought of the traveller to Calvary's rock.

The old pilgrim, Sir John Maundeville, probably gives the leading traditions of his day by which it was sought to account for the more prominent species of thorns associated with the Corona Spinarum. And to do so he makes four separate crownings—with white thorn, eglantine, berberis and rush. He says:

"In that nyghte that He was taken, He was ylad into a gardyn, and there He was first examyned righte scharpley; and there the Jewes scorned Him, and maden Him a croune of ye braunches of Albespyne, yt is White Thorn, that grew in the same gardyn, and setten it on His Heved, so faste and so sore, that the Blood ran doun be many places of His visage, and of His necke, and of His schuldres. And therefore hathe ye

White Thorn many vertues, for he that berethe a braunche on him thereoffe, no thondre, ne no maner of tempest may dere him ; ne in the houws that it is inne may non evylle gat entre ne come unto ye place that it is inne. And in yt same gardyn Seynt Petre denied our Lord thryes. Afterward was our Lord lad forthe before the bischoppes and the maystres of the lawe, into another gardyn of Anne and there also He was examyned, repreved, and scorned, and crowned eft with a White Thorn, that men clepe the Barbarynes, that grew in the gardyn ; and that hath also many vertues. And afterwards He was lad into a gardyn of Cayphas, and there He was crowned with Eglantier. And afterwards He was lad into ye chambre of Pylate, and there He was examyned and crowned. And ye Jewes setten Hym in a chayere and clad Hym in a mantelle, and there made thei the crowne of Jonthes of the see ; and there thei kneeled to Hym and skorned Hym, seynge : ‘ Heyl, King of the Jewes.’ ”

The thorny nature of much of the vegetation of Palestine must have been a subject of remark to the early pilgrims from Europe ; the underwood is dry and prickly, numerous small grey spinous bushes of paterium, hawthorn, bramble, dog-rose, buckthorn and the like abound, while the very oaks, as well as the acacias, are prickly. There would be no long search needed to obtain material for our Lord's Crown of Pain. The ordinary white thorn, or hawthorn, would be less likely to have been actually employed, since the difficulty of adapting any but the shorter sprays to the purpose, for the tree gets its botanical name of *Cratægus* from the Greek word for strength, in allusion to the toughness of its wood. It may have been one among the handful of various thorns gathered, and it belongs to the same family as the apple, the traditional fruit, in many lands, of the tree of the Fall, and therefore there was a poetic applicability in making it furnish this instrument of suffering to the Saviour. At Toulouse, moreover, they preserve a thorn as a relic from the Crown which has been closely examined by the learned Professor M. de Cloos, who considers it to be a species of Syrian *Cratægus*. Signor Pietro Savi, of Pisa, has also seen it, and is of the same opinion. Bartholinus thought that some such white thorn formed part, at least, of the thorns collected for the purpose, and of course there is no reason why only one species should have been used. The Norman peasant to this day wears a sprig of hawthorn in his cap from the belief that it was once upon his Saviour's brow, and this notion was very prevalent in mediæval times. Many of its names will show this, such as Christ-dorn, still heard in Silesia ; Calavru or Calaviru in Sardinia ; La Sainte or La Noble Epine in France ; Hag, Halig, or Holy Thorn in England, Denmark and Scandinavia, while its fruit and early leaves have also many sacred associations. It is a common rustic saying that “the hawthorn groans on Good Friday night,” as if still mindful of the share one of its genus was forced to take in the day's sad events ; and in Ireland these trees are the “Monument

Bushes," beneath which, formerly, the unbaptized children were buried, and upon passing which the peasant uncovers his head and repeats the "De profundis" psalm.

The Pink Hawthorn (*Cratægus pyracantha*, Pers.) is an Eastern tree; and in its lovely flowers men saw nature's memorial of this thorn having been sprinkled with the Saviour's blood; hence in Cheshire it is still known as Christ's Thorn; and we shall see the same pious thought connected with the sweetbrier or eglantine. It is curious to note that most of the Eastern traditions connected with the white-flowered thorny acacias are found in the West allied to the hawthorn, so that the latter is considered not only a component of the Corona Spinarum, but also the representative of what in the East is connected with species of acacia, such as the burning bush, the thicket tree in which Abraham caught the ram-substitute for his son Isaac, Moses' rod, and hence the "wishing tree," or divining rod. The lines of one of the Breviary hymns, to which we shall often refer for the commemoration of this instrument of the Passion, seems to recognize some of these types:

"Legis figuris pingitur
Christi corona nobilis (*noble épine*)
Implexa spinis victima (Abraham's ram)
Ardensque testatur Rubus." (Burning bush.)

The Acacias get their name from their sharp spines, and have white flowers, although the *Acacia lebbek* with which travellers in Egypt are familiar, has finer ones. The tree we usually know by this name, and commonly planted in England, does not belong strictly to the acacia genus at all, but is a North American product introduced in 1640; botanically it is the *Robinia pseud-acacia*, and to ordinary observers look it, and those that follow may be mistaken for acacias. It is remarkably handsome when covered with its white blossom, and its wood, when properly seasoned, is as strong and durable as oak. They know it in Italy as Spina Christi. Another most ornamental tree often called acacia is the *Gleditschia*, and one of its species (*G. triacanthos*) has branching thorns upon its stem which have become memorials of the thorny Crown. A fine specimen grows in the garden of the Bishop of London at Fulham. In France it is known as Acacia de la Passion or Epine de Christ, in Piedmont "Spin d'nostr Sgnour," in Italy generally Spina Cristi. It rises to the height of forty feet; its beautiful delicate leafage conceals the cruel thorn, whose branchings form a cross. The *Mimosa Juliflora* (Swartz) belongs to Jamaica, and in the French Antilles it is called, from its fearful spines, L'arbre de

Malédiction. The *Parkinsonia*, too, of the West Indies, is also in those islands the Holy Thorn, Jerusalem Thorn, or Epine de Jerusalem.

In the East the acacia, known under the name of *Sayal*, is not uncommon even nowadays, when Palestine and all Turkish governed lands are denuded of their timber, and where the effort seems to be to repress any chance of the fulfilment of the words, "I will plant in the wilderness the cedar, and the thorn (*Shittah* or *acacia sayal*), and the myrtle, and the olive tree. I will set in the desert the fir tree, the elm and the box together." (Isa. xli. 19.) We know the tree better, perhaps, under its plural form of *shittim*, from the tangled thickets into which it extends; it abounds along the eastern and western terraces of the Jordan, defining them with its graceful verdure. Ablesatim, or Abel-Shittim, or the Meadow of Acacias, "in the plains of the Moabites," of Numb. xxxiii. 49, is still perhaps to be identified; and the House of Acacias-Berhsetta or Beth-Shittah of Judges vii. 22 must be also near the Jordan, under the mountains of Ephraim. Of this wood was made the Ark of the Covenant and other furniture of the Tabernacle, and this is apparently recalled in the Breviary hymn whose first verse we have quoted above, the second continuing:

"Arcam corona cinxerat
Menseque sacrum circumlum,
Aramque thuri fermidam
Corona nectit ambiens."

Lastly, the wild acacia of the desert sands in the Sinai peninsula and elsewhere is the *Mimosa nelotica*, the Arabic sunt, with which all Eastern travellers are familiar, the Hebrew *seneh* or *senna* of Ex. iii. 2 and Deut. xxxiii. 16, where it is translated "bush." Its confused spread of branches, with their grey foliage and white blossom, is of frequent occurrence about Sinai, and to it local tradition attaches the belief of having been the *Rubus* in combustus of Moses. It differs but slightly from the *Acacia sayal*, but we can again trace a connection of thought between it and the Egyptian thorn, as they call the pink hawthorn (*Cratægus pyracantha*) in Cheshire, which in France bears the name of L'arbre de Moïse or Buisson ardent. There almost seems to be a further idea that the tree of the burning bush furnished material for the Crown of our Lord at His Passion, for the holly or holy tree is another instance of a combination of these associations. In Denmark it is known as Kristi tvon-krön, Krist torn, and the same in Norway, Sweden, and Germany, and in France as Epine de Christ; yet alongside

with this we find the tradition of its being nature's type of the burning bush, of which it forms a singularly beautiful picture, with its flame of scarlet berries amid its green leaves. In the early days artists were wont to place type and antitype upon missal-page or window, and one of the most familiar was this of the bush on fire yet unhurt, corresponding to Mary bringing forth her divine Child with virginity unstained; and it was this that made the holly our Christmas bush, and gave it the west country name of "Aunt Mary's tree." Nor should we omit to notice that the same thought is connected with the pink hawthorn and the Glastonbury thorn (*Cratægus oxyacantha præcox*), the one being not only Christ's thorn, but also the burning bush; and the abnormal flowering of the latter coming at the Incarnation tyde, thus again united this suggestive symbolism.

Sir John Maundeville, after the white thorn, mentions the "Barbarynes," the common barberry of our hedges and gardens, and of which the species *Berberis Cratægina* is frequent in various parts of Palestine. In Italy, especially, it is called Spina santa or Spina Cristi, or, as in Piedmont, "Spin d'nostr Sgnour." Its thorns are set in threes; the serratures of its leaves terminate with soft bristles; its pendant clusters of golden flowers leave behind them bright red berries that are known in some places as the Madonna's Bitter Grape, as if connected with the chalice of woe she had to drain. And the third he speaks of is the "Eglantier," as the name occurs in Chaucer, our eglantine or sweetbrier (*Rosa rubiginosa*), the engelthierrose of parts of Germany, and the eglantyr, engeltorn of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden.

In the Lateran Museum there is an early Christian tomb upon which is sculptured a Roman soldier placing a crown of laurels and roses upon the head of our Lord, for with their joyousness in the new Faith the triumphant sentiment most prevailed, and the faithful did not like to dwell so much upon the human sufferings of the Saviour as upon the victory won and the fresh hopes rekindled; and hence the Crown of Thorns became a Crown of Roses, as the Vesper hymn for the first Friday in Lent (Commemoration of the Crown of Thorn) sings:

"Christ: rubescens sanguine
Aculeos mutat Rosis."

It is this pretty thought, no doubt, which was also in the mind with all the foregoing flowering trees, that, although bearing cruel spines, yet they burst into blossom wherever the sacred blood fell. In the barberry there would be seen the natural curiosity of the

thorns themselves passing into leaves, for if they be traced to their base in a young, vigorous shoot, it will be noticed that the transition is apparent, showing that they are but leaves in an "arrested" condition; in the sweetbrier, as in the pink hawthorn, there are the deep-red roses, with delicious fragrance, thickly beading the branches with their memorials of the Saviour's blood. The brier rose (*Rosa canina*) is also called the "Engelntier" in the "Nomenclator Latino-Saxonicus" of Chytraeus in 1582, and to it the same tradition is attached; and in its fragile beauty, blushing through every shade of carnation, it spoke to thoughtful minds how

"Men saw the Thorns on Jesus' brow,
But Angels saw the Roses."

The brier rose, together with many varieties of its family, is a native of Palestine, abounding around the Holy City; and it is worth noticing that in the passage in the Book of Kings where Rehoboam threatens to be more severe than his father, the word translated "scorpions" is said to be more correctly rendered by "briers," and Celsius quoted the Rabbins in favor of this being so. In that sense the symbolism would be very remarkable and typical that the words of the foolish son of Solomon should be visited by Jews, the only loyal tribe, upon the "Son of David," by binding His head with a brier band amid the assertive shouts that they had no king but Cæsar. The words of the Breviary hymn for the Friday in Lent commemorating this diadem of sorrow seem to have in mind some such thorn as the brier:

"Quæ terra sulcis invia,
Damis regens et sentibus,
Lugubre munus protalit,
Quæ sæva messuit manes?"

And the entire hymn, whose English translation begins:

"Daughters of Zion! Royal maids!
Come forth to see the Crown
Which Zion's self, with cruel hands,
Hath woven for her Son,"

seems full of the thoughts we have alluded to above in connection with the blossoming thorny rose.

We have thus exhausted the species of thorns mentioned by Sir John Maundeville and come to one omitted by him, unless we include it among his white thorns, and it is that which seems to possess the strongest evidence in its favor, if only one kind were

employed. St. Jerome, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Augustine, Cassiodorus, Dioscorides, Calmet, Lamy, Baronius, and a great number of other important authorities, all unite in thinking that the *Rhamnus* or buckthorn was that made use of, and the writers of modern times are generally agreed that it is the most probable. An examination has lately been made by botanical experts of some of the larger thorn relics preserved of the Crown. They are found to entirely confirm this opinion. At the Electoral Palace of Munich, in Bavaria, there is a spray with five spines; the Confraternity of Charity at Venice has another with four; the one at Trèves, presented by St. Helena herself, has more; the remains also at Pisa, and at Wevelgham, near Courtrai, have been all closely inspected, and have been declared to be a species of *Rhamnus*, or buckthorn. All the species of this thorn are closely allied, and are met with under the names of *Zizyphus* and *Paliurus*; they abound in Palestine; and an aged bush of this shrub is shown near the Holy City from which the Crown of our Blessed Lord was said to be taken. One species (*Rhamnus aculeatus*), of which Bellonius says "Christi Domini Corona confecta fuit," has very singular fruit, as if to recall this event, for it appears something like a head with a broad-trimmed covering or wreath. The *Paliurus Spinagti* has many cruel, hard, sharp thorns, well adapted to give pain, and the branches are soft, round and pliable, and easily brought into any form required. It is one of the most common shrubs in Judea and Egypt, evergreen and hardy, about six feet high, and Harrelquist says that what to him seemed the strongest proof of its identity was that its leaves resembled the kind of bay with which emperors and generals were wont to be crowned. The enemies of Christ would desire to have this resemblance of a plant used in times of triumph and festivity to increase the scorn, calumny and reproach. Bartholinus says that he has heard the Arabs call it *Al hansegi*, which the Latins interpret the Thorn-Crown. In southern Italy and Spain, where the flora is nearly identical with that of the Holy Land east of its central partition, the *Rhamnus* has for centuries been known with this reference—in Italy as the *Spino Crocefissi*, in Spain as *Espina de Cristo*, *Espinu santa* and *vera*, in Portugal, *Arvore de Espinhos de Cristo*; and in other countries we find the same association; for instance: in Poland, *Ciern Chrystusa*; in Silesia, *Christdorn*; in Holland, *Christdoorn*, and in France, *Epine de Christ*. Old Gerard is led to call it the Christ's Thorn, or Jews' Thorn, on the authority of Petrus Bellonius, who, having travelled over the Holy Land, saith that this was the "shrubbie thorne Paliurus

wherewith they crowned our Saviour Christ. His reason for the proof hereof is this, that in Judæa there was not any thorn so common, so pliant, or so fit for to make a crown or garland of, nor any so full of cruel, sharp prickles. It groweth throughout the whole country in such abundance that it is their common fuel to burn; yea, so common with them there as our gorse, brakes, and broom is here with us. Josephus, in his first book of Antiquities, and eleventh chapter, saith that this thorn hath the most sharp prickles of any other, and, therefore, that Christ might be the more tormented, the Jews rather took this than any other." The tradition of the Buckthorn being the Spina Christi existed, however, long before the time of Bellonius, as the folk-lore names tend to prove; and Ruellius, in 1544, records the prevalent belief of the "Rhamus, Ramus et Virguerum Spinosum, quo Cristus pientiss. S. N. coronatus est."

In Germany the name has become attached to the *Rhamnus catharticus* more than to its kindred species, and this, perhaps, from some legend of the shrub having lost its spines and become endowed with qualities helpful to aid humanity after its contact with the suffering Son of man; for this species has no thorn, and the juice of its berries is sold under the name of syrup of buckthorn as a purgative. It grows in our hedges in England and flowers in May under the frequently-heard name of Christ's thorn; in Prussia it is Kreuzholz, in Silesia, Mecklenburg, and indeed most German states, Kreuzdorn; in Austria, Kreuzbeersbrauch; the same in Berne, and in Denmark Korsbaertorn. Another shrub of this family grows in the Jordan valley, as also in the East Indies, the drupes of whose plum-fruit are wholesome and excellent, and known as Jujubes; it is the *Zizyphus Jujuba* or *Rhamnus Nubica*, called Chinese Japonica by gardeners in Europe. Another N. African species yields the Lotus, from eating which the Lotophagi are said to have been named, and this is the *Zizyphus Lotus*.

The Rhamnus is thought by Kuhn and others to get its name of Buckthorn or Bocksodorn from having been used to burn the sacrificial buck-goat in heathen Teutonic days, and it is still used in the East to heat the sacrificial oven for the Jewish paschal feast: Hence, throughout Germany, it has also the name Jews' Thorn, or Judendorn and Judenbaum. It was also said to have been the bush in whose tangled meshes the ram was caught by Abraham on Mount Moriah, where the temple afterwards stood; and it is curious to note that it continued to be used at the Christian Pasch in early times, for Easter fire in Germany was anciently called

from it Bocksborn, being kindled with the wood of the Rhamnus ; and to this day at Dassel, in Westphalia, they are said to continue the custom. St. Gregory of Nyssa applies the words of the Psalm lvii. 10 in the Vulgate to the Crown of Shame—"Priusquam intelligerent spinæ vestræ Rhamnum"—seeming to connect it with both associations. The city of Rheims is said to take its name from the Rhamnus, or Reim in Old French, two branches of which are crossed in the city arms, perhaps in memorial of some relic it once possessed of the Crown of Thorns, or the abundance of this shrub in its neighborhood. The *Zizyphus vulgaris* grows profusely about Paris, and is often to be met with in our English hedgerows, and it is not unlikely that once it was cultivated for pious memorial as well as for other uses, such as the Easter fire. In Sicily we find the name for it of Zaccati natalini, which would indicate that there it formed the Christmas fagot that burned on the hearth of every home in Europe, to be succeeded by the Yule log on the Holy Night, "to keep the divine infant from the cold," as they say in the Tyrol. The earliest parable recorded in the Bible is that addressed by Jotham to the Schechmites from the overhanging hillside of Gerizim, a spot where the prevalence of the olive tree clearly marks that tree for sovereignty ; next to the olive, the rarer but still commanding fig tree, or the trailing festoons of the vine, are most prominent ; each, however, refuses the kingship of the trees ; finally, "Dixerunt omnia ligna ad Rhamnum : Veni et impera supernos." They thus descended from the noble and useful trees to this worthless bush, whose only utility was to furnish their sacrificial ovens with fire ! There was, however, a symbolical sense in which mediæval observers of nature would apply these words, showing how the most humble of plants became indeed their king when it formed the diadem of the Saviour on the Cross, and thus gave a fresh application to its reply : "If, indeed, you mean to make me King, Come ye, and rest under my shadow : but if ye mean it not, let fire come out from the Rhamnus (bramble in trans.), and devour the cedars of Libanus." (Judg. ix.)

Although in every way the Rhamnus seems to be the more probable identification, still, in considering these sacred associations of plants with the Crown of our Lord, we must continue our mention of others which have been chosen for memorials of the same. The *Lycium Europæum* and *lanceolatum* or Box-thorns, which are found in southern Europe, are also to be found about Palestine, and often chosen by eastern Christians to weave into small wreaths in memory of the thorny crown. In Italy, in vari-

ous districts, this straggling thorn is known by various names in this connection, such as Spina da Corone de Crocifissi, Corone de Spine, Spino di Cristo, Tuchia da Cristi or Pruno di Macchio (Thorn of Shame), and in Sicily and Sardinia, etc., the same titles prevail. In Syria the *Ribes orientale* is common; it is one of the natural order to which our gooseberry and currants belong, and in northern Europe they have named the prickly stems of their gooseberry bushes in connection with the Passion; thus, in Sweden the *Ribes grossularia* is the Krusbär, the Krúsbaer of Denmark; in Flanders it is Kruisdorn, as it is in many parts of Germany. We find it Christdorn in Silesia, Christorenbere in eastern Prussia, and Cordus gives the name of Herr Gottsbeer as prevalent in his time (sixteenth century). In Swabia it is Nonnenfürzl, from its presence in their culinary garden, and it seems to have been a popular monastic shrub, for such names as Cloisterberry, Klosterbeer and Uva de' Frati are often found for it. The derivation of gooseberry from gorseberry would seem very probable, as we hear it still called in Swabia Nuns' furze. The common Furze or Whin (*Ulex Europæus*) has the same association in Denmark, where it is Kristi tvankrun, a thought which its harassing cruel spines might very well recall, and its lovely golden flower rejoices every British heath. The *Ulex provincialis* species is found in southern Europe, and may therefore exist in Palestine, but we cannot recall having seen it there.

Mrs. Jameson, speaking of the Crown of Thorns in her "History of Our Blessed Lord" (p. 85), says:

"This object, too, like all the various instruments of our Lord's sufferings, was viewed in the likeness of various types, accomplished, unconsciously, by the cruel ingenuity of His enemies. While thrust on His brows in mockery of a regal diadem, it denoted also the thorns and briers sown by the first Adam, and now forever blunted on the sacred head of the second Adam. Or, according to the beautiful idea of St. Ambrose, the thorns are the sinners of this world, thus woven into a trophy, and worn triumphant upon the bleeding brows of the Redeemer."

This connection between the Curse of the Crown, the Thistles and the Thorns, was not unnoticed among the men of old time as they passed along their country wastes, for to them type and anti-type were constantly familiar. Just as the pitiless *Carlina corymbosa* was Christ's Scourge in Spain and Provence, so another of that order, the *Carthamus lanatus*, was Espino de Cristo, while its red juice recalled the Sangre de Cristo, or, as in southern France, Le Troune de Nostre Segné. The Eryngiums, lovers of sandy soils, all rigid and spinous, had the same thoughts connected with them. Our Field Eryngo (*Eryngium campestre*), which in Russia

has the curious name of Adamova Golova, or Adam's Head, recalling the legend of Calvary's Rock in a double manner, has in Germany, Holland, Sweden and Belgium the name of the Cross Thistle; and so, too, the species *E. maritimum*, whose dense blue terminal head of flower is common upon our sea-shores in August. Just as the Creeping Thistle (*C. arvensis*) is popularly known as the Thistle of the Curse, so the *Carduus benedictus* is everywhere called the Blessed Thistle, and in Germany the Thistle of the Cross, or Tribulus Sanctæ Crucis.

A singularly beautiful little emblem of the Crown of Thorns is to be found in the Medicagos we now call Calvary Clover. It comes from the Levant, and is probably to be found in the Holy Land. Like the Starry Trefoil (*Trifolium stellatum*) of our English commons, whose pale rose flowers are known in the Balearic Isles as Corona de Cristo, so the Medicagos have large globular seed-vessels, which uncoil into exquisite little memorials of this instrument in the Passion. Sown on Good Friday—that day so propitious for seed-planting in all old garden lore—it comes up on Low Sunday, and certain species produce leaves stained as if with blood. After flowering, seeds of a dark-red color are formed and found enclosed in a ball of the most delicate and lovely texture-work, and this can be uncoiled so as to make a little spinous girdle ready to be plaited into a circle of thorns. The *Medicago maculata*, *ciliaris*, *præcox* and *denticulata lappacea*, are all most suitably called Calvary Clovers, worthy of cultivating in this pious fashion; but perhaps the best for choice may be the *Medicago cchinus* (not *tuberculata*).

Here we end the memorials with which we are acquainted, in nature, in connection with one incident in the Passion, and the extent to which it was recalled throughout Europe is as indicative of the piety of thought of mediæval times as are the remains they have left us in architecture and other forms of art. We will close with a pretty old doggerel charm used for extracting a thorn from the flesh, once frequently to be heard in old England, when faith-healing had not degenerated into imposture, and christened folk are not likely to deem the thought that it suggests as impotent to aid the sufferer. It ran:

“Happy man that Christ was born,
 He was crowned with a thorn.
 He was pierced through the skin,
 For to let the poison in.
 But His five wounds, they say,
 Closed before He passed away.
 In with healing, out with thorn,
 Happy man that Christ was born.”

It seems a peasant's practical application of the words of the concluding verse of the office hymn we have already referred to as that for the commemoration of Corona Spinarum :

“Culpis satæ mortalium
Te, Christe, spiræ vulnerant,
Evelle nostras, cordibus
Tuasque nostris insere.”

ALFRED E. P. RAYMUND DOWLING, B.A., Oxon.

THE LAST OF THE HURON MISSIONS.

FORT PONTCHARTRAIN was built and the colony of Detroit founded in 1701. The location selected by its founder was the north littoral of the strait, two miles below Isle aux Cochons, around which island the waters of Lake St. Clair circle and unite in a bay forming the head of the strait flowing into Lake Erie twenty miles below. The original colonists during the first decade located their farms above the post as far up as Lake St. Clair; these farms were nearly uniform in width, a few arpents only; but each had a water-front, and extended north three miles into the forest. By this wise arrangement each family had an abundant supply of fresh water for domestic use and for the live-stock of the farm, besides communication by canoe during eight months of the year, and by the *carriole* and pony on the ice during the winter. Below the fort were located the Huron, the Miami and the Pottawotomi Indian villages. A few farms had been located between the fort and the Huron village.

No attention seems to have been given during the first decade to the colonization of the south littoral opposite Fort Pontchartrain, whose stockade inclosure had in the meantime afforded shelter to the colonists against hostile Indian marauders.

Later arrivals of colonists, however, who had been encouraged to settle at the post, finding the water-front of the north littoral solidly occupied, located farms on the south littoral with similar advantages.

Thus it came about that, near the end of the third decade

of the eighteenth century, on the north and south sides of the strait, which was about half a mile wide in the vicinity of the fort, were French colonists united to a great extent by kindred ties, who were solidly Catholic, who attended divine service and accomplished their religious obligations at Ste. Anne's, near the fort, which had been served by Recollet Fathers, and which was the mother Church of the West and North-west.

As we have stated, the Hurons had their village about a mile below the fort. It was well defended by a surrounding stockade, besides a strong fort with bastions inclosing a council-house and a granary.

The Hurons were good hunters, leading sober lives; and, according to a report to the Government, they were well clad, and lived comfortably in commodious homes. The same report states that they were good farmers, raising more grain and vegetables than they needed, while their surplus was bartered to advantage at the store-house of the post. But they at all times had in the granary of their fort a supply of grain sufficient to provide for any possible emergency.¹

They lived under a tribal system similar to and as ancient as that of their kindred, the tribes of the Iroquoian Confederacy.

Their chief sachem, Sas-ta-ret-sa, who was a sincere Christian, occupied one of the best houses on the strait, which had been built for him by direction of the Marquis de Vandreuil, Governor-General of New France.²

When Father Charlevoix visited Detroit in 1721 he remained at the post several weeks, the guest of Father Delino, Recollet pastor of Ste. Anne's. He was naturally attracted to the Huron village, whose people were descendants of the tribes of Huronia, who, during the previous century, had been won from Paganism by missionaries of his order, and subsequently driven from their homes by an invading army of Iroquoian warriors.

His knowledge of the Iroquoian language, which to some extent was spoken by the Hurons, enabled him to mingle with their people and converse with their chiefs.

Sas-ta-ret-sa had passed to eternity, while some of the old chiefs had a faint traditional knowledge of Christianity remaining. The generality, however, although not Pagans, followed their tribal laws and customs.

¹ This report was made in 1718. See N. Y. Col. Doc. 9.

² This house was built by the Chevalier Cadillac. In modern times it had become the home of Governor Cass; it was subsequently moved and taken down in 1890. It might have lasted for another century.

No Jesuit could look with indifference upon the Huron people, who were among the *élite* of the Indians of North America. Father Charlevoix became deeply solicitous for their spiritual regeneration; before leaving Detroit he informed the chief sachem that he would, on his return to Quebec, endeavor to have a missionary sent to their canton. He explained the situation to the Father Superior of the Jesuits at Quebec, who promised to send a missionary to the Hurons at Detroit as soon as one suitable would be available.

But most of the Iroquoian missionaries, who were familiar with the language of the Hurons, were incapacitated by age and infirmity for active work. Some years elapsed before the promise made by Father Superior Du Park could be fulfilled.

In 1728 Father Armand de La Richardie, S.J., was appointed missionary to the Hurons at the post of Detroit, and he reached the scene of his spiritual labors early in the summer of that year. We are indebted to Father Arthur E. Jones, S.J., archivist of St. Mary's College, Montreal, for such authentic information as will enable us to publish for the first time, probably, in the English language, an outline of the career of one of the most learned and distinguished of the Fathers of the Society of Jesus of the old *régime*, who became the founder of one of the most remarkable and successful missionary establishments in North America during the eighteenth century.

Father de La Richardie was born in the diocese of Périgueux, France, June 7, 1686. This would give his age at 42 years when he came to Detroit.

"He was," says Father Jones, "of a distinguished family, uncle of Monseigneur de la Crope de Bourzeque, Bishop of Noyon, a count and peer of France, when Church and State existed harmoniously side by side. The Bishop of Noyon was a zealous prelate and friend of the members of the Society of Jesus."

Armand de La Richardie entered the society October 21, 1703, and took his first vows at Limoges, October 25, 1705. He made the solemn profession of the four vows February 2, 1721.

He arrived at Quebec in 1725, and spent the two following years at the Huron village of Lorette, near Quebec, where he acquired a knowledge of the Huron dialect under direction of Father Richer, S.J. When Father de La Richardie arrived at Detroit he found the Recollets of Ste. Anne in pastoral jurisdiction over the habitants on both littorals of the strait. To avoid possible complications in the future as to his jurisdiction as a missionary, he wrote to Father Superior Du Park, and through him ob-

tained pastoral control over the habitants on the south littoral, on which side he intended to establish his mission.

The location selected was the Point de Montreal, nearly opposite Fort Pontchartrain, where a crescent bay, whose gravelly shore touched the channel, gave easy access to canoes and larger boats.¹ This locality is now known as Sandwich, in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

About 300 feet above the shore, and overlooking the strait, *La Mission des Hurons du Detroit* was commenced by the building of a mission-house 30 by 45 feet.

The mission-church was then built of hewed upright timber. It was "70 cubits long."² The church was well inclosed and roofed with boards.

This church was probably dedicated on the festival of the Assumption, 1729. Its successor, built 122 years later, bears this name, as does the parish.

The funds requisite for the establishment of the Huron mission were supplied by the Government of France.³ Father de La Richardie outlined his preliminary work in a letter to the Father Superior, which, translated from the Latin text, is as follows :

"On my arrival I did not find a single Huron who professed the Christian faith, though some of the old people had been baptized during sickness by the missionaries before the tribes had removed from their former homes. One of the principal chiefs, Ho-a-is-ens, after being instructed was baptized; his example so influenced the people of his tribe that not a single soul among them resisted the grace of the Holy Spirit. The death of this chief soon after deprived me of his great influence over the people of the other tribes, and I became greatly discouraged.

"While in this state of mind the merciful intervention of the Saviour induced the Hurons of both sexes to come cheerfully to the open-air instructions which I preached.

"With God's assisting grace the good work succeeded so well that within three years from the death of Ho-a-is-ens not a single soul in the Huron village (at Detroit) remained unconverted."⁴

After the mission-house and church had been completed, a *forge* was built near the crescent bay, stocked with material, and placed in charge of an armorer for the convenience of the mission, of the habitants, and of the Indians.

After seven years of apostolic labor, Father de La Richardie sought the enjoyment of community life at the College of Quebec,

¹ This selection was in accord with the usual good judgment of the Jesuit Fathers, who located their missionary centres with reference to sanitary, to strategic, and to accessible advantages, and rarely without attractive surroundings.

² Letter of Father de La Richardie to the Father Superior at Quebec.

³ Manuscript document in the Archiepiscopal archives, Quebec.

⁴ Manuscript letter dated June 21, 1741. For the copy, we are indebted to Father Arthur E. Jones, S.J.

where he spent the winter of 1735-36. His sojourn at the college was not altogether recreative. Father Luc-François Nau, S.J., wrote to Father Bonin, S.J., from Sault St. Louis (near Montreal), October 2, 1736: "*Le Père de la Richardie a passé l'hiver a Quebec, où il a fait des biens infinis par le moyen des deux retraites publiques qu'il a données.*"¹ Before his return to Detroit he completed an important arrangement, which had for its object the attraction to his mission, for permanent settlement, of the Huron tribes domiciled at Detroit, on Bois Blanc Island, at the end of the strait near Lake Erie, and at Sandusky. He had already established a sub-mission on Bois Blanc, where he had also in operation *la ferme de la mission*, which was well stocked, having a resident farmer, the annual products of which amply sufficed for the requirements of his missionary establishments.

This arrangement, as far as we know, comprised the establishment of what was unique in missionary work in North America; it was the establishment of a *mission store-house*, on a basis more extensive than that of any existing trading-concern at the post of Detroit, where the Indian could dispose of the products of his hunting-seasons on an honest basis of barter, while he was protected from the fraudulent and to some extent inhuman practices of the local traders, who generally first made the Indian drunk, and then obtained his furs without fair consideration in exchange, principally for *eau de vie*, which, instead of necessary articles, he brought to his home, thereby entailing much misery to his family. Father de La Richardie understood the situation; his intentions, while beneficent, were profoundly politic. He appointed Monsieur Rene de Couagne, a wealthy merchant of Montreal, factor of the intended mercantile establishment of *La Mission des Hurons du Detroit*. Placing in his hands the requisite funds, he authorized the shipment to the mission of the stock of goods which the merchant should deem suitable for such an establishment. After obtaining the services of Lay Brother La Tour to take charge of the mission-store, he returned to Detroit. We have said that Father de La Richardie understood the situation. He had the welfare of his Huron constituents at heart.

At this time the prices paid for furs by the leading English traders in barter were much higher than those of the French traders, while the barter-value fixed by the former on blankets,

¹ Father Nau adds: "*Le Détroit est le plus beau pays du Canada. Il n'a presque pas d'hiver. Toutes sortes de fruits y viennent aussi bons qu'en France.*" A transcript of this correspondence has been kindly furnished us by Father Jones, S.J., Montreal.

on powder, on lead, on vermilion, on cutlery, arms, cotton and trinkets, was much lower than that demanded by the latter.¹ It was advantageous to the Huron hunter to dispose of his packs of furs to the English traders, but to do this required a journey through territory inhabited by the enemies of his race, with the possibility that he would never return to his home.

It will be seen that the design of Father de La Richardie was based on wise and beneficent considerations. Under his able direction the mercantile annex of his missionary fabric became the most important of its kind on the strait; it proved of great importance to the welfare of the Indian and his family, as well as to the habitants and officials on both littorals.

It was controlled by Lay Brother La Tour, and conducted on strict business rules, while its able factor at Montreal contributed largely to its commercial success. It should not be inferred, however, that Father de La Richardie took any part in the operations of the mission-store; Brother La Tour and his assistant, Regis, did the work of the store, while the former supervised the business of the forge and the management of the mission-farm on Bois Blanc, while neither officiated in the church. There was a Lay Brother, with an assistant, for the church and presbytery.

In 1743 the mission-house was enlarged by an addition of 60 feet front on the west, by 45 feet deep—making a building 90 by 45.

The accounts of the mission show that Pierre Meloche was contractor for the wood-work, and Nicolas-François Janis for the mason work. Alterations were made in the interior of the church during the same year; besides, out-buildings were constructed; the total outlay exceeding 6,000 livres, all of which was paid and the mission was placed entirely free from debt.²

The west 60 feet was used for the mission-store, while all the east 30 feet was reserved for the presbytery, in which lived the missionary and his male household.³

In 1743 Father Pierre Potier, S.J., arrived at Quebec from

¹ New York Col. Doc. 9, 892.

² *Livre de Compte.* Potier MS.

³ Probably the best illustration of the mission-house as enlarged in 1743, which was first occupied by Father de La Richardie, and subsequently by his successor, Father Pierre Potier, S.J., until the accidental death of the latter, in 1781, is to be found in *Memorials of Half a Century*, by the late Bela Hubbard, of Detroit.

We saw this ancient landmark of Catholic missionary work in 1891. The building was still entire, with massive stone chimneys and dormer windows; it had been standing 143 years. In recent years the original 30 feet, built in 1728, was taken down. The remaining 60 feet front is still extant, and likely to remain on its solid foundation during a century or more. It is occupied as a dwelling, and surrounded by a garden and orchard.

France, a volunteer for Indian missionary work ; he was then in his 34th year. He was sent to the Huron village at Lorette, where he soon acquired a practical knowledge of the Huron dialect, and in the following year he was sent to assist Father de La Richardie, who was overburdened with work. Father Potier was assigned the care of the sub-mission on Bois Blanc Island, where he perfected his knowledge of the Huron language. On March 26, 1746, occurred the first serious menace to the health of the Superior of the mission ; he experienced an attack of paralysis, which, although not of a severe nature, he was induced to recreate for a time at the College of Quebec. He departed by the spring convoy, leaving Father Potier in charge.

The latter records, in the *Livre de Comte*, the instructions of Father de La Richardie, which, translated, reads :

“ Prayers shall be daily offered in the church for the safe return of the Father Superior during his absence. The new church is to be of the same width, but 16 feet longer than the old edifice. The sacristy is to be of wood, and 16 feet square ; a new refectory and servants' room to be built by the side of the old refectory. The kitchen is to be enlarged by using a part of the old refectory. The church is to have a new bell, similar to that in the fort at Detroit.”

Directions follow as to frame-work by M. Meloche and mason-work by M. Janis, and the prices to be paid. Memorandums were also left as to the farm and the forge.

In the meantime the Huron canton and fort below Fort Pontchartrain had been abandoned ; the tribes crossed the strait and built a new village, fort and council-house on the prairie west of the mission. Thus, after seventeen years, the design of Father de La Richardie to concentrate these and other tribes at the Point de Montreal was to a considerable extent accomplished.

The status of the mission, in connection with these instructions of the Father Superior, may be stated as follows : The church and presbytery ; the mission-store, which was one of the most extensive mercantile concerns, if not the largest, on the strait ; the farms, farm-houses, the live-stock, the out-buildings and the forge, all well equipped ; while the entire establishment was free from debt.

So far as the Huron tribes in the vicinity were interested, their people had not enjoyed such agreeable surroundings since their forefathers had been driven from the Christian fabric which had been reared in their ancient homes in Huronia. Father de La Richardie returned the following year, and during his absence the improvements he had directed had been finished and paid for.

Father Potier made this entry :

“Charles Parant, ‘the carpenter,’ has been paid for all the work completed in the church and for the work he is yet to finish, which includes an altar-railing corresponding with the plan sketched by him on the confessional; one closet for the antependiums of the altar, and one for altar-linens, albs, surplices and ornaments; both of which are to be built in the vestry. Finally, if deemed advisable, he is to build two chapels (in alcoves), price to be agreed upon.”¹

It is evident from this entry that the mission-church was well provided; the fact that the *pain benit* was distributed on Sundays and festivals indicates that the two Jesuit Fathers conducted the religious ceremonies in accordance with the regulations prescribed.

While the majority of the congregation were red-skinned Hurons, the French race were always present. To the former the ceremonials were edifying, while to the latter they revived memories essentially Catholic, and dear to their feelings as well as to their fervent faith.

While Fathers de La Richardie and Potier wore the brevet of the Companions of the Society of Jesus, attainable only after passing the probationary ordeal of the rule of their order, they essentially differed in temperament. Father de La Richardie was a fine scholar, a wise administrator, reserved in manner, and very pious; Father Potier was perhaps not as profound as his *confrère*, but the bibliographical manuscripts he left indicate considerable ability. He was over six feet and of slender frame; his great wit, which his personal diary indicates, must have made him the solace of his austere Superior, while it cheered the solitary existence of both.

The *Livre de Compte* of the mission shows that the establishment was more than self-supporting.²

A surplus of grain was harvested on the mission farm; more than necessary was the supply of meat, dairy products and vegetables from the same source.

¹ *Livre de Compte*, etc. Potier MS. While M. Meloche constructed the framework, it is evident that Charles Parant did the finer work in the church.

² The following memorandum, written in the account-book of the mission in reference to “*la ferme*,” is introduced in evidence of the self-sustaining status of the establishment; it is by Father de La Richardie. Translated it reads:

“The farm is to be worked on shares. The increase in live-stock will also be equally divided, and the use of the cattle given to the mission when needed.

“The farmer shall haul from 40 to 50 cords of wood each winter for the use of the mission and dependencies, and furnish suet and lard to the extent of 200 pounds weight. The following live-stock is to be furnished the farmer in addition to that on hand: 3 cows, 1 heifer, 2 oxen and 2 mares. Besides the farm-stock, the mission owns, on separate account for breeding purposes, ‘Major’ and ‘White Back,’ and ‘Souris,’ a mare. The farmer shall be given 45 fowls, from which he shall furnish each year an equal number of chickens for the table and 45 dozen eggs.”

The bread for daily use was baked from flour supplied ; which, with the laundry-work of the mission, was contracted for from year to year.¹

In the meantime the health of Father de La Richardie had become so impaired that he retired to Quebec, and Father Potier became Superior of the mission.²

War now prevailed in the East. The New England Puritans and most of the people of the Colonies disliked the French settlers on the St. Lawrence on account of their religion.

A colonial war was provoked, which finally became a national contest between England and France for supremacy.

During this war the Indian tribes on the strait sided with their French friends, and many war-parties were organized and took the trail for Canada. French officers came to Fort Pontchartrain and recruited the flower of the habitant youth, who were formed into companies and sent by way of Lake Erie to Montreal. Among the deplorable results of this unfortunate contest affecting Detroit may be included the loss of the best hunters of the Huron, the Miami, the Ottawa and the Pottawotomi nations, who had their homes in the vicinity of the post. The young Indian hunters could not resist the attractions of the war-path. The economic results were soon severely felt in the Indian's household and in the community, which depended so largely upon the fur trade for business and support. The Indian no longer went to the hunting-field, for he was on the war-path in Canada, and there were no packs for the trader to barter for ; this prolific source of trade was suspended.

The situation of the habitants became deplorable. Their robust sons had volunteered for the war and were fighting in Canada ;

¹ The cost of baking and of the laundry-work was 100 livres per year.

² In the records of the Hotel Dieu, of Quebec, of the year 1758, the soul of Father de La Richardie having passed to eternity in the latter part of March of that year, is the following Capitular Act., transcribed for us by the Rev. Arthur E. Jones, S.J.:

“ Le 28 Mars, 1758, notre communanté capitulairement assemblée, notre Révérend Mère, Marie André Duplessis, de Ste. Heléne, Supérieure, qui avait remarqué beaucoup d' empressement dans toutes les Religieuses de cette maison pour donnée au feu R'd. P. Armand de La Richardie, de la Compagnie de Jésus, mort le 17 de ce mois, des marques publiques de reconnaissance, nous proposa de lui faire un service solennel, ayant déjà pour cela l'agrément de Monseigneur notre Évêque. Toutes y consentirent tres volontiers, se souvenant avec gratitude de la charité que ce Rev'd Père eut pour nous après l'incendie de notre maison. Il était pour lors Vice Supérieur du College de Quebec, il nous fit fournir abondamment de pain, de viande et autres nécessités, même pour nos domestiques, et depuis ce temps etant notre confesseur jusqu' a sa dernière maladie, il nous a visité pendant unc mortalité qui nous a fait perdre dix religieuse en moins de quatre mois, venant toutes ces jours les consoler plutot deux fois qu'une.”

Thus ended the saintly career of the venerable founder of the Huron Mission of Detroit, in his seventy-third year. All we have stated of the history of this distinguished missionary has been drawn from authentic records.

their strong arms were no longer available for the cultivation of the soil; agriculture languished; while their family circles were saddened by the absence of cherished ones, and their maidens who pined for lovers they might never behold again.

To add to these misfortunes, the successive failures of crops on both littorals of the straits caused a scarcity of cereals, while the price of grain advanced to three times its normal value.

The Hurons on Bois Blanc Island had become so restive that the sub-mission could no longer be continued, while *la ferme de la mission* on the island had to be abandoned. Its live-stock, seed and implements were transferred to the ten or more acres of cultivable land which had been inclosed in the vicinity of the mission near the Point de Montreal, which thereafter became the mission-farm. In a few years it became unsafe for the semi-annual convoys to traverse Lake Erie, and commercial intercourse by way of the Georgian Bay and the Ottawa River, between Detroit and Montreal, had to be resumed. The business at the store-house of the mission declined from the causes stated; shipments from and to Montreal became of small account.

The transfer from French to British rule on the north and south littorals of the Detroit had no serious effects on the habitants, who probably were guided by the advice of Father Bocquet on the north and of Father Potier on the south. But in many homes there was mourning for sons whose lifeless forms lay unrecognized under the soil of the Plains of Abraham, and of other battlefields in far distant Canada. The burden of grief, however, fell upon the mothers, whose religion became their consolation. The records of Ste. Anne and of the Assumption show, by the many votive masses provided for, the aid invoked through this medium for the souls of the cherished ones.¹

¹ The following entry in the *Livre de Compte*, in the handwriting of Father Potier, shows the number of masses provided for. Translated it reads:

"The following named persons are indebted to this mission for masses offered during the winter for their intentions," viz.:

Surgeon Chapoton of the fort,	18 livres.
"Père Bon" of Ste. Anne's,	50 "
"Big" Pilette,	35 "
François Des Ruisseau,	28 "
Madam Gervais,	19 "
The late Jacques Campeau,	10 "
Charles Chesne,	9 "
Madam Belleperche,	2 "
Madam Catin,	2 "
Maurice St. Louis,	2 "
Jean Baptiste Campeau and wife,	2 "
Madam Montmirel and Pierre Perthuis,	2 "

While the habitants soon recovered their wonted cheerfulness and continued their agricultural pursuits, the demoralizing effects of war had so unsettled the people of the four Indian nations in the vicinity of Detroit that their condition became a menace to British tranquillity. The French had capitulated, but the Indian nations had not made peace; a serious cause of offence would have aroused the Indian population to unite in retaliation, which might result in a general Indian war against British rule in the West.

So alarming was the situation on this frontier that Sir William Johnson, the "Irish Mohawk chief," who at the time was British Commissioner of Indian Affairs, came to Detroit early in September, 1761. He was escorted by a company of the Royal American regiment, and brought with him from Niagara a large fleet of bateaux laden with provisions and Indian goods intended for presents.

The baronet was a colonel in the British army, and major-general in the Colonial forces. The purpose of his visit was to treat with the Indian nations on the frontier, and by treaties bring them under British rule. In Indian diplomacy Sir William had no equal in North America; he remained at Detroit two weeks, and finally negotiated a treaty with the four nations at the post—with the Ohio Delawares, the Shawnees, the Senecas, and the Upper Lake Chippewas.

His distribution of presents was extensive. The harmonious result of his diplomacy may have been agreeable, but we believe he was too sagacious to put entire faith in the sincerity of the newly acquired Indian subjects of the British crown.

During the visit of the baronet he entertained the French residents at dinners and balls; twice he had Fathers Bocquet and Potier to dine at his quarters; his demeanor toward the conquered race was characteristic of the chivalrous soldier and the Irish gentleman, and doubtless had the effect of securing their friendly course during the ensuing sanguinary Indian war.¹ His last visit of ceremony was made to Father Potier after he had visited the Huron canton on the evening of his departure, September 17, 1761. The missionary entertained him at supper, at which were present several prominent French residents.²

"Père Bon," of Ste. Anne's, was the name given Father Bonaventure Carpentier, who, having more masses than he could perform, had fifty offered by Father Potier, as stated.

¹ Colonel Duquesne and Major La Motte, French officers, who had surrendered their swords to the baronet when he captured Fort Niagara, were residing at the post at the time of this visit; both gentlemen were courteously invited to all entertainments given by him.

² The detailed history of the visit is quite interesting. It will be found in the appendix of the *Life of Sir William Johnson*, by W. L. Stone.

Meanwhile some light is shed upon the pastoral work of Father Potier during the preceding years. "I have," wrote Dr. Shea in his letter to us dated July 11, 1883, "a curious list, in the handwriting of the Rev. Father Potier, S.J., of those who made their Easter communion in 1747, 1748, 1749, 1750, 1751, 1752, 1753, 1754, 1755, 1756, 1757, 1758, 1759, and 1760. There were eighty names given in 1759, which was not bad for the population at that time. His list for 1760 is short; he got four or five names down, and then wound up with "*et igdem qui annis superioribus.*" There were no "backsliders." Many of these names, Dr. Shea remarks, seem to be of Detroit families—Campau, Clairmont, De Quindre, Godefroy, Le Beau, Le Vert, and others.¹

"The Conspiracy of Pontiac" seriously menaced the tenure of British control over all the territory west of the Ohio, and from Niagara over the lake regions as far west and north as the head waters of Lake Superior. The focus of Pontiac's intrigue was at the Ottawa castle, two miles above the Huron missionary establishment. The great conspirator had won to his project the tribes of his own, as well as those of the Huron, the Miami, and the Pottawotomi nations at Detroit. The local history of the conspiracy, its relation to the habitants, but more especially to Father Potier, is of interest.

The *chantier* and mills of Pierre Meloche adjoined the Ottawa canton on the east; his home, as well as that of his relative, Charles Parant, was directly across the strait. These gentlemen had enjoyed the esteem and friendship of Fathers de La Richardie and Potier, and had mainly constructed the church and adjacent buildings of the missionary establishment. Both were friends of Pontiac, while M. Meloche, especially, was as intimate as any Christian could have been with such a peculiar character as was the Ottawa chieftain.

Parkman, in his "Conspiracy of Pontiac," fairly illustrates the magical influence of the Ottawa conspirator over so many Indian tribes. This writer describes the massacre of the garrisons of Forts Le Bœuf, Miami, Michilimacinac, Presque Isle, Sandusky, St. Joseph, and Venango, at a preconcerted time, accompanied as each tragedy was by lamentable slaughter. He writes a vivid description of the failure of the Ohio Delawares to surprise Fort Pitt, and of the repulse of the Senecas when they assailed Fort Niagara.

¹ This list of Father Potier was probably among the papers of the mission sequestered by the commandant at Detroit in 1781.

The two latter forts were in their respective localities the strongholds of British supremacy, and more or less essential, but not entirely so, to the consummation of Pontiac's design. This included the capture of the fort at Detroit, which, if captured, would have given him control over the lake regions westward of Niagara. This was to have been the masterpiece of his bloody work; its consummation he reserved for himself. His plan to surprise the fort and massacre its garrison was ingenious; it would have succeeded had not Major Gladwin, who was in command, been warned on the eve of its execution, and foiled his wily enemy. As to who or by whose direction the disclosure was made to Major Gladwin has been, and we believe will ever remain, an unsolved historical enigma. In vain has Mr. Parkman sought for authentic evidence to establish the truth, both in America and in Europe; he acknowledges his failure, and he was compelled to give his readers the traditional story of the disclosure current, and generally believed on the strait, that Major Gladwin was warned at the opportune time by a young Chippewa woman who had made him a pair of moccasins which she brought to his quarters, and, after being liberally paid by the officer, unburdened her conscience of the terrible secret she possessed and disclosed the plot.

This is simply the outline of a story which has formed the subject of the novelist and of the dramatist, and which has inspired Stanley, probably the greatest painter of American Indianology, to immortalize a scene in Western history by his painting of the interview of the Chippewa girl with Major Gladwin.

But romance, however agreeable to the imagination, cannot be accepted as history.

Mr. Parkman, who had devoted much of his life to the study of Indian character, could not accept the tradition as genuine because of the natural improbability upon its face. The Indian woman at that period, as he well knew, because of her inferior social position, did not share the confidence of her husband or master; she was the drudge, if not the slave, in the Pagan lodge; but whether wife, mistress, or daughter, she was considered beneath the consideration of the lord and master of the Indian home.

Others, familiar with the social status of the Pagan Indian's household at the time, who have become interested in the solution of this historical enigma, assert that it was improbable that an Indian woman, but more especially a Chippewa, could have acquired a knowledge of the plans of the Ottawa chief, so carefully had they been guarded even from his most intimate associates; moreover, they claim that such a breach of Indian custom was as un-

likely then as would be, in our own times, the disclosure by a Free Mason "in good standing" of the secret of his lodge to his wife or daughter.

Mr. Parkman and other historians who have studied the history of the events on this frontier at this period apparently had but little knowledge of the position occupied during those exciting times by Father Potier, in his relations with the Hurons and other Indian tribes in the vicinity of his mission, nor were they probably aware of the intimate business relations existing between himself and Pierre Meloche, the near neighbor and confidential friend of Pontiac.

We believe that Father Potier learned directly or indirectly from Pierre Meloche of the intended *coup* against the fort, and unraveled its details.

Pontiac's plan for the capture of the fort shows strategic ability. Athletic games of the Indians on both sides of the strait were of common occurrence; they were always exciting; tribe was matched against tribe, while the games were witnessed by large numbers of interested Indian spectators, and betting on the result was the rule. The field in front of the fort had been the scene of many well-played games of ball by the Indians, with the officers and soldiers generally as spectators. Pontiac arranged a game of ball to be played near the stockade, and on the appointed day a large number of his warriors were to assemble as spectators; they were to wear their blankets, under the folds of which were to be concealed their rifles, whose barrels would be *sawed off*, and other weapons.¹ The athletes who were to play would be naked, as usual, except their breech-cloth, in which would be concealed their knives.

During the course of the game the ball was to be thrown over the stockade, and the players would be permitted to follow it through the small door near the gates. Once inside the inclosure the athletes were to kill the sentries and open the gates, through which Pontiac and his warriors would enter and commence the slaughter of the unsuspecting garrison.

While this game was being played, the officers and soldiers were not among the spectators as usual; the ball was tossed over the stockade, and after it rushed the athletes through the small door; finding no sentries they opened the gates, through which Pontiac led his warriors on the run; but he found the garrison under arms

¹ The grandfather of the late Colonel Beaufait, whose farm was on the river road east of the fort, told his grandson that he stood at his gate when Pontiac led his warriors in Indian file toward the fort. As the last of the warriors, who was known to M. Beaufait, passed, he lifted his blanket and disclosed the shortened rifle.

as if on parade, the artillery ranged in line, with a gunner at each piece holding a lighted match, and Major Gladwin, with his staff, in full uniform. When Pontiac and his Indians entered the drums were beat, the officers drew their swords, and the soldiers brought their muskets to aim. Pontiac saw he had been betrayed, and he knew that at a single word from the commandant he and his warriors would meet instant death. At a signal the Indians stood in the esplanade, while their leader approached Major Gladwin, and, addressing the latter's interpreter, asked the meaning of such an unusual parade. "Tell him to get out of the fort, with his Indians, immediately, or I shall order my soldiers to kill every one of them," was the response of the commandant. Pontiac led his force without further parley through the gates, and retired beyond the range of fire.

These are the bare facts of the *denouement* of the last of the series of the Ottawa chief's combinations.

How might Father Potier have obtained knowledge of the chief's plan? The scope of the latter's conspiracy was of wide extent. The adhesion of each Indian nation had to be obtained through diplomatic envoys accredited with war-belts of wampum to the sachems; councils had to be convened, to whose directors other war-belts were to be delivered by the envoys; Indian statecraft exhausted much time before important conclusions were reached. We estimate the time required for the perfection of his plans by the conspiring chief to have exceeded two years. This involved expense, the principal item of which was for the black wampum-beads composing the war-belts, without which no Indian diplomacy could proceed.

Such a large supply of wampum-beads at the time could be obtained only at the store-house of the Huron Mission, and the sale of such an unusual quantity could not have passed unnoticed by Lay Brother La Tour. Ammunition was also needed by the four nations at Detroit; to secure a large supply, recourse must be had to the mission store-house. To saw off the barrels of the rifles of Pontiac's warriors required the use of fine tempered steel files; these could not be obtained on either side of the strait except at the mission store-house. There is proof of this in the transactions detailed in the *Livre de Comptes*. But from whom and by whose direction did the timely warning come to Major Gladwin?

Father Potier had been the honored guest on many occasions at the table of the commandant. How could his generous soul contemplate without horror the intended massacre of his chivalric host, of the young officers whose society he had enjoyed so often,

of the soldiers, and of the women and children domiciled within the inclosure of the fort?

And yet he knew that the consummation of the chief's bloody design would in all probability have suspended British control for a long time over all the lake region west of Niagara.

From a careful study of the antecedent circumstances, we venture to claim that the intended massacre was averted by the timely interference of Father Pierre Potier, S.J., Superior of *La Mission des Hurons du Detroit*, and that Major Gladwin was bound by a solemn promise on his honor never to reveal the secret of his deliverance from the impending massacre.

We might claim, further, that this promise was considered so sacred that no documentary evidence in connection, as we have stated, could be found after the most diligent search in the archives of America or at London. The medium Father Potier selected to make the disclosure on the eve of the day appointed for the consummation of the plot was not the Indian woman described in the romantic legend. Indications developed in later years point to the selection of the pretty daughter of Madam Cuillerier, a prominent member of the Huron Church of the Assumption, who, with her husband, is frequently mentioned in the transactions at the mission-store by Father Potier in his *Livre de Compte*.¹

Among the manuscripts of Father Potier in the archives of St. Mary's College, Montreal, probably one of the most curious and interesting is that containing the personal diary of the missionary. It was shown to us by the archivist, Father Jones, S.J., in 1891. It is a well-bound and well-preserved duodecimo of 185 pages, every one of which is closely filled with the minute and beautiful handwriting of its venerable author. In it is his personal history in Europe, an itinerary of his journey to Quebec and thence to Detroit, with a diary of events as they occurred at the mission; curious, droll and piquant as to the events, and more so as to the *dramatis personæ*.²

¹ Clarence M. Burton, of Detroit, has discovered in the Canadian archives at Ottawa a petition to Governor-General Carleton from Mrs. Sterling, formerly Miss Cuillerier, claiming a pension for the important service she rendered during the Pontiac period at Detroit. Mr. Burton believes this lady, as we have claimed, disclosed the plot to Major Gladwin.

² A rare chapter in this diary is the directory of resident Frenchmen on both littorals of the strait, colonists, traders, and officials; it is in three columns—the French names, the translation in Huron, and the Huron nicknames given to each white man, no matter what his position or rank may have been, which, when once applied, became identical with the individual among the Hurons for life.

Some physical peculiarity or defect, the color of the hair, prominent teeth, a large nose, the loss of an eye, a florid complexion, tall or short stature, formed, as the case

But the pages of the diary in which would be noted the events as they occurred during the years 1762, 1763 and 1764 had been removed by Father Potier, probably from prudential motives, and destroyed. The French in this locality after Pontiac's time had a lively fear of the arbitrary power wielded by the commandant of the post of Detroit; he was the law in person and the supreme ruler. Father Potier was too shrewd to leave among his papers any compromising evidence against his friends Pierre Meloche and Charles Parant in connection with the designs of Pontiac. On this account, in our estimation, the historic leaves which would have shed light upon the betrayal of Pontiac's plot were suppressed. After the chief had been driven out of the fort he returned to his castle, and soon after united the warriors of the four Indian nations in an attempt to cut off the supplies of the garrison, to which he laid siege. The arrival by water of troops and supplies saved the fort.

Then followed the sortie to surprise the camp of the chief and the bloody ambushade by the latter on the bridge over Parant's River, where, in the darkness of early morning, the attacking party were routed with great slaughter; the final discomfiture of Pontiac; the dispersion of the Ottawas after they had destroyed their fort and canton on the south littoral, and finally the retirement of their great leader, with some of his chiefs, to Southern Illinois. During the ensuing decade the three Indian nations remaining recuperated from the demoralizing consequences of war, while a new generation of stalwarts replaced its victims.

The lodges in the Huron village had increased in number, while the warriors had resumed their expeditions to their hunting-fields, returning each season with their packs of furs as regularly as the farmers harvested their grain. What remained of the

might be, a descriptive, long syllabic and distinctly pronounced nickname, curiously illustrating the simple construction of the Iroquoian language in the expression of matters relating to every-day life.

Belleperche, a prominent habitant, who had large front teeth, was known among the Indians as "Big Teeth." Douaire de Bondie, a nobleman at the post, had a prominent nose; his nickname was "Long Nose," by which he was designated among the people of the tribes. Father Jones, custodian of this relic, describes Father Potier as a great humorist; the highest dignitaries of Church and State did not escape his wit. In his correspondence he refers to the venerable Bishop of Quebec, who came to Detroit in 1755 to dedicate the third Church of Ste. Anne, as Monseigneur Mitasse; the latter word meant the long red leggings worn by the habitants in winter, which was used to designate the purple hose of the bishop. In this diary is a census of the Hurons and the Ottawas, and the names of their respective chiefs and fighting strength. The names of the articles mostly used in barter are given in Huron. But there are so many droll passages written in the *vie intime* which might be turned to harm that the Jesuits deem its publication unadvisable.

Hurons, the Miamis and the Pottawotomis on the strait were mostly Christians. The Ottawas after abandoning their canton had made new homes on the littoral of Lake Michigan and in the fair regions of the Grand River Valley.

Sir William Johnson was not satisfied with the tenure of British supremacy over the Indian nations during the decade mentioned. He sent belts of wampum to the nations under his official control, inviting them to send their sachems and chiefs as delegates, at a stated time, to attend a general council at Niagara.

Colonel Croghan was sent to Pontiac at Peoria with a belt and invitation to attend this council, with the offer of an armed escort to protect his life against those whose relatives had been slain during his recent war. The chief declined the escort, but he promised to attend. He embarked in a war-canoe, descending Fox River with a retinue of chiefs, his totem on a pennant at the bow; he passed from Green Bay down the lakes and reached the vicinity of the council unmolested, where he encamped, and then sent a wampum-belt to Sir William. The latter sent Colonel Croghan in response, who brought the chief and his retinue to the council, the scene of the opening of which was probably one of the most dramatic in American-Indian history.

Among the chiefs present was young Joseph Brant—Ta-yanda-ne-ga—brother of Sir William's Mohawk wife, Molly Brant. Many other sachems and chiefs were in attendance, but the most renowned Indian among them all was Pontiac.

Sir William presided, as the representative of British power in North America; but he was not dressed in the brilliant uniform of a major-general which he was entitled to wear.

The Irish Mohawk chief wore the dress and carried the arms of a chief of the Mohawk tribe which had adopted him, one of whose maidens he had made his second wife; over his costume he wore the scarlet cloak, indicating his rank in the most warlike of American Indian nations.

When Colonel Croghan entered the council-room with Pontiac, Sir William advanced to receive the renowned Ottawa; the white chief and the red chief were on neutral ground; but the red chief was won to friendship by the warm greeting extended by the white chief. The result of this council secured British supremacy over the Indian nations whose delegates were present, and gave the death-blow to the hopes of Indian control over all the regions west and south-west of New York.

The proceedings of this council, memorable in colonial history, with the great speech of Pontiac *in extenso*, will be found in W. L. Stone's "Memoirs of Sir William Johnson."

Pontiac returned to his camp, re-embarked in his war-canoe, and, sailing through the waters of Lakes Erie, Huron and Michigan to Green Bay, he reached his adopted home, where, some years later, he was assassinated. No native of Detroit, whether of the red or of the white races, was more notable in the history of North America during the eighteenth century than this Ottawa chief. Had he accepted Christianity at the hands of Father de La Richardie, and, as a Christian, sought the wise counsel of Father Potier, his own destiny, that of his race, and the tenure of British control over the West, might have been essentially different in political results. But it is apparent these results were providentially directed for the development of white civilization and the spread of Christianity.

In the personal history of Pontiac there is no romance to be found. He was an Indian *pur sang*, and he lived and died outside the pale of Christianity. His discomfiture brought ruin to most of the nations who were in his league; the Senecas, who were with Pontiac, the most numerous and warlike of the nations of the Iroquoian Confederacy, is the only one that has retained autonomy, and who hold it at the present day.

This fine race continues to live in Western New York, on the same soil possessed by their ancestors four centuries ago. Remnants of the tribes of the other nations only are left, and most of these are to be found on Government reservations west of the Mississippi.

Tranquillity among the Indian nations represented at the famous council at Niagara succeeded unrest; and especially, as we have stated, among the Hurons, the Miamis, and the Pottawotomis in the vicinity of Detroit.

Sir William Johnson was an able administrator of Indian affairs; he was lavish in his presents of food and clothing to any tribe in need of assistance; whenever disturbances were provoked by unlawful acts by bad white men on the frontiers of the respective colonies, he promptly called a council to redress grievances, to settle disputes as to boundary lines, and to define the jurisdiction of the white residents or the rights of the Indian occupants of the soil in dispute. His untimely death at his castle on the Mohawk, while a general council of the sachems and chiefs of the Iroquoian Confederacy was in session, in 1773, was a calamity for the Indian nations at the time. The American Revolution succeeded, while the course of the British commandant at Detroit in arming and subsidizing all the Western Indian tribes and sending them on the war-path against the sparse settlements on the borders of the re-

volting colonies demoralized once more the Indian population, irrespective of nation or tribe. This shameful policy continued during and after the Revolution, and until the evacuation of Detroit by the British in July, 1796. Many of the Indians who went upon these raids never returned. *La Mission des Hurons du Detroit* gradually lost the flower of its male constituency; of the latter, the old men only were left, while, during the last decade of the career of its venerable Father Superior, the old men and the women and children of the Huron tribes were practically all that remained in the Huron village to benefit by his missionary care. The evangelization of the Hurons by Father de La Richardie, and the missionary work among them by his venerable successor, Father Potier, saved many souls; but, as we have stated, there is an inherent attraction in the nature of the American Indian for the excitements of war; however high the standard of the Huron may have been, he could not resist the temptation offered by the British commandant to indulge in this favorite passion.

Its indulgence hastened the demoralization of his race and the subsequent disappearance of the Huron tribes who had been domiciled under Catholic auspices at the Point de Montreal. Meanwhile, since the advent of Father de La Richardie two generations of French habitants had been born on the south littoral of the strait from Point Ottawa, the former home of Pontiac, several miles below Point de Montreal.

These became constituents of the parish of the Assumption, which had for its religious centre the Huron church built and enlarged by Father de La Richardie. The ancient registers of this parish attest the fecundity of this race of Catholics.

While, as we have stated, the historic mission-house and store is still extant, all vestiges of the mission-church have disappeared since the first years of the current last half of the passing century, while no outline of its venerable form has been preserved.

We were present at high mass in this old church while the present Church of the Assumption was in process of erection. The pastor at the time was the venerable Angus McDonnell, one of the race of Scottish Highland Catholic colonists who had been driven from Scotland and had settled in Canada during the last of the Stuart rebellions. The ceremonies were similar to those observed in Lower Canada—there was a beadle in uniform, the distribution of the blessed bread, and the sermon was delivered in French. There were some fine examples of wood-carving; but so old was the building that it had to be supported on the outside by strong beams to keep it in perpendicular.

From the course of political events as shaped on this frontier by the British commandant at Detroit the sacerdotal work of Father Potier at *La Mission des Hurons du Detroit* had been changed, during the later years of his life, from the spiritual direction of the Huron race to that of the French indigenous community which, in the meantime, had grown upon this soil.

But the care of their souls did not absorb all his time; he devoted his leisure hours to bibliographical study. We have critically examined his duplicate grammar of the Huron language, and have described this remarkable manuscript work in our first article on "Indian Bibliographies" in number 72 of Vol. XVIII. of this REVIEW, on pages 716-717.

The literary works of Father Potier might have been preserved intact had Governor Hamilton, British commandant at Detroit during the Revolution, possessed the honorable instincts of a British officer as to the sacredness of the records and papers of a Catholic priest. But this same officer, who armed the Indians and sent them to murder the helpless women and children of the American settlements, and who, when in a notable instance, as these Indians were about to leave the council-house, said to their chiefs, "*We take hold of the same tomahawk,*"¹ wrote to General Carleton at Quebec in 1778, "That, as the Jesuit missionary at this place is advanced in years and very infirm, I have directed, in case of his death, all his papers to be secured and sealed up till I have your Excellency's orders as to their possession."²

So well did Hamilton carry into effect the intention outlined in the letter quoted above that Father Potier's papers were sequestered, and subsequently scattered.

It was our rare fortune, half a century ago, to secure one of the most unique of these precious relics, the *Livre de Compte de la Mission des Hurons du Detroit*, in the microscopic but perfectly formed handwriting of Father Potier.

Others of his manuscripts, as we have stated, are in the archives of St. Mary's College at Montreal. The reference we made to the list of Easter communicants written by Father Potier, which the late Dr. Shea described, is another evidence how widely these precious manuscripts had been scattered.

During the war of the American Revolution the habitants on the north and south littorals of the strait from Lake St. Clair to Lake Erie were passive spectators of a contest in which they, as a class, were not interested. The last of the commandants of the

¹ Original letter on file in the Canadian archives at Ottawa.

² General Cass, discourse before Historical Society at Detroit, 1830.

post under the French *régime*, the Chevalier de Bellestre, who had returned to Quebec, was honored with the commission of a colonel in the British army and fought with distinction against the Continental forces. We believe he was the only officer of note who had been prominent at Detroit, and who had served under the standard of France, who fought on the British side during the Revolutionary campaigns.

In the meantime, while these momentous events were occurring in America, the edict of Pope Clement XIV. for the suppression of the Society of Jesus throughout the world had been forced from this Pontiff by the combined intrigues of the Bourbon cabinets of Europe. Certain formalities were prescribed for the promulgation of the edict to make its effect valid. Its promulgation in Canada by Jean Oliver Briand, Bishop of Quebec, was forbidden by the British Governor, General Carleton. The autonomy of the order in America remained intact until March, 1800, when the death of the last survivor of the illustrious line, Father Jean Joseph Cazot, ended the history of the Jesuits of the French *régime* in America. This is why Father Potier, while Superior of the Huron mission and pastor of the Church of the Assumption at the Pointe de Montreal, after recording in Latin in the register of the parish the *acte* performed, affixed his signature, Petrus Potier, S.J.

After the retirement of Father de La Richardie, during the remainder of French control, and until Pontiac commenced his great intrigue, Father Potier exercised great influence over the chiefs and people of the four nations—the Hurons, the Miamis, the Ottawas and the Pottawotomis. His profound knowledge of Indian character and the facility with which he spoke their respective dialects were advantageous qualities in this connection, while his unaffected bonhomie was also in his favor.

But this influence was weakened when his indigenous constituents had been, as it were, electrified by the excitements of war; besides, most of the chiefs, who had been more or less as a rule communicative, became reserved, as if they feared their secrets might escape.

For more than a decade of the later years of his career Father Potier's ministration was over the habitants of his extended parish.

La Mission des Hurons du Detroit, founded in 1728 by Father de La Richardie, which had flourished as such during forty years, had, in consequence of the political events culminating on the north littoral of the strait, ceased more or less to be an Indian missionary establishment. In its place there remained the Huron church, the spacious presbytery, and the parish of the Assumption which exists at the present day.

The "mission-store" was no longer a necessity, and it was abandoned ; so it was with the *forge*, which was sold ; the farm—the live-stock and the agricultural establishment which had been profitably maintained during the flourishing times of the mission—was reduced to suit the condition of a well-to-do habitant, leaving a couple of ponies sufficient for the journeys on sick-calls of a parish priest, whose circuit extended ten miles up and ten miles down the littoral of the strait.

The extensive domain which extended from the crescent bay about two miles south into the forest, which was several acres in width and admirably located, was considered too large for the appanage of a parochial *fabrique* like that of the Assumption. Portions of this domain were sold by Father Potier to parties whose descendants are in possession at the present day.

Copies of the deeds of these sales are on record in "Liber A. of Deeds," in the registry of Wayne County, Detroit. To each of these deeds is appended the authorization of the venerable surviving Father Superior of the Society of Jesus in North America ; Father Augustine-Louis de Glapion's signature is affixed to those of Father Potier's, thus placing on local record the fact of the existence of the autonomic status of the Society of Jesus at this time.

When Father Potier had reached the age of seventy-three, an unusually long life for a missionary priest who had been in continuous service for nearly forty years, he had become somewhat feeble and had been subject to attacks of vertigo ; it is considered probable that while walking in his study he experienced one of these attacks and fell backwards in such a way that his head struck the ball of one of the andirons of the hearth, which penetrated his skull and caused instant death ; his lifeless body was discovered by his sacristan July 17, 1781. Thus ended the career of the last of the Huron Missionaries of Detroit.¹

¹ Father Potier was the first Belgian priest who officiated on the littorals of the *D'etroit*.

He was born at Blandain, Flanders, April 21, 1708. He began his studies at the Jesuit College of Tournai, April 21, 1721, and continued those studies at Douay. He entered upon his noviciate at Tournai September 30, 1729, and made his first vows as a Jesuit September 30, 1731.

His juniorate from October, 1731, to October, 1732, was as teacher at Lisle. As a professor he was six years at Bethune, 1732-1738. His course in theology of four years, 1738-1742, was completed at Douay. After a year of probation at Armentieres, subsequent to his ordination in 1741 and a retreat of eight days at Tournai, he made his final vows February 2, 1743. Taking leave of his parents and relatives at Blandain April 29, he departed for Paris, which city he reached May 1. Having volunteered for the Indian missions of Canada, he left Paris for La Rochelle May 9, and soon after embarked for America on the "Rubis."

His obsequies were performed by Vicar-General Hubert, subsequently Bishop of Quebec, of Ste. Anne's Church, Detroit, as appears in the register of the Church of the Assumption at the Huron Mission, with the official attestation of this prelate. His remains were laid to rest under the altar. When, seventy years later, Father Point, of the new *régime* of the Society of Jesus, had completed the present Church of the Assumption, and before the old historic Mission Church had been taken down, he had the remains of Father Potier and of two other priests, reposing beneath the altar, exhumed and translated to the new church and interred in front of its altar. The venerable missionary's remains were identified by the unusual length of the skeleton and by a round hole in the skull, where the ball of the andiron had penetrated. Rev. François Xavier Dufour, who died September 10, 1796, and Jean Baptiste Marchand, who died April 12, 1825, were the names of the two others.

RICHARD R. ELLIOTT.

The voyage was tedious, and ended on the morning of October 1, 1743, when Father Potier landed at Quebec. We are indebted to our learned and venerable correspondent, Father Arthur E. Jones, for these authentic details, which are now published for the first time in America.

THE CHURCH AND SCHOLASTICISM.

RATIONALISM and *Traditionalism* may conveniently be used as terms to denote two philosophical extremes or excesses, towards one or other of which every mind, and the mind of every people and age, is unduly bent. Rationalism, in this sense, repudiates wholly, or suspects and distrusts, any assent which is not based on self-evidence or logical demonstration. Traditionalism, seeing the sceptical and unpractical issue of Rationalism, not only accepts the consent of mankind as an excellent working criterion, but would make it the universal final and infallible guide. Each of these erroneous extremes is founded on a truth too much neglected and overlooked by the other; and, according to the recognized law of its growth, it is only after a series of diminishing oscillation from one to the other that the human mind can hope to find rest and equilibrium in the golden mean. If *Rationalism* stands for an abuse of reason, *Traditionalism* stands for an abuse of the principle of faith. To establish the right use of faith and reason, and their exact relation one to another, is a problem which is ever gradually approaching a final solution, but which still presents many obscure points.

We may assume, what has so often been abundantly demonstrated, that the great bulk of our beliefs rest on matters which are not strictly rational, although in a broader sense they may be justified as prudent, and as so far rational. On a former occasion, when criticizing Mr. Balfour's work on "The Foundations of Belief," we wrote as follows:¹

"A moment's reflection will show that if, under pain of unreasonableness, we were bound to discredit every assertion until personally satisfied, from intrinsic reasons, mental growth would be impossible and society would perish. It would be like forbidding one to eat any morsel of food that he had not drawn out of the ground and prepared by his own unaided labor. Nor, to go much further with Mr. Balfour, would the effects be much less disastrous were one to refuse credence to any testimony that did not evidently conform to the logician's criterion of testimony.

"Authority, as Mr. Balfour takes it, is a strictly non-rational cause of belief; and its results, though reasonably accepted, have not *per se* a justification in philosophy, but must seek it elsewhere. That he means something more than such an instinctively rational acquiescence in authority as might be justified by the 'Illative Sense' seems to us plain, though he does not explicitly advert to the possible confusion. That children and simple folk believe what they are told is often to a great extent a rational act, so far as they confusedly believe, rightly or wrongly, that their informant is a com-

¹ *Month*, May, 1895.

petent and truthful witness, although to analyze or state their reason is beyond them. But, according to Mr. Balfour, reason here but supervenes, and mingles its force with that of a strong mental instinct analogous to the gregarious or imitative instincts of animals, which inclines us to believe an assertion as such, rather than discredit it.

“That this tendency to be influenced by assertion, to assent rather than to doubt in the absence of all evidence, does exist, can hardly be denied. Proofs abound to show that men’s beliefs and conclusions do, as a fact, rest to a great extent on anything but reason. The existence of prejudice is not so much an abuse of reason as of this instinctive tendency to believe; it is but a hurtful issue of a principle which is, on the whole, useful and beneficial, though, like all instincts, fallible through want of adaptability to particular cases. Hence it is for reason not to despise, but to safeguard and supplement this instinct of docility.

“That the same political views should be held by all the members of the same family for generations, plainly points to a non-rational influence at work; that on the whole all the members of one religious order should agree as to the issue of an open question against all the members of another order,—and that, for generations,—is manifestly another instance in point. That in deference to the ‘time-spirit’ nearly all philosophers should agree in certain leading ethical and scientific conclusions, while hopelessly at variance about their derivation and worth, may serve as another example. It is needless to prove the existence of what is so notorious; but Mr. Balfour’s concern is to show that this influence, and the instinct it appeals to, are an absolutely necessary and, in the rough, a legitimate source of beliefs. Far from clogging the growth of mind, it supplies it with its daily bread. To refuse these supplies is to perish. It is for reason to sift and compare, to eliminate what is incompatible, to verify and prove; but as an inventive faculty reason is feeble, almost useless in comparison. What reason disproves is reasonably rejected; but what reason cannot prove, remains by the same title that it entered.

“Even most of the beliefs that we seem to owe to reason, depend more fully on influence which furnishes so many of the premises. By reasoning we but condition and determine their action upon our mind; and to credit ourselves with the whole result would be to be proud of growing on the score that we had eaten our meals regularly. No doubt one of the causes why reason is in such superior repute is that we look on its conclusions as actively self-produced, forgetting how largely we are passively influenced by the premises which we use, and of which we can often give no rational account.

“There are very few who can give reasons at all for much that they believe; still less, reasons that are truly the cause of those beliefs, and not a mere after-justification of an instinctive acquiescence in authority. Like free-choice in the determination of our actions, reason in the determination of our opinions is everything in respect to its rights, but comparatively nothing in its actual result—a supreme court of appeal, but rarely appealed to. It criticizes when needful, but originates little. It supplements where the ordinary means is deficient, *i. e.*, where our instinct of docility and our acquired mental habits fail us.

“Mr. Balfour insists that this instinct is not only beneficial but necessary to all mental growth and progress. He defends it against the contempt with which it is fashionable to treat it, especially on the part of ‘Naturalists’ who rest their system on beliefs which are non-rational, and accepted merely on psychological compulsion, and whose only reasonable justification is trust in Nature’s selected methods for man’s well-being. Our relation to this mental instinct is much the same as that in which we stand to other instincts. Previous to the full use of reason we are governed by them wholly. They are for the most part efficacious means to the securing of necessary and natural ends, but, being of the nature of physical laws, they are not self-adaptive to exceptional cases. When reason supervenes, it may at times resist these instincts for motives of its own kind; or it may freely and deliberately approve and follow them; or it may direct, modify and adapt them; or, finally, it may trust the reins to Nature, and simply stand by to check or veto whatever is seemingly against right order. In all these cases, even in the last, the result is in some sense reasonable, though not the direct effect of reason. Even the policeman who stands by unseen to prevent a disturbance, may be credited with the order preserved by the crowd.

“So, too, many of our beliefs may be called reasonable in so far as reason would veto any patent absurdity. Still there will always be a large residuum with which reason has had nothing to do; mere unsorted material, by no means to be bundled out indiscriminately.”

As is implied in the passages just cited, the formation of the mind is dependent both on reason and on what Mr. Balfour calls “authority,” but what we prefer to call “tradition.” To exalt one of these agencies at the expense of the other, or, still worse, to its exclusion, is to fall into the error of “Rationalism” or of “Traditionalism,” as the case may be.

It would be misleading to press the analogy of bodily nutrition, so as to regard tradition as the feeder of the mind, furnishing it with pabulum which reason sorts, digests and assimilates; for the great bulk of our assents which are woven into the texture of our mind never are and never can be subjected to the criticism of our reason at all. We have simply to recognize the coexistence of two distinct orders of assent in our mind; one, of those in regard to which we are largely passive, and another, of those which we have in some sense formed for ourselves. It is evident that in the latter our intellectual dignity as free self-forming agents is chiefly vindicated, and that it is only the very limited character of that dignity that makes it needful to supplement our vast deficiencies by the humble and more humbling provision. It is this reflection that inclines our pride to resent this dependence on tradition, and to affect that rationalism which professes idly to believe nothing that cannot be proved. Had we entered upon existence with a mind already stored with innate judgments on every conceivable matter, with unaccountable but irresistible synthetic *à priori* assents, however we might have been mortified by our dependence on so needful a supplement of our narrow experience and feeble reasoning power, yet we should have been able to put that all but divine faith in such knowledge which we put in the wisdom of nature’s instincts. Our trust would be such as we place in one who rarely or never deceives, and whose word is as good as a proof of the truth which it asserts. But we have been provided for far more humbly. God does not directly mould our mind himself, or even through necessary causes which execute his designs infallibly, but through the common beliefs and opinions of the society into which we are born and in which we live; through the intellectual atmosphere which we breathe; that is, through the instrumentality of frail men who can both deceive and be deceived. Thus it is that the irregularities of individuals are lost in the crowd; and though the multitude may be deceived, the multi-

tude will not readily agree to deceive, still less will the whole race, and that through successive generations. Without accepting the consent of the millions as an ultimate test of truth, yet in many matters within its competence it is obviously a reliable test, while in others it justifies a practical and prudent assent. Yet, so far as tradition is our only source of knowledge, it is full of many impurities; and were we dependent on it alone we should pay for the truth with a variable but always a very appreciable percentage of error, though we should have no more cause of just complaint against the goodness of Nature than have the animals whose instincts at times fail them, but in the main are reliable. Not that tradition is necessarily reliable in the greater *number* of its truths, but that it is so for the greater practical truths on which the life and preservation of the race depends—else the race had perished long since. It is not and does not pretend to be a provision for speculative intelligence. If there is such a thing—and surely there is—as pride of intellect, it would seem to lie in a certain impatience at the limited nature of our mental faculties, a resentment that we are not created independent and self-sufficing in regard to the possession of truth, but must hang upon others and gather tares with our wheat, and struggle from darkness to dimness and from dimness to a little light about little things. We would be as gods, knowing all things for ourselves; and so the vessel complains to the potter: Why hast thou formed me thus?

Although faith in itself, apart from those preambles which are its conditions but not its cause, is a non-rational (not an irrational) assent, yet in so far as it is an obedience of the mind, believing simply because it is told to believe, not from a criticism of the speaker's competence and veracity, but from a recognition of his moral authority to govern and shape the mind at his will, it is a motive of certitude, *i.e.*, of subjective firmness in adhering to a truth. Here, as soon and as long as we recognize an authority with a right to govern and command our assents, all disobedience, and therefore all doubt, becomes sinful. There is, however, an immeasurable difference between the firmness of the assent which a parent exacts of his child and that which God exacts of his creature, for each rightly exacts a firmness proportioned to the value of their own competence and no more. No mother would require of her child to receive her word as the word of God, but only at her own estimate of its value. To exact more were an abuse of authority; to exact as much, without any proof or defence of her intellectual competence and veracity, is lawful, just as she may lawfully physic or feed or otherwise govern her child in

body or mind or morals without being called upon first to prove her competence to the said child. That the child's confidence may be occasionally abused no more interferes with the moral duty of obedience of judgment than does the possibility of misguidance in practical matters of conduct excuse from obedience in general. Unless the error be self-evident or clearly evident, the child must submit to authority as to its natural God-appointed guide, pending the growth of the power of self-guidance.

If we look into the matter more closely we shall find that, as in the case of our other natural sources of knowledge, so here the occasional error is due to our own inferences from the *data* we receive, and is not contained in the *data* themselves.

Although the child (in years or culture) can form no logical estimate of the value of testimony, yet it has a certain instinctive estimate. Its assent does not *fall* directly upon the objective verity, but upon the verity as mirrored and reflected in the mind of its informant, and as getting its objective value therefrom. To pass from the undoubted, self-evident fact that its mother says that fire burns, to the further fact that fire does actually burn, is a matter of immediate though unconscious inference, which may deceive occasionally. Every parental assertion as such has a certain weight of probability which in normal cases may be treated as practical certainty, and makes the unconscious inference from assertion to fact quite legitimate and prudent, though not infallible. Similarly the assent accorded to particular matters of public tradition and general agreement falls directly upon the fact that it is publicly said and generally agreed to; and if the mind is, in one and the same act, reflected from the mirror to the reality—if, that is, because it is generally said to be so, we infer that it is so—this inference has a value just proportioned to the trustworthiness of public opinion in such matters, and no more. For example, much that we read in the legends of the saints is not professedly a record of facts, but of what have been commonly accounted as facts. It gives us the impression made by the saint's personality on the public mind of past times. We are looking into a mirror, and not directly into realities. It is left to our skill and intelligence to interpret the symbolism; to recognize the man underneath the disguise of halo, and emblem, and jewelled vesture; to separate what the old schoolmen would call the "second intention" from the "first intention," the idealization from the reality, the subjective modification from the object modified. It will be strange if false miracles are not mingled with true, or if the true be recorded without some decoration and addition. With practical wisdom the Church

gives us the story in the gross and as a whole, without much attempt to sieve chaff from wheat, dross from gold, so long as the dross is not hurtful. Were it all given to us as objective truth, and not formally as tradition, then indeed it would be a hurt to deem fact what is not fact, however unimportant; but the only fact the Church vouches for in the matter is that these things have been generally said and believed by prudent persons, and presumably have a considerable basis in history.

The Catholic religion, therefore, without being traditionalist, sets no small store by tradition as a method, nay, even as the principal and most practical method of forming the human mind. She sees clearly that assents which in one way are non-rational—and amongst them the assent of Faith—are from a wider and higher point of view rational and necessary. Still, she has never regarded tradition as an exclusive or ultimate criterion of truth, or allowed its claims to stand in the face of self-evident or demonstrable contradiction. She knows well that logic and analytical reasoning can never lead the mind to super-rational truths, nor, even with any facility, security, and universality, to the common truths of theism. Yet, if analytical reason is not a guide, at least it is a test to be used; not always—else our minds would be starved—but in cases of reasonable doubt. However liable to abuse, the Church does not on that account discard or despise what without offence might be called the “rationalising” of our faith; its defence against the charge of being in conflict with itself or with demonstrable truth of any kind; its illustration; its ever exacter expression; its orderly and scientific treatment. Herein we have a great safeguard against that fanaticism and superstition which would be favored by traditionalism and a total neglect of criticism. If at certain periods she has leant over to the side of traditionalism to counteract the rationalistic bias of the age, if to the earliest Church Aristotle was the foe of faith, she has been no less ready to lean over to the other side, and to press Aristotle into her service against an uncritical and short-sighted contempt of reason in the supposed interests of faith. Not that in any age she has been traditionalist or rationalist, or neglected the sound principles perverted by both extremes. If the matter of her earliest creeds and symbols has been provided by tradition, their very form and setting forth has been the work of reason; nor does the structure of the “*Summa*” of Aquinas merit the reproach of rationalism any more justly than that of the Apostles’ Creed, of which it is but an evolution.

Philosophy has its due function in the collective mind of the

Church as in the individual mind. Reason and analysis are not a guide but a corrective. We learn through faith, through tradition, through imitation, through unconscious inference, for the most part; that is, through sources where truth is to some extent mingled with error; and so far as we have leisure and culture our reason sifts and analyses these multitudinous assents; rejects what is spurious and worthless, classifies and orders the remainder, always tending to some comprehensive unification of all our knowledge into one organic whole. So far as this last tendency is conscious and reflex, we may be said to be in quest of a philosophy; but even wherever reason in any way begins to work on the gathered materials of thought, there is an unconscious groping after this same unity. Similarly in practical matters we are guided in the main by instincts, passions, habits, customs, fashions, laws; and it is only to supplement the occasional deficiencies of these humble guides that reason is called in to decide problems of right and wrong. Philosophy, therefore, is very dispensable for most individuals, but not so for society as a whole. There must be those who frame laws, who search out truths, who correct errors and abuses, else the corruptive tendency of tradition would be unchecked.

So albeit that Divine Faith, and in a large measure human tradition, is the means whereby religious truth is apprehended by the millions of Christendom, and indeed by all in so far as they are Christians; yet the Church acknowledges the need of some sort of public philosophy whereby the very notion of faith may be vindicated, the *data* of faith set in order, expressed, and translated into the mind-language and word-language of the day, and not only defended from the charge of conflict with demonstrated truth, but in some measure synthesized with secular knowledge into one organic whole. Still more needful is such a corrective rationalism when it is a question not of the infallible religious data of Divine Faith, but the very fallible religious data of human tradition.

For this end the Church has always implicitly or explicitly availed herself of some kind of philosophy in giving expression to her teaching. Those who find fault with her for this forget that there is a philosophy, nay, a metaphysics implied in the common language of the rudest savage or the simplest child. It is not only the Gospel of S. John but the Sermon on the Mount which depends for its intelligibility on a presupposed philosophy.

We may not unfairly to some extent regard a philosophy as a mind-language, as a system of inward ideal signs or forms by which the mind actively presents and expresses to itself the whole

body of that knowledge of which it is first the passive recipient. "Not unfairly," since every philosophy has also a word-language whose parts and inflections answer roughly to something in the mind. And as we can largely translate from one philosophical word-language into another with substantial fidelity, we may safely infer that there is a corresponding agreement in the mind-language, although there will always be an extensive residue of irreconcilable difference in detail owing to differences of experience, information and reflection. In a word, as language itself is natural, and as all languages in spite of the widest differences observe certain laws in their growth towards an even more flexible system of expression, so the tendency to unify our ideas into a system; and the fundamental lines of that procedure are common to all men, however antagonistic their analysis or expression of the process. The Catholic religion can no more be independent of philosophy than it can be of language. The Gospel is preached in human words, and the words must be translated into human thoughts and ideas; thoughts and ideas imply categories, and categories bring us into philosophy. But then, since Catholicism is the religion of humanity, of all ages and countries, of all levels of culture, it cannot afford to make itself dependent on that which is contingent, local and mutable, but must in some sense speak a Catholic and universal language, and rise above the differences of philosophies and grasp that which is common to all. How, as a matter of fact, has she dealt with this problem?

She has taken a word-language which when living had a sort of territorial universality, and which being now dead has the greater universality of an universal and immutable standard—a language the meaning of whose terms is no longer fluctuating but fixed, and in which her teaching, once stereotyped, can be translated into the living languages of various countries as faithfully as possible. Yet this were not enough, for the realities which she proposes to our faith have first to be conceived, formed and expressed in the ideal language of the mind before they are formulated upon the lips; they have to be clothed in philosophy before they are clothed in words. They cannot lie in the mind as disconnected apprehensions in no way entering into the thought-system. To apprehend is also to classify; it is to compare and contrast; to observe agreements and differences, likenesses and unlikenesses. And so the Church has taken a classical philosophy which was when living—and who can say that it is yet dead or will ever die, save as to its excesses and follies, as long as man's first and freshest thought is realism?—which when living attained an univer-

sality even wider than that of the Latin or Greek tongue ; which was professedly the philosophy of common sense and common language ; which by reason of its child-like directness and simplicity departed as little as possible from the fundamental conceptions common to all philosophies, and in this philosophy she eventually decided to embody her dogmas, leaving it to those who should care to do so at their own peril to translate them from the mind-forms of Aristotle into the mind-forms of other thinkers, *salvi substantie*.

To suppose, however, that in using Aristotle for this purpose the Church hereby commits herself to his philosophy as the only possible or the best possible, would be almost as foolish as to suppose that she regarded ecclesiastical Latin as the original or the best possible language. She does not deny that Chinese may admirably express the fact of the Immaculate Conception, but she does not guarantee the translation in the sense in which she guarantees the Vulgate to be substantially faithful to the originals from which it was translated. Similarly, if the facts which she expresses as "transubstantiation," or "hypostatic union," or "trinity" can be faithfully conveyed in the philosophy of Berkeley or of the Sensists, well and good ; but she does not guarantee the translation.

Further, when she condemns certain formulæ and verbal expressions, she takes them only according to the sense they bear in the philosophy which she has adopted, and takes no account of the sense other philosophies may attach to them.

By Scholasticism we understand the application of Aristotle to theology, or the expression of the facts and realities of revelation in the mind-language of the peripatetics. That the gain to theology in clearness, order, stability was immense no one can deny ; and as a flexible and exact medium of expression is one of the chief instruments in the evolution of any science, so here the vitality and rapid growth of theological thought in the schools was undoubtedly the result of this gain. Let us grant that it was to some extent a one-sided growth, neglecting as it did the historic and inductive method, then undreamt of ; that it simply evolved into explicit recognition what was already contained in received data ; that it brought no new facts to light, but simply analysed the facts to hand which it took for granted. Yet this very analysis, ordering, systematizing, was at the time a more urgent need. It is better to digest a little thoroughly than to overload our minds, as is now the fashion, with undigested masses of information. Doubtless, for lack of sufficient matter to work upon, this

digestive process was carried in many ways to excess, and the desire to unify and systematize made men apt to press fact into accord with theory, instead of waiting patiently for fuller light. Nowhere was this more apparent than in the desire to establish an unbroken logical sequence from the data of sense and reason up to the conclusions of faith; starting from the rational proofs of God's existence and veracity, of the possibility and probability and fact of a Divine revelation, attested by miracle and prophecy, and thence passing, in strict accordance with the canons of criticism, to the acceptance of the Divine testimony according to its demonstrated worth—thus trying to show that even reason leads us to a rational hold of those truths which faith holds to by an act of will.

That such a synthesis is possible, and that it should be attempted, always, as something provisional, by experts, we have elsewhere insisted. In a certain objective and impersonal sense such a scientific apologetic may be considered to represent the "preambles" of faith; but to suppose that any such logical process is requisite to make faith subjectively reasonable, or that faith in the individual depends on its validity, is nothing short of rationalism. The subjective and always necessary preamble of faith is a clear apprehension of the duty of obeying God in the matter of belief as in any other matter—a certainty which needs no power of logical and formal analysis—"Non in dialectica vult Deus salvari populum suum." The true reasonableness of faith is sacred in the simplest believer; the reasonableness of apologetics is a luxury of the few, and altogether dispensable as far as the individual is concerned.

Here, perhaps, the impetus given to systematizing and syllogizing by Scholasticism may have led to some excesses and misapprehensions. Faith being an act of loyal personal trust in God (whether speaking through conscience or through Christ or through the Church), it were as absurd to expect that any objective analysis could adequately describe the concrete grounds of that trust as that one could put in words and forms the reason for one's hopes or affections, or likes or dislikes. It were no less absurd to expect that an unbeliever should be able adequately to formulate his entire subjective reason for not trusting. Nothing is more familiar to us than the ridiculous inadequacy of the attempts we make to give reasons for actions, decisions, impressions that we know to be perfectly reasonable. Our powers of analysis and expression lag wofully behind our powers of intuition and of informal inference. It is for this reason that so much polemical

and controversial writing is mere air-beating. Arguments seem unanswerable, and yet no conviction is produced—not because of any intellectual deficiency or insincerity on either side, but because of the disproportion between formal logic and the thoughts of man's heart.

The legitimate aim of the apologist is to square the credibility of revelation with the demonstrable or evident truths of secular knowledge. Where this seems impossible it will be due to a false assumption on one side or the other, and the error may be latent for years. He would be equally foolish who should be distressed by any such temporary hitch, or who should be sanguine over a seemingly perfect harmony; for, as the defences that seemed satisfactory a century ago seem wholly inadequate to day, so the apologetics of to-day may be comparatively worthless a century hence.

It was the error of the scholastics to put too full a reliance on the secular philosophy, history, physics and criticism of their own day; to be over-eager to enter into harmony with it, and then to regard their painfully-wrought synthesis as final and perpetual. Clinging to that synthesis, their successors were often disposed either to ignore the total change of position on the part of secular thought, or else to labor vainly to bring the world back to that philosophy which their apologetic supposed, and for which alone it availed. Hence the vague idea among Catholics as well as among non-Catholics¹ that the Church had virtually incorporated

¹ Though introducing a hostile conclusion, the following remark rightly insists on the contingent nature of the alliance between the Catholic creed and the philosophy which it uses to express itself:

“It should be remembered that the Eastern Church knows nothing of scholasticism, and has never passed through this phase of thought. The West has; and although it is a system generally taught and received, scholasticism has passed away, yet it has not done so without leaving many a trace behind it. The reduction of matter and form to certain irreducible *minima* are again conceptions which we owe to scholasticism. The doctrine of intention as now taught is another scholastic product. Accordingly, the great Roman Church, which in formulating the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Ever-Virgin Mary has carried the application of logic to spiritual matters further than any other church has dared to do, finds it necessary first to teach its future theologians the scholastic philosophy, that into minds prepared by that teaching may be poured the Western theology built upon scholasticism.”—*A Complete Manual of Canon Law*, by Oswald J. Reichel, vol. ii., Preface. London, 1896. P. T. O.

If it be urged that “*quisquis deinceps assevere, defendere seu tenere pertinaciter præsumperit, quod anima rationalis seu intellectiva non sit forma corporis humani per se essentialiter tamquam hæreticus sit censendus*” [Concilium Viennense], and that therefore Catholics are tied to the system of hytomorphism, it will be now evident how such an objection should be met. The Council addresses a public which spoke the language and used the forms of the scholastics, and therefore it uses that same language. The contrary doctrine in that same school of thought denied the substantial unity of human

Aristotle's philosophy into her official teaching. That she makes use of it as a fixed standard of expression we have already seen, but that she commits herself to any of its tenets that are not necessarily accepted (however expressed) by the common sense of all mankind we may boldly deny; for, like every other philosophy worthy the name, it contains certain elements given irresistibly by the very nature of the human mind, combined with many peculiar and questionable features which are the work of human ingenuity.

That the Church should require her ecclesiastics to be well versed in the thought-language which she has made her own is no more wonderful than that she should exact from them a knowledge of ecclesiastical Latin. Such action cannot be twisted into an indiscriminate approval of Aristotle and a condemnation of every other philosophy.

As far as the cultivation of an analytical habit of mind goes, it perhaps matters less that the philosophy should be absolutely unquestionable than that it should be coherent, systematic, well worked out, and as close as possible to the lines of ordinary unsophisticated thought. This, perhaps, will always give Aristotle precedence as an educational instrument, as the innumerable revivals and reactions in his favor indicate. Of course the exclusive cultivation of analytical habits to the neglect of the historical and positive methods can lead to nothing but the narrowest rationalism, and eventually to scepticism. It would be to provide an elaborate machinery with nothing to work upon. It was through this one-sidedness that the abuse, not the use, of scholasticism led to Protestantism, and thence to the widespread scepticism now prevalent outside the Church. Yet it is no less plain that an indiscriminate traditionalism would have reacted in the same direction, for it is only in the right adjustment and tempering of all methods that truth is safeguarded.

G. TYRRELL.

nature and so imperilled the right understanding of more than one dogma of faith. If the Greeks had had to deal with similar heresies they could not have formulated the truth without supposing and using some kind of philosophy. Even Anglicans can never hope to say anything intelligent or coherent without committing themselves to theories of thought and reality which form no part of revelation.

CATHOLIC MISSIONS IN THE PACIFIC.

IT is only within a century that the natives of the Pacific islands have been brought into contact with modern civilization. Magellan, it is true, crossed the South Sea at the same time as Cortez conquered Mexico, and during the following two centuries a few explorers, Spanish, Dutch and English, touched occasionally at a few of its islands ; but they were looked on as too insignificant for settlement or conquest, and no attempt was made at either by any European nation. The natives were left undisturbed in their primitive barbarism while the American continent was being conquered and colonized from Canada to Patagonia.

The scientific expeditions of Cook and Bougainville between 1760 and 1770 first awakened in Europe an interest in the Pacific islands. It was more sentimental, at first, than practical. The time was fertile in new theories of society, and Rousseau's "Social Contract" and his declamations on the charm of savage life were a fashionable fad in France and England. They brought back to civilization conceptions of the joyous and indolent life of a primitive people on the fertile islands of tropical seas, and soon fascinated public attention. Louis XVI. sent out La Perouse to explore the Pacific just before the French Revolution. The British sent Bligh on a similar errand at nearly the same time. His crew mutinied, and became the first white settlers of any part of the Pacific islands. Traders and whalers began to follow in the wake of scientific exploration, and their crews left an increasing contingent of runaway sailors amongst the islands before the close of the century. The convict station of Botany Bay, now the city of Sydney, was established in 1788, and escaped criminals soon became a numerous class through many of the groups of the Pacific.

Another class of Europeans appeared as settlers eight years after the establishment of Botany Bay. These were English Protestant missionary colonists. Down to that time the English people, in its foreign conquests, had been indifferent to any work for the spread of Christian belief among heathen populations. There was not an English clergyman, except military chaplains, in the Indian Empire of Warren Hastings. Bishop Berkeley's project for a mission to the American Indians fell still-born before

the indifference of the English ministry and English church. Towards the end of the last century, however, as a consequence of the growth of Methodism through the preaching of Wesley and Whitefield, an idea that something ought to be done for the spread of the Gospel in heathen lands became popular among English Protestants, especially the bodies outside the State Church. A movement began not unlike the Salvation Army of our own time, and equally vague in the doctrines which it desired to teach. A meeting of three hundred ministers of various sects, held in 1795, organized itself into a body under the name of the London Missionary Society, and with the professed object of teaching Christianity to the heathen generally. The society, when organized, was somewhat puzzled how to begin its novel and extensive task. A committee was duly appointed, and pronounced in favor of the South Sea islands as the best field for the newly awakened missionary spirit. The report was drawn up by a Dr. Haweis and unanimously adopted. Its eminently practical character illustrates the idea and nature of English Protestant missionary work admirably.

Having laid down the duty of Christians to send teachers of the Faith to the non-Christian world, the report first stated the conditions which would excuse from anything in the way of missions. These were :

“ 1. An inhospitable climate, whether from wet, intense heat, or cold. The preservation of a missionary's life is of the last importance.

“ 2. Absolute governments, such as China and Japan, desirable objects for a mission, but in neither is it possible to introduce one.

“ 3. Established prejudices of false religions. Such is the state of the Hindoos and Mahometans, who are shut within a barrier of prejudice against us.

“ 4. The acquirement of languages. On the African coast the nations and tongues are so multiplied as to increase the difficulty of evangelical operations. Several tongues are necessary to a missionary in India. The Chinese is all but insuperable.”

That the kind of mission work contemplated by the London society was entirely different from that which had converted Europe to Christianity was thus made clear, but still the report found a field where it could be safely attempted.

“ Of all regions of the earth that are yet in heathen darkness,” the report continued, “ the South Sea islands appear to combine the greatest prospect of success with the smallest number of difficulties.

“ 1. The climate is unequalled ; winter's cold is never known. The trees are clothed in perpetual foliage and bear fruit most of the year.

“ The heat is constantly alleviated by alternate breezes, while the natives sit under the shade of groves scattering odors and loaded with fruit.

“ The diseases of Europe are unknown, unless imported ; *health and longevity generally mark the inhabitants.* We shall not have to follow them into the lonely wilds of

a desert or over fields of ice. Every man is at hand, under his cocoa or bread-fruit tree, and the sound of the saw or anvil will never fail to attract an audience.

"2. The government is monarchical, but of the mildest nature, with little authority, no written law, nor the use of letters.

"3. Religious prejudices are not strong. The little we know affords the strongest evidence that the priests are not invested with a power to persecute, nor can the people be averse to hear us on a religious subject, since they reverence us as their superiors on almost every other.

"4. The language is simple and easily acquired."

This remarkable summary of motives for missions to the South Seas was cordially accepted by the London society. It was resolved that its first efforts should be directed there, and "that a vessel should be provided and navigated by a serious captain and crew, with accommodations for thirty or more missionaries, exclusive of women and children. Tahiti, the Friendly Islands, the Marquesas, the Sandwich Islands and the Peleu Islands" were specified as the points to be occupied. The directors added that the voyage "might be profitably terminated by the missionary ship passing on to China or Bengal and getting freight home from the East India Company." The East India Company was willing, and the ship *Duff*, Captain Wilson, commander, duly sailed with its missionary passengers in 1796, and landed them at various points in the South Seas.

The missionaries sent out in the *Duff* were by no means all clergymen. The majority were mechanics of various kinds, smiths, carpenters and potters, who were to establish themselves in small colonies for their own benefit. The captain was specially ordered to get free grants of land from the chiefs, and to secure the protection of the most powerful among them. Individual missionaries, clerical and lay, subsequently acquired immense tracts for very small consideration, a few hatchets or shirts being, in New Zealand, the price paid for many thousand acres. In Tonga, Tahiti, and other islands, powerful chiefs readily accepted the wealthy strangers as their guides, and ministers soon obtained full control of the native populations. Arms and ammunition were an important part of mission supplies. From the beginning, and with the help of these instruments of civilization, the friends of the missionaries soon won supremacy among their fellows. The name of Christians was freely given by the Protestant ministers to their partisans, and glowing accounts of conversions swelled the contributions at home, while the labor of the natives was made to contribute to the profit of their teachers abroad. The mission vessels had a practical trade monopoly, and the chiefs readily lent themselves to any legislation suggested by their new

teachers as a part of the new religion and "white man's ways." The legislation was chiefly on the pattern of the Scotch Presbyterian Kirk and the old Blue Laws of New England. Religious doctrine of a definite kind there was little, but attendance at prayer-meetings was rigidly enforced, often by the lash. The native dress, the old meetings for social enjoyment, and dances, were regarded as criminal offences, at least among the mass of the people. Reading and writing were introduced, and translations of the Bible into the native language were spread broadcast among the so-called converts. To English religious ideas of the time reading the Bible was sufficient to make Christians, and it is not surprising that the morals of the converts remained nearly as before.

The natives of the Pacific islands are a very distinct race, or rather two races. The brown Polynesians, from New Zealand to Hawaii, are all of a common stock. From Fiji west a nearly black race, known as Melanesian, occupies the different groups. The Polynesians in all their settlements spoke practically a common language, and had the same government and customs. In some respects they were further advanced in civilization than either the African negroes or the Indians of our own continent. They cultivated the ground, though grain of any kind was unknown, and fruits and roots their only crops anywhere. They built houses and temples of wood, and their war-canoes were often large enough to carry a hundred and fifty men each, and to make expeditions of over a thousand miles. They made cloth from the bark of the paper mulberry, and wove cordage from the cocoa fibre, and sails were as familiar to their ways as oars. Yet they knew nothing of any metal, and shell and stone or bone were the only materials for the tools they used. They were not without a certain amount of mental culture. Their history and the pedigrees of the chiefs were handed down from one generation to another in ballads carefully learned by memory. They had a mythology and a class of priests; they believed in a life beyond the grave and in future rewards and punishments, though on this their ideas were vague enough. Their government was organized to a much higher degree than among the Indian hunters of America. In Hawaii and New Zealand it was nearly as definite as the royal authority in England or France at the time of the Norman conquest. Everywhere there were chiefs and subchiefs, and if there were no codes of law, there were strict rules of social etiquette and a rude chivalry in war. They had public meetings for national objects, and oratory was cultivated, as in civilized communities, as a means of political

influence. Gatherings for social enjoyment were also very common, and there was little rudeness or brutality in manners, except in war time. All early voyagers were struck with the fine figures and physical strength of the Polynesians, as well as by the good temper and cheerfulness of their character. Altogether they may be regarded as, by nature, one of the finest races of mankind, though still in the infancy of civilization.

On the other hand, they had little idea of a moral code of action. Human life was of little account whenever passions were excited or interests involved. Their wars were ferocious and exterminating, and cannibalism was common, though to a much less extent among the Polynesians than the Melanesians of Fiji or New Caledonia, where it was an every-day practice. Like all uncivilized races, too, they were capricious in their likes and dislikes, and disinclined to steady work—except under compulsion. Compared to Christian Europe and America they were a nation of children ready to be moulded by superior knowledge for good or evil.

The result to this primitive race of a century's intercourse with modern civilization is as strange as it is saddening. Tools and clothes and books have been introduced and cannibalism has disappeared, but the native population, without any armed conquest, is dying out as if stricken by a pestilence. When Cook visited Tahiti in 1769, the scientific men in his company estimated the population of the Society Islands at over four hundred thousand. The chief of the island mustered three hundred and thirty boats, manned by seven thousand men, for a review on one occasion. To-day the whole group has scarcely thirty thousand. In Hawaii, when the widow of Kamahameha I. put herself under the control of Messrs. Bingham and Thurston, the American missionaries in 1821, a census was taken which gave a population of over a hundred and forty thousand natives. In 1890 the total was only thirty-eight thousand. The New Zealand Maoris, though unconquered by the British troops in many a battle, have shrunk in numbers in fifty years to less than thirty thousand. They were over a hundred thousand when the British Government took possession in 1840. Tonga, Samoa, the Marquesas Islands, Fiji, and nearly every other group of the Pacific, has a similar tale of vanished population. Four or five exceptions are all that can be found. The Hervey Islands, the Gambiers, Wallis, Futuna, and the Island of Pines, on the coast of New Caledonia, are almost the only places where the native population increases. In Wallis it has doubled in forty years, and in Futuna a similar increase is

noted since the old religion was abandoned. It is noteworthy that it was from Catholic sources that Wallis, Futuna and the Gambiers got their first introduction to civilization, and the same is true of the Island of Pines.

Hawaii was the first of the Pacific groups to receive Catholic missionaries. In 1825 Leo XII. established a Prefecture Apostolic of Oceanica and appointed Father Bachelot of the French Missionary Society of Picpus its first Prefect. It is a curious coincidence that at the time a future Pope, Pius IV., was temporarily residing on the shores of the Pacific in Chile. Father Bachelot, with two other priests, landed in 1827 at Honolulu, which was already a port frequented by whalers, and the capital of the whole kingdom founded a few years earlier by the conqueror, Kamahameha I. His widow was then reigning, and anxious to model her dominions on the white man's ways. In this task she had taken as her advisers a colony of New England Calvinist ministers who had landed seven years before. At the time when the queen was beginning to revolutionize the native government Mr. Bingham, a congregational minister, was the queen's guide in both religion and politics, and Protestant churches and schools had been built extensively through the islands. The queen and many of the chiefs called themselves Christians, and the churches were attended by a large part of the natives.

The Catholic mission, however, was not ill-received by the Hawaiians. They came to the chapel which Father Bachelot built and listened to the new doctrines. Within two years about a hundred had been admitted to the Church by baptism, and twice that number were preparing for that sacrament. Mr. Bingham had a full share of the Puritan intolerance and hatred of the Catholic Church, and the queen, under his instructions, forbade religious freedom to her subjects and ordered the Catholics to attend Protestant churches. The priests were at the same time prohibited from receiving native converts, and on their refusal to obey were put by force on an English vessel and transported to California in 1831. A bitter persecution was set on foot against the native Catholics for several years. Women were flogged and hung by the wrists from posts for many hours at a time. Others were condemned to the chain-gang or long terms of close imprisonment. A characteristic punishment was obliging the Catholic converts to clean the jail privies with their bare hands. It is remarkable that very few Hawaiians gave up their religion during the eight years of Puritan intolerance, though they had neither priest nor church.

Fathers Bachelot and Short made an attempt to resume their mission in 1837, after six years' exile. The death of the old queen, it was thought, might end the persecution, but it did not. Mr. Bingham and his colleagues had been reinforced from New England, and they handled the natives with the skill of politicians and the intolerance of the old Puritans. The priests were arrested on landing and put on board the vessel in which they had come. The English and American consuls remonstrated in their favor, but the only concession they could obtain was that Fathers Bachelot and Short might stay until vessels were available to carry them to some friendly port. Father Short after some time got a passage to Valparaiso, and Father Bachelot chartered a schooner to carry him to the Gambier Islands, where a Catholic mission was already established. The schooner would have to leave him on some still savage island for several months, as it had a trading-trip to make before going to the Gambiers. It sailed for the Ascension group, but Father Bachelot's health had been broken and he died on sea. His grave was made on a little island of the ocean whose pioneer Catholic missionary he had been, and only one countryman and four natives formed the attendance at his burial.

Eighteen months after Father Bachelot's death the Puritan persecution in Hawaii was ended suddenly. A French frigate anchored in Honolulu in 1839 and sent a demand to the king for the free exercise of Catholic worship through the islands. The Puritan missionaries yielded reluctantly. Father Maigret, afterwards bishop, and some other priests, landed and resumed the long-interrupted missions. A remarkable movement took place towards Catholicity. Within two years there were three thousand converts, who increased to fourteen thousand in eight years. In 1864 Bishop Maigret counted one-third of the then population in his flock, and the Protestant population was only another third.

Though the Puritan missionaries had to allow freedom of religion to the natives of Hawaii they continued to direct their government. If attendance at Protestant churches was not compulsory they took charge of the schools and tried to suppress those established by the Catholic priests. The administration of the islands was run by the methods familiar to American politicians. American law was made the law of the land and the missionaries appointed the judges to interpret it. A financial system was established, and another missionary, Judd, kindly took charge of the native Treasury. A land system on modern ideas was established, and the bulk of the soil of the country was turned over for a nomi-

nal consideration to an Improvement Company in which ex-missionaries and their friends were the stockholders. Foreign laborers were brought from Asia to work the plantations of the missionary colonists, while the natives have dwindled to one-fourth of their numbers seventy years ago. They are now a minority in their own land, and the control of their own destiny has passed away from their hands. Their experience of the benefits of civilization without Catholic Faith has been a hard one indeed.

Amongst the results of it has been one which has drawn wide attention throughout the world. Leprosy in a terrible form appeared in Hawaii about 1850, and it spread so rapidly that the government, after some years, ordered the banishment of all afflicted persons to the valley of Molokai. There is no egress from this leper colony, once a patient enters, and within it the unfortunate prisoners literally rot away to death. There were over seven hundred lepers in Molokai when in 1873 a Belgian, Father Damien Devenster, asked to become their chaplain and share their imprisonment. He had no lodging, at first, but the shade of a tree, when he entered the devoted valley. How he lived and toiled for years in that dreary spot, cheering, consoling and reforming the unfortunate inmates until the plague seized himself, need not be detailed here further. It is known throughout the world.

That civilization under Christian principles need not be fatal to the Polynesians, the experience of another community will show. The contrast is remarkable.

In 1833, while Father Bachelot was in exile in California, the Holy See established a new diocese for the Pacific Ocean. Its first Bishop was Dr. Stephen Rouchouze, who sailed with four priests and a few lay brothers for his distant diocese that year. His first destination was Tahiti, but the queen, under the influence of the Methodist ministers established there since 1797, refused him permission to land. The young bishop had to seek a place among the islands where the natives were still in their original barbarism. He found it in the Gambier group, to the south of the Poumoutou Archipelago, whose barren sands had offered little inducement to foreign visitors.

The four little islands which form the Gambiers were, on a small scale, a copy of the Hawaii of Kamahameha I. A conquering chief had united them into a little kingdom a generation before, after long wars which had materially lessened the population. The government was the same in form, the language, the customs, the religion and the dress of the people the same as in

Hawaii of old. The native paper-cloth was their only dress, hogs and dogs were the only animals, and the canoes were hollowed out with stone axes and the fish caught with pearl-shell hooks. A few pearl-fishers had occasionally touched on their shores, but in all essentials the Polynesians of Gambier sixty years ago were the same as the Tahitians of Cook's day.

Into this community of three or four thousand primitive islanders a Spanish schooner brought the first Catholic Bishop of Oceanica on All Saints' Day of 1834. The chiefs were surprised when the strangers asked leave to settle among them, but they granted it readily. The missionaries landed their baggage, the brothers began to plant a garden, and the priests to learn the language and make themselves friends with all classes, chiefs and slaves alike. As soon as the new-comers were able to make their mission understood they found it well received. There was no particular desire to learn the improvements of material civilization, but the Catholic teaching of the nature of God, the future life, and the redemption, excited serious attention. Like most Polynesians, the Gambiers had a priesthood with a chief whose authority was next to that of the king, but the chief priest was one of the first converts. A strange prediction was current in the islands that a new and true worship was shortly to be brought among them. A woman of the priestly class had repeated it for many years during the reign of the last king, and had added that the strangers to introduce it would come after her own death. From whatever cause the readiness of the Gambier islanders to accept the Catholic faith came, it existed in a way hardly found elsewhere among any Polynesian tribes.

The work of true missionaries, however, only really began when the tattooed natives came in crowds to have the new doctrines and new rules of life taught to them. New terms had to be made to express Catholic doctrines in the primitive dialect of savages, and long months were needed to make those terms thoroughly understood. It was needful, too, to remember that Polynesians, like other uncivilized races, are naturally as changeable as children, and need the same care as children. Bishop Rouchouze and his priests spent two years in this task before they admitted the mass of the grown-up natives to baptism. A favorite method of teaching introduced was to have the would-be converts discuss the various points of belief among themselves in the assemblies, which were a common centre of life in Polynesia. It is a hard task, indeed, to change a race of half-cannibal savages into intelligent Christians, but such was the work to be done.

Abstract instruction, besides, was not all that was needed. Morals had to change, as well as beliefs, for any real progress. The French priests found idleness the root of evils in Polynesian life, and they set to work to banish it. Like the old monks, they worked, as well as prayed and taught. They cleared and planted ground, cut stone for building, spun cotton-thread and wove it into muslin, in the short intervals that were left from their work of teaching: The more energetic young men, after a time, began to join in, and insensibly the others followed their example. The little patches of the natives received a larger share of attention, and tracts overgrown with reeds were cleared in every island for new plantations of yams and bread-fruit. The crop was divided equally among all the laborers at harvest-time; and though the primitive wooden spades and shell hoes were the only tools, a great change for the better, materially, was seen in two or three years.

"We built a house of three rooms of stone for the bishop," wrote Father Caret in 1837, "and there is not a native who has not come to admire it. We took occasion from this to suggest the building of churches for God's worship in the same style, and the suggestion was taken up enthusiastically. Ten of the smartest are learning how to cut stone and burn lime, and others are quarrying on the rocks away from the shore. We have also got them to improve their own huts and to sleep on reed and leaf beds, instead of sleeping, as they used, on the ground, to the injury of health. Such are the means we employ to banish idleness."

The change of a population from savage to really civilized life was effected in the Gambiers with scarcely a wrench to the old ways where not criminal in themselves. The occupations urged were only the old ones, except in the interest excited in them. The old gatherings and games were regulated, not abolished; the chiefs, as of old, were heads of public life, but they were taught to govern as Christian men should. The history of the Gambiers recalls the tradition of St. Patrick, when he appointed a mixed commission of priests, bards and brehon lawyers to revise the old Celtic code in Ireland. Whatever was conformable to right human reason was left, and only those maxims directly opposed to Christian morality were removed. The whole system was radically different from that of the Calvinist teachers in other parts of the Pacific. So were its results. "Our population continues to increase," wrote Father Caret in 1841, seven years after his arrival. "In the large island we have had only twenty-two deaths, and forty-eight for the last year." The following year there were fifty-two births and only twenty-two deaths. Civilization was come to the Gambiers in different shape from that in which it had come to Hawaii or Tahiti.

It was a different task, too, for the teachers, from the glowing picture of tropical life mapped out by Dr. Haweis for the London missionaries.

"When we came here," wrote Bishop Rouchouze to the Superior of the Mission Society of Picpus in 1837, "we had no shelter but the sky; no food but that of the natives, often trying to foreign stomachs; no clothes but what we brought. During the first two years we slept on reeds, and had no seats but blocks of stone or wood. I gave baptism once to eighty persons, and the episcopal throne during the ceremony was a section of the backbone of a whale which had been washed ashore some time long forgotten. We have here now a small house and some chairs, but in the other islands our missionaries are destitute of every personal convenience."

To live on potatoes and fish, to sleep in sheds, to patch together their worn-out clothes, to work at stone-cutting, digging and pruning under a tropical sun for three years, is a task against which even convicts would rebel; but it was the life of this bishop and his priests, fresh from the cities and colleges of Catholic France. The longing for churches suitable to divine worship was felt more keenly than that of the things which civilized men think most needed for personal convenience.

"What we are most anxious about is to build churches more decent than the wretched cabins we have had to be satisfied with till now. I should die happy, I think, if I saw a few churches in fit Oceanica in which the August Mysteries might be decently celebrated."

The good bishop's desire was only half gratified. A stone church was built in Gambier a year or two later, but he only heard of it by letter. With all its hardships the mission in Gambier was the one converted land in his diocese of over a thousand islands, and when its people had become a Catholic population the bishop sailed away to begin again work of the same kind in the Marquesas. He secured for two thousand dollars a half interest in a schooner in 1838, and with this at his disposal he visited the various islands of that group, and also Tahiti. Two missions were founded in small islands much as that of Gambier had been begun, but without the same friendly reception. In Vapoo, one of them, the two priests were doomed to death on the occasion of a chief's burial, and only escaped by the chance arrival of a vessel. In Dominica the chief drove them out and plundered their effects. Nearly five years passed before any of the islands showed any willingness to accept the faith of the Catholic missionaries, and long before that the bishop had gone to his reward. The end of persecution in the Hawaiian islands gave him an opportunity to visit them in 1840 and to found the missions there on a permanent footing. For that, however, more priests were a necessity,

and the bishop returned to Europe to recruit them. He gathered twenty-five priests, brothers and nuns, and sailed from France in 1841 full of hope that the whole of Polynesia would be converted and civilized as the Gambiers had already been. But it was not to be. The vessel on which he sailed touched at Destierro, on the east coast of South America, in March, 1842, but was never heard of again. The fate of the first bishop of the Pacific Ocean is one of the mysteries of its waters.

The great ocean had been already divided into two Catholic dioceses. All west of the 160th meridian was put under Bishop Pompallier in 1836. With four Marist priests, he left France for Valparaiso that year. From Valparaiso an American brig carried the missionaries to Tahiti, where they chartered a small schooner to explore the various islands. The bishop intended to establish himself in New Zealand, but he divided his priests in other islands. Father Bataillon and a brother were left in the little group of Wallis, centrally situated between the Samoan and Marquesas islands, and Father Chanel and another companion in Futuna, about a hundred and twenty miles from Wallis. The bishop, with two priests, sailed on to New Zealand.

The two islands were still in their primitive condition when the Catholic priests landed. The Wallis islanders had killed the crew of an English ship three years before, and several of the warriors had obtained guns and axes, but otherwise they were still as when Cook visited the South Seas. Old natives told of seeing the first vessel, which they had taken for a divine visitor. Bishop Pompallier asked the chief's permission to leave two of his people with him, and the chief, after a discussion with his advisers, agreed. There was a spirit of distrust of Europeans, however, and the name of "missionary," which had been confined hitherto to the Protestant teachers, was unpopular in Wallis. An armed expedition from Tonga had come there a few years before to establish a mission by force, but had been defeated, and the native chief resented the invasion. It was not until Father Bataillon had acquired a knowledge of the language that he explained the object of his coming, and then the chief was doubtful and unfriendly. He feared the native deities, who, as he said, gave the cava and bread-fruit, and he was also a polygamist, and disliked the restraints of Catholicity. For many months no impression could be made on the natives in a religious way, though Father Bataillon became widely known. At last a young chief in one of the smaller islands decided to become a Christian. The head chief broke out in anger, and threatened death to any who would leave the worship of

the old gods. The natives were forbidden even to give food to the strangers, for a time, and the bananas of the garden cultivated by themselves were their only resource against starvation. It is a strange picture that the lonely life of the young missionary affords. With one companion, on a remote island of capricious warriors, living in a shed on roots and fruits, working as a gardener hard enough, and meanwhile composing grammar and dictionary for the use of others, Father Bataillon kept on cheerfully for two long years. The tide of public feeling suddenly turned. One native after another, in spite of the king's orders, declared his determination to be a Christian. In the early months of 1840 eight hundred Kanakas had so pronounced themselves, and the king gave up threatening. Within two years the whole population was baptized, and Wallis became, and has remained, a Catholic land. Within five years a single man, unarmed and destitute, had changed the minds of a nation of savages and made them civilized Christians, as they have since remained.

A tragedy came to sadden the solemn reception of Wallis into the Catholic Church. Father Chanel, in Futuna, had lived almost exactly as Father Bataillon in the more populous island, for three and a half years of toil. His mode of living was graphically told by a countryman who visited Futuna in 1840, on his way to New Zealand with other missionaries :

“We came to his house, which was only four walls of bamboo thatched with reeds. The openings between the bamboos gave air and light, for there was no window. The floor was covered with pebbles from the beach, and a log of wood served as a pillow at night, with a sheet of native bark-paper for blanket and protection against the crowds of mosquitoes. There was neither chair nor furniture, except a little altar of rough boards. Some ragged clothes, a few garden tools, and the requisites for divine service were the whole contents of the cabin. There was neither kitchen nor larder, and as I had no lack of appetite I hinted at the need of something to eat. Our host replied that the feast would be a royal one, but that the time depended on his majesty's appetite. A shout was suddenly heard, which was, in fact, the call given us by the monarch of the island. We went to the smoky hut of the sovereign, where we were regaled with potatoes and taro roots, which calmed my appetite without satisfying it. They were, however, Father Chanel's regular food.”

So wrote Bishop Epalle in 1845, a few months before receiving his death-wound on the shore of Isabella Island.

It was a strange life indeed for a delicate priest, but lately the head of a diocesan seminary ; but he never flinched from it through over three years of apparently wasted effort. The king would not have Christians among his people. He was considered the representative of a native deity, and “reasons of state” have a place among savages as well as among civilized nations. A few

dying natives baptized, mostly children, were the only result, apparently, of three years' teaching, when at last an impression began to be made. Some young men asked to be instructed, and the chief threatened them fiercely. At last his own son declared that he, too, would be a Christian; and then a band of savage warriors, in a spirit like that which centuries before had made Henry II.'s Norman courtiers murder St. Thomas à Becket, came to Father Chanel's hut to kill. One asked for some ointment for a wound, and as the priest gave it he was struck down by a club. Another savage seized the hatchet used for splitting firewood and buried it in the victim's skull. Oceanica had its first Catholic martyr.

It is very strange, indeed, what followed. The lay brother, Father Chanel's companion, was absent, and a schooner touching at the island carried him to Wallis to tell the martyr's end. The body was rolled in a mat and buried by the murderers, but immediately a movement commenced among the population towards the Christian faith. Father Chanel was murdered on the 28th of April, 1841. The following January one of Father Chanel's colleagues visited Futuna to ask for his body. The natives dug it up and brought it to the ship, and at the same time they declared their sorrow for the crime and asked for a priest to teach them. Bishop Pompallier came to the island a few months later, and found a hundred already familiar with the Catholic doctrines from the instructions of the martyr's converts. The bishop baptized them, and left Father Servant and a lay brother to continue the work. Within eight months three-fourths of the Futunans were instructed and baptized, including the murderers of the first missionary. The island has since remained unshaken in the faith, and one of its natives, Father Gata, was the first Polynesian to receive holy orders, some twenty years ago.

Hawaii on the one hand, and Wallis and the Gambiers on the other, are typical examples of Catholic missions in the Pacific. In the islands where Protestant influences had been firmly established, as Tonga, Fiji, New Zealand and Samoa, the number of Catholic converts has been considerable, but the population steadily declines. Where Catholic faith has been able to form the Polynesian islanders socially as well as individually, thriving communities have been formed, and continue to live and thrive. The difference is a most remarkable one, and the lessons to be learned from it are not confined to the Pacific islanders.

BRYAN G. CLINCH.

THE PROBLEM OF HAPPINESS IN THE LIGHT
OF ECCLESIASTES.

OF all wisdom literature the Book of Ecclesiastes, or Qôhéleth, is the most fascinating to read and the most difficult to understand, the most impressive to quote and the most troublesome to explain. Hardly another book of the Bible has received so much attention on the part of commentators, and has suffered so much at their hands. To begin with the earliest records, the difficulties of Ecclesiastes occasioned considerable discussion in the Jewish synod at Jerusalem, about 65 A.D., and in the subsequent synod at Yabne, about 90 A.D.; the school of Shammai went so far as to decide against the book's canonicity, but the school of Hillel upheld truth and tradition.¹ The negative tendency appealed to the absence of internal signs of inspiration,² alleged apparent contradictions in the book itself,³ tried to establish an opposition between the teaching of Qôhéleth and that of Moses,⁴ and charged Ecclesiastes with a leaning to heresy.⁵ The conservative school showed that the alleged difficulties were only apparent ones, and urged the writer's admonition to fear God, and his doctrine of a future judgment in favor of his inspiration, a dogma which ultimately prevailed.⁶ Among Christian writers it was Theodore of Mopsuestia who first denied the inspired character of Ecclesiastes on the plea that the book teaches human, not divine, wisdom; after Luther had favored the same opinion, Leclerc⁷ rejected Qôhéleth from the Canon on the ground that it teaches the epicurean tenets of the Sadducees. But even a century before the last named writer we meet with the remark, "Difficult as this book is, it is almost more difficult to clear the author of the visionary fancies palmed upon him by his numerous commentators than to develop his meaning."

Thus far we have not much advanced in our task of connecting the doctrine of Ecclesiastes with the problem of human happiness; but if we keep in mind that the various explanations of Qôhéleth depend on the expositor's own view of life, we shall begin to understand that a writer's opinion on the Book of the Preacher is

¹ *Mishna Yadaim*, iii. 5; iv. 6; *Eduyoth*, v. 3.

² *Sabbath*, 30 b; *Megilla*, 7 a.

³ li. 2; vii. 3; viii. 5.

⁴ *Eccles.*, xi. 9; *Num.*, xv. 39.

⁵ *Cf. Midrash Rabba on Eccles.*, xi. 9.

⁶ *Aboth d' R. Nathan*, cap. i.

⁷ *Sentiments de quelques Théologiens d' Hollande*, etc., 1685.

a function of his theory on human happiness. And as different schools of philosophy point out different causes of beatitude, different subjects in which it must be sought, different methods of attaining it, and, finally, different ends or motives that must impel us to strive after it, so do different schools of exegesis differ with regard to the author of Qôhéleth, with regard to the contents, the form, and the scope of the book. In the present essay we can state only a few of the contradictory theories that have been put forth on the foregoing four points of controversy, referring the reader to the special treatises on Ecclesiastes¹ for a complete history of the question.

1. As to the authorship: "The Messiah, the true Solomon, who was known by the title of son of David, addresses this book to the saints"; a profligate disseminates his infamous sentiments by assuming in this book the person of Solomon. Again, Solomon published the book in his repentance; Solomon wrote it "when he was irreligious and skeptical during his amours and idolatry." The book was written between the time of Solomon and Jeremias, 975-588;² between the period of Manasses and Sedecias, 699-588;³ at the time of Zorobabel, 536-500;⁴ during the Persian period, 538-333;⁵ under the reign of Artaxerxes I., 465-424;⁶ after the middle of the fifth century, 450-400;⁷ between the time of Nehemias and Alexander, 450-333;⁸ in the latter part of the Persian period, 420-330;⁹ about 400,¹⁰ or towards the end of the Persian period and at the beginning of the Greek, 350-300¹¹ during the reign of Darius Codomannus, 335-333;¹² during Alexander's stay in Palestine, 333;¹³ in the beginning of the Ptolemaic period, 305-247,¹⁴ or about 300 B.C.;¹⁵ between the time of Alexander and Antiochus, 333-164,¹⁶ or during the Syrian and Macha-

¹ Cf. e.g., Ginsburg, *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, pp. 27-293, London, 1861; L. van Essen, *Der Prediger Salomo's*, Schaffhausen, 1856; B. Schäffer, *Neue Untersuchungen über das Buch Koheleth*, Freiburg, i. B., 1870; A. Motais, *Salomon et Ecclésiaste*, Paris, 1876; *L'Ecclésiaste*, Paris, 1877; Rambouillet, *L'Ecclésiaste*, Paris, 1879; G. Bickell, *Der Prediger über den Werth des Daseins*, Innsbruck, 1885; G. Gietmann, *Commentarius in Ecclesiasten*, Paris, 1890; Bernstein, *Quæstiones nonnullæ Kohelethanae*, Breslau, 1854; Böhl, *De Aramaïsmis libri Koheleth*, Erlangen, 1860; Bullock, *Commentary and Critical Notes on Ecclesiastes*, Speaker's Commentary, London, 1878; O. Zöchler, *Das Hohelied und der Prediger*, Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1868; Fr. Delitzsch, *Hohelied und Koheleth*, Leipzig, 1895; Wright, *The Book of Koheleth commonly called Ecclesiastes*, London, 1883.

² Nachtigal. ³ Paulus, Schmidt, Jahn.

⁴ Grotius, Kaiser, Eichhorn.

⁵ Bernstein Hengstenberg.

⁶ Keil.

⁷ Hävernicks, Weber, Zöchler.

⁸ Rosenmüller.

⁹ Stähelin, Davidson, Elster, Vaihinger, Castelli, Herzfeld.

¹⁰ Gerlach.

¹¹ De Wette, Knobel, Schrader, Bleek.

¹² Delitzsch, Wright.

¹³ Burger, Bergstr.

¹⁴ Kleinert.

¹⁵ E. Maier.

¹⁶ Bertholdt, Zirkel, Gelbe.

bean period, 300–100;¹ towards the end of the reign of Ptolemy Lagus, 285–283;² about 210, about 204;³ under Antiochus Epiphanes, 176–163;⁴ during the reign of Herod the Great, 40–4.⁵ Though most of the arguments for these various opinions are derived from internal evidence, and therefore bear directly on the interpretation of Ecclesiastes, still we need not consider them here as such, since they are based on the form, or the scope, or, again, the contents of the book, and fall, therefore, under these respective heads for their treatment. The only views that must here be absolutely rejected are those destructive of the inspired character of Qôhéleth; for it is a dogma of faith that the Preacher is an inspired writer, so that the light he throws on the problem of human happiness is not merely the result of human investigation, but the truth of divine revelation.

2. The literary form of a work is closely connected with its meaning; the former must be clearly determined before the latter can be grasped. Now here again interpreters have arrived at absolutely opposite conclusions: Ecclesiastes, we are told by some, is a dialogue between a pious Hebrew and a Sadducee,⁶ or between a refined sensualist and a sober sage,⁷ or, again, between a Hellenizing Jew impersonating Solomon and a conservative Jew faithful to all the traditions and manners of the ancients. The book is a dramatic discussion between Solomon and a Jewish prophet defending divine providence against the current difficulties of the people;⁸ a wrangle, finally, between Solomon extolling sensual enjoyments as a man's supreme happiness and a sage old Doctor defending the opposite thesis.⁹ Convenient as this view of the literary form of Ecclesiastes may be for answering the difficulties against the orthodoxy of the preacher, it cannot be upheld by its defenders. They do not agree as to the beginning or the end of a single part of the alleged dialogue; and they must confess that the disputants proceed without all logic, since they do not answer their opponent's arguments when they are urged to do so, but return to them after they have been lost sight of. These considerations oppose the view of those too who contend that Ecclesiastes is a monologue indeed, but a monologue between two interior voices, as it were; one is the voice of reason going astray and the other the voice of reason leading to truth, or one is the voice of the human heart at a period of temptation and inward trial and the other the voice of the same human heart

¹ Vatke, Hartmann.² Schenkel.³ Hitzig, Bickell.⁴ Reuss.⁵ Grätz.⁶ Leclerc.⁷ Herder, Eichhorn.⁸ Rohde.⁹ Kelle *cf.* Rosenmüller.

at a period of spiritual consolation. The possibility of this literary form in the case of an inspired book once admitted, all certainty as to its real doctrine is destroyed, unless definite criteria be pointed out according to which the various parts of the work can be determined.

The commentator of Ecclesiastes cannot therefore fall into the mistake of a recent theological writer who endeavored to prove the unsoundness of St. Thomas's doctrine by quoting certain chapters of difficulties contained in the Summa; the entire book of Ecclesiastes expresses the real sentiments of the Preacher himself. But this is only the beginning of new trouble, the basis for a new variety of opinions concerning the literary form of Qôhéleth. According to some the book is a medley of heterogeneous fragments belonging to various authors and different ages, a "rudis indigestaque moles,"¹ at best a chance collection of prophetic songs emanated from various schools of prophets and annotated by a more recent editor;² according to others the book is a prodigy of literary symmetry, consisting of four discourses, each discourse of thirteen sections, each section of thirty-seven strophes and half-strophes of a constant number of verses, recurring according to an invariable law.³ Others again bring literary unity into Qôhéleth by means of transposing some of its parts,⁴ or by rejecting certain portions entirely,⁵ while another class of writers admit a certain unity of drift in the whole book, but deny any logical connection between its parts.⁶ Consistently with the foregoing opinions some interpreters explain Qôhéleth on the basis of the most absolute literary unity; others treat the book as an aggregate of proverbs and prophetic oracles; others again suppose in the work the unity of a piece of music consisting rather in a suite of essays than in a logical development of the same subject.

In the analysis of Ecclesiastes it must be borne in mind that the Hebrew writers always kept to the primitive way of imparting instruction and giving explanation in sentences and maxims, and that accurate and complicated divisions of the subject were unknown to them. Even in the epistles of St. Paul we find the division into a doctrinal part and a practical repeatedly employed instead of the systematic development of a thesis, such as we are accustomed to look for in the sermons of Bossuet or Bourdaloue. If we approach Qôhéleth with this common-sense

¹ Stäudlin, Bruch.

² Nachtigall.

³ Köster, Vaihinger.

⁴ Umbreit, Spohn, Paulus, Bickell.

⁵ Dolus.

⁶ Herder, Eichhorn, Friedländer, Knobel (?).

view of Hebrew literature, we shall be able without much difficulty to discover a division of the book that will at least greatly assist the reader, even if it has not been actually in the mind of the writer. In the prologue¹ Ecclesiastes states the problem of his work; in the epilogue he summarizes his solution of the problem.² In the body of his work the writer first develops his subject theoretically,³ and then applies his doctrine practically.⁴ While this division commends itself by its simplicity and the equality of its parts, each of which consists of six chapters, it is also necessitated by the division of thought on the part of the writer, and the character of language in the two parts of the book, the first of which proceeds mainly in the third person, the second has the tone of a direct address. We do not, however, exclude from the present work a characteristic found in each collection of Wisdom literature; there is always a place for disconnected proverbs interspersed among more extended compositions.

3. Thus far we have seen that the light Ecclesiastes throws on the problem of human happiness is not of created, but of divine origin, is not interrupted by the clouds of human error or the darkness of human passion; and though it does not reach us through the polarizing medium of versified language, it does not resemble the scattered light of the starry firmament by reason of its lack of connection, but like the light of the sun it is continuous, direct, and reaching from end to end. Before we proceed to study the objects manifested by this light we must pay a moment's attention to the color under which they are made visible; in other words, before we consider the truths taught by Ecclesiastes we must locate the focus around which they are grouped. We are so well accustomed, by this time, to the disagreements of commentators on Qôhéleth, that we shall not be astonished at their difference of view on the scope of the book. Its object, we are told, is to prove the immortality of the soul;⁵ its design is to deny a future existence. It aims at comforting the unhappy Jews in their misfortune;⁶ it purports to pour forth the gloomy imaginations of a melancholy misanthrope.⁷ It is intended to open Nathan's speech,⁸ touching the eternal throne of David; it propounds by anticipation the modern discoveries of anatomy and the Harveian theory of the circulation of the blood. It foretells what will become of man and angels in eternity; it is a keen satire on Herod casting his son Alexander into prison.⁹ It is a paraphrase of the

¹ i. 1-11.² xii. 8-12.³ i. 12, vi. 12.⁴ vii. 1, xii. 7.⁵ Desvœux.⁶ Ewald.⁷ Knobel.⁸ I. Par., xvii.⁹ 8 B.C.

warning "fear God;"¹ it is an apology of divine providence.² It warns against the vanities of life,³ it recommends a proper use of the goods of this world.⁴ What has been said sufficiently illustrates the different conclusions commentators have arrived at concerning the scope of Qôhéleth; and since all of these views are, again, based on internal evidence, they show to some extent the relation of the book to the problem of human happiness. The book really considers the question of divine providence, *e.g.*, it investigates the extent to which man's appetites can be satisfied by earthly goods, it touches upon the immortality of the soul and a future state; but all these are only subordinate questions of the main issue of the writer; they occupy his attention in one chapter or another, but they do not express the drift of his entire treatise. The problem of human happiness is the focus in which meet all the rays of light emitted by Qôhéleth.

After the writer has expressly formulated the question:⁵ "What profit has man of all his labor wherein he labors under the sun,"⁶ he depicts for us the "vast wheel of nature" by placing before our eyes the eternal rounds of coming and going generations, of sunrise and sunset, of south and north wind, of rain and vaporation. Surely, man's life seems to be not a progress, but a treadmill; his labor cannot change the tyranny of the law, for "there is no new thing under the sun." This weariness of life becomes still more painful, because the human heart is a bottomless abyss that cannot be filled with the goods of the world; "the eye is not satisfied with seeing, nor the ear filled with hearing." Again, therefore, "what profit has man of all his labor?"

Qôhéleth's theoretic answer to the foregoing question is contained in the first half of his treatise.⁷ Man cannot find happiness in wisdom,⁸ nor in pleasure and wisdom combined,⁹ but God alone can make man happy.¹⁰ For God has appointed a time and season for all things,¹¹ so that human efforts, independent of the divine appointment, are wholly ineffective;¹² in society they cannot remedy the most flagrant cases of injustice¹³ or oppression;¹⁴ in private life success is subject to jealousy,¹⁵ solitude is unprofitable and dangerous,¹⁶ power is uncertain and delusive,¹⁷ devotion is apt to become

¹ Hengstenberg.

² Rohde.

³ Eichhorn, Herder.

⁴ Luther, Jahn, Zirkel, Keil.

⁵ Eccles., i. 3.

⁶ For brevity sake we shall translate our quotations directly from the Hebrew text, instead of first giving the text of our English version and then drawing attention to its shortcomings.

⁷ i. 12-vi. 12.

⁸ i. 13-18.

⁹ ii. 1-23.

¹⁰ ii. 24-26.

¹¹ iii. 1-8.

¹² iii. 9-15.

¹³ iii. 16-22.

¹⁴ iv. 1-3.

¹⁵ iv. 4-6.

¹⁶ iv. 7-11.

¹⁷ iv. 13-16.

exaggerated,¹ riches are at times distressful² and always uncertain.³ Human efforts are, therefore, vain, God alone can give man happiness,⁴ and man must submit to the decrees of providence.⁵

In the second half of his treatise Ecclesiastes shows the practical bearing of the foregoing principles on our daily life. Beginning with the *negative* inferences derived from the principle of total surrender to providence, Qôhéleth shows that the effect of sorrow and suffering on the human heart is commonly more salutary than that of joy and pleasure;⁶ at least, we must be patient in our trials,⁷ since our complaints are useless, dangerous, and even unjust, both women and men having their faults that cannot be imputed to providence.⁸ The first *positive* obligation which the preacher derives from his principles is obedience to the king,⁹ because of the oath of allegiance and the impossibility of resistance.¹⁰ Charges against divine providence cannot release us from the oath of allegiance, since providence will administer justice in the next life,¹¹ and since a number of facts¹² have occasioned false inferences.¹³ An apologue showing that wisdom is victorious, but not preferred by the multitude to the folly of the rebels,¹⁴ concludes this part, and forms the transition to the development of the impossibility of resisting authority. The rebel chief is incapable of ruling,¹⁵ he is base and treacherous,¹⁶ he is impotent against existing authority,¹⁷ he is the misfortune of his country whose blessing lies in the person of the rightful king;¹⁸ therefore the obligation of loyalty to the king.¹⁹ The second positive duty urged by Ecclesiastes on his readers is that of resisting the very causes of rebellion: inactivity, sadness of heart, and irritation against providence. The first is removed by assiduous labor,²⁰ the second by cheerfulness of heart,²¹ the third by a life of virtue;²² all else is vanity.²³

In the epilogue Qôhéleth first gives us a glimpse of himself; he was wise, and a teacher of the people; in his former capacity he "pondered and sought out, and set in order many proverbs"; as a teacher, he aimed to speak at once words that would please, and words which were true.²⁴ The writer considers this as an important hint; for while the words of the wise are at once goads to the intellect and stakes that uphold the soul, "there is no end" "of making many books" on the part of the would-be-wise, "and much reading is a weariness of the flesh" for the poor student.²⁵

¹ iv. 17-v. 8.² v. 9-11.³ v. 12-16.⁴ v. 17-vi. 6.⁵ vi. 7-12.⁶ vii. 1-7.⁷ vii. 8-12.⁸ vii. 13-29.⁹ viii. 1-2.¹⁰ viii. 3-5.¹¹ viii. 6-8.¹² viii. 9-17.¹³ ix. 1-12.¹⁴ ix. 13-18.¹⁵ x. 1-4.¹⁶ x. 5-7.¹⁷ x. 8-13.¹⁸ x. 14-19.¹⁹ x. 20.²⁰ xi. 1-6.²¹ xi. 7-9.²² xi. 10-xii. 7.²³ xii. 8.²⁴ xii., 9-10.²⁵ xii., 11-12.

To summarize, therefore, his solution of the problem, the Preacher concludes, "Fear God, and keep His commandments, for this is the whole of man." The summary of principles by means of which all difficulties may be solved is equally brief: "God shall bring every work into judgment, with every hidden thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil."¹

4. We have determined the scope of Ecclesiastes, the literary form, and the author, so far as these questions bear on the relation of the book to the problem of human happiness. It remains now to consider the contents or the matter of the work, taking matter in the sense of doctrine. After all that has been said, we need not delay over the opinion of those who regard the book as an expression of the lamentations of Solomon, together with his prophetic visions of the ruin of the royal house of David, the destruction of the temple, and the captivity; nor need we refute the contention that Ecclesiastes is "a chronicle of the lives of the kings of the house of David from Solomon down to Sedecias." At this stage of our study we understand also, without further explanation, in what sense the Book of Qôhéleth can be called a treatise on the "summum bonum," or a description of the beautiful order of God's moral government, showing that all things work together for the good of them that love the Lord. But the point that needs explanation is the nexus between the Preacher's question and his answers. The question reads, "What profit has man of all his labor wherein he labors?"² The answer is threefold: 1. "All is vanity"; 2. "Fear God and keep His commandments"; 3. "God shall bring every work into judgment." The first of these answers is negative, stating wherein the profit of man's labors cannot consist; the second answer is positive, and contains the ordinary solution of the problem; the third is also positive, but hypothetic as it were, supplying the solution of the problem in those instances in which the second answer is found unsatisfactory. We begin now to study these answers separately.

(1) "All is vanity"; but what is vanity cannot constitute man's profit for his labor; therefore (all cannot, or) nothing can constitute man's profit for his labor. Here we have the nexus between the inspired writer's question and his first answer; the full bearing of the conclusion however, will become more apparent by an investigation of its premises. What is the extent of "all" concerning which vanity is predicated?³ On reading the book, we find that concerning certain subjects the Preacher predicates

¹ xii. 13-14.

² i. 3.

³ i. 2; xii. 3.

vanity without assigning any further reason; concerning others he gives the reason for his opinion, and in the case of a third class of subjects he proves their vanity without stating this conclusion explicitly.

The following passages may serve as instances in which both reason and conclusion are stated: "I have seen all the works that are done under the sun, and behold, all is vanity and a striving after wind (useless study). That which is crooked cannot be made straight (by means of wisdom), and that which is wanting cannot be numbered" (or, wisdom cannot change the objective realities or deficiencies of things).¹ Again, the writer says of wisdom: "And I applied my heart to know wisdom, and to know madness and folly; I perceived that this also was a striving after wind. For in much wisdom is much grief, and he that adds knowledge adds sorrow."² Wisdom is therefore rightly numbered among the vanities of life. Qôhéleth next proceeds to state his experience with regard to pleasure: "I said in my heart, Go to now, I will try thee with mirth; therefore enjoy pleasure; and behold, this also was vanity. I said of laughter, It is mad, and of mirth, What doeth it?"³ And again: "Then said I in my heart, as it happens to the fool, so it will happen even to me; and why was I then more wise (why did I join wisdom with my pleasure)? Then I said in my heart, that this also was vanity."⁴ Then considering the grand enterprises he had successfully carried through in order to secure his pleasure, the Preacher continues: "And who knows whether he (my heir) shall be a wise man or a fool? Yet, he shall have rule over all my labor wherein I have showed wisdom under the sun. This also is vanity."⁵ After stating this last argument in a somewhat modified form a second time,⁶ the writer reflects on the condition of the man toiling for the satisfaction of his love of pleasure: "All his days are but sorrows, and his travail is grief, yea, even in the night his heart takes no rest. This also is vanity."⁷ Pursuing our investigation we strike a passage in which God alone is represented as the author of man's happiness, and in which man's labor is said to be of no avail. In proving this last statement, Ecclesiastes writes: "That which befalls the sons of men, befalls beasts; one lot befalls them; as the one dies, so dies the other; yea, they have all one breath; and man has no pre-eminence over the beasts; for all is vanity."⁸ We notice here that premise and conclusion are inverted; since all is vain and nothing can satisfy the longings of man,

¹ i. 14, 15.⁵ ii. 19.² i. 17, 18.⁶ ii. 21.³ ii. 1, 2.⁷ ii. 23.⁴ ii. 15.⁸ iii. 19.

he is in the helpless condition of the beast as far as his happiness is concerned. The writer next depicts the successful endeavors of man to remedy unjust oppression, and the jealousy on the part of his neighbors that will follow his chance success. Is man therefore to lead a life of seclusion? Here is the verdict of Qôhéleth: "Then I returned and saw vanity under the sun. There is one that is alone, and he has no second; yea, he has neither son nor brother; yet, there is no end of all his labor, neither are his eyes satisfied with riches. For whom then (says he) do I labor, and deprive my soul of good? This also is vanity."¹ Perhaps riches of themselves can fill the soul of man; the Preacher dispels this doubt of the reader at its first appearance: "He that loveth silver, shall not be satisfied with silver; nor he that loveth abundance, with increase; this also is vanity."² And to do away with any notion that independently of God the goods of life can make man happy, the inspired writer returns, as it were, to the subject: "There is an evil which I have seen under the sun, and it is heavy upon men; a man to whom God giveth riches, wealth, and honor, so that he lacketh nothing for his soul of all that he desires, yet God giveth him not power to eat thereof, but a stranger eats it; this is vanity."³

The second class of passages in which Qôhéleth predicates vanity of things without stating any other reason than his own experience or opinion, is represented mainly by the following texts: "Then I looked on all the works that my hands had wrought, and on the labor that I had labored to do: and behold, all was vanity and a striving after wind, and there was no profit under the sun."⁴ The writer considers it so important to convince his reader of the futility of the spirit of enterprise with the view of securing one's own happiness that, not satisfied with giving several proofs for his statement, and appealing to his own experience in its confirmation, he states the result of his experiment a second time: "So I hated life, because the work that is wrought under the sun was grievous unto me; for all is vanity and striving after wind."⁵ The next appeal to his own experience Ecclesiastes makes where he mentions the jealousy he suffered on the part of his neighbor: "Then I saw all labor and every skilful work, that for this a man is envied of his neighbor; this also is vanity and a striving after wind."⁶ It is not always his individual experience that the Preacher advances in proof of his statements; at times, universal experience and common sense form the basis

¹ iv. 7, 8.

⁴ ii. 11.

² v. 9.

⁵ ii. 17.

³ vi. 1-2.

⁶ iv. 4.

of the argument: "There was no end of all the people," the writer says when speaking of a dead or dethroned ruler, "even of all them over whom he was; yet they that come after shall not rejoice in him. Surely this also is vanity and a striving after wind."¹ The proverb preferring a bird in the hand to two in the bush is expressed by Ecclesiastes in this way: "Better is the sight of the eyes (*i.e.*, the good actually seen and possessed) than the wandering of the desire; this also is vanity and a striving after wind."² In the "History of Sinkarib and his two viziers"³ we read the admonition: "Son, neither speak nor laugh loud; for if noise could build a house, the ass would build several every day." Ecclesiastes expresses a similar contempt for a senseless exercise of the vocal organs: "As the crackling of thorns under a pot, so is the laughter of the fool; this also is vanity."⁴ Were we to enter into the exegetic intricacies of the next passage, we should add a new cause of complaint to this "weary world." For our purpose the following probable rendering will prove sufficient: "And withal I saw the wicked buried, and they passed away; they had departed from the holy place, and their conduct was forgotten in the city; this also is vanity."⁵ A similar sentiment is expressed a few verses further on: "There is a vanity which is done upon the earth, that there are righteous men unto whom it happens according to the work of the wicked; again, there are wicked men to whom it happens according to the work of the righteous: I said that this also is vanity."⁶ Finally, the Preacher holds up a sad picture of old age: "If a man live many years, let him rejoice in them all; but let him remember the days of darkness, for they shall be many. All that comes is vanity."⁷

A third class of passages touches upon such gloomy points of life that only the premises need be stated in order to render the moral darkness palpable; here, therefore, Qôhéleth refrains from an explicit expression of the conclusion. A few examples will render our meaning clear to the reader: "What profit has he that works in that wherein he labors? I have seen the travail which God has given to the sons of men to be exercised therewith. He has made everything beautiful in its time; also he has set the world in their heart; yet so, that man cannot find out the work that God has done from the beginning even to the end."⁸ This gloomy aspect of the intellectual efforts of man is still more

¹ iv. 16.² vi. 9.³ Cf. *Geschichten und Lieder aus den aramäischen Handschriften der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, Weimar, 1896.⁴ vii. 7.⁵ viii. 10.⁶ viii. 14.⁷ xi. 8.⁸ iii. 9-11.

darkened by man's social evils : " Then I returned and saw all the oppressions that are done under the sun ; and behold, the tears of such as were oppressed, and they had no comforter ; and on the side of their oppressors there was power, but they had no comforter. Wherefore I praised the dead which are already dead more than the living which are yet alive ; yea, better than both them (did I esteem) him who has not yet been, who has not seen the evil work that is done under the sun."¹ But the gloom of existence encircles perhaps only the weak and the poor ; the fate of the rich and powerful may be quite satisfactory. " This also is a grievous evil," answers the Preacher, " that in all points as he came, so shall he go ; and what profit has he that he labors for the wind ? Moreover, all his days he eats in darkness, and he is sore vexed, and has sickness and wrath."² It is not only the individual and the social life that is thus beset with unspeakable difficulties ; unless there be a special protection of providence, the domestic life may become more burdensome than either. " I find a thing more bitter than death," adds Qôhéleth, " (even) the woman whose heart is snares and nets, whose hands are bands ; whoever pleases God shall escape from her, but the sinner shall be taken by her. Behold, this have I found, saith the Preacher, putting one thing to another, to find out the reason of things—which my soul still seeks, but I have not found : one man among a thousand have I found, but a woman among all those have I not found."³

Thus far we have determined, in the light of the Preacher's own development, the comprehension of the word " all " which forms the subject of his first answer, " all is vanity," given to the question, " what profit has man of all his labor wherein he labors under the sun." We have found that " all " includes all earthly goods taken apart from God's influence ; independently of God man cannot procure his happiness either as an individual, or as a member of the family, or again as member of the state. The heart of the individual will not be satisfied with wisdom, or pleasure, or wealth, or the combination of all of these ; the state will naturally either cause, or at least not prevent, certain practices of injustice and oppression and rivalry ; the family, finally, apart from God will prove " more bitter than death." It is on account of this doctrine that the Preacher has been charged with moral scepticism, or even cynicism. But the sceptic questions the certainty of our knowledge, while Ecclesiastes points out the limits of science, its ineffi-

¹ iv. 1-3.

² v. 16-17.

³ vii. 26-28.

ciency to bring about moral reform, and its inadequacy of satisfying the human heart; similarly, there is a world-wide difference between the cynic who denies all moral worth and disinterestedness of motive and the writer who merely grants the existence of moral evil in society, both domestic and civil. It is true, that even an inspired writer may give expression to more or less so-called pessimistic views; but if the Book of Ecclesiastes be judged according to its whole doctrine on human happiness, if we make no abstraction from its positive answer to the question, "what profit has man of all his labor," we shall find enough of creature comfort urged on us by its principles to satisfy even an exacting optimist.

(2) The profit of man's labor or his earthly happiness depends entirely on God; but God will grant it to those that fear Him and keep His commandments; therefore, "fear God, and keep His commandments." Here we have the nexus between Qôhéleth's question and his second or positive answer. We shall see, however, that an investigation of the premises of this argument will throw considerable light on the teaching of Ecclesiastes. We suppose that the cogency of the argument will not be questioned on account of its defect of form or its assumption that man must be happy. The form¹ has been couched in the terminology of Ecclesiastes for the convenience of the reader; the terms can be translated into dialectically exact expressions without altering the material meaning of the propositions. As to the assumption of the need of man's happiness, it is expressly stated by Qôhéleth himself: "If a man beget a hundred children, and live many years, so that the days of his years be many, but his soul be not filled with good, and moreover he have no burial: I say that an untimely birth is better than he; for it comes in vanity, and departs in darkness, and its name is covered with darkness; besides, it has not seen the sun nor known it; this has rest rather than the other."² Hence only the major and the minor premise need further examination.

The texts that bear on the major premise state not only the supreme dominion of divine providence over man's happiness, but they describe also the object of the latter. "There is nothing better for a man (than) that he should eat and drink, and make

¹ In strictly dialectic form the argument reads: Man's earthly happiness is a good that depends on God alone; but man can obtain the good depending on God alone only by fearing and obeying God; therefore, man can attain earthly happiness only by fearing and obeying God.

² vi. 3-5.

his soul enjoy good in his labor. This also I saw that it is from the hand of God."¹ The drift of these words is repeated again and again throughout the "Book of the Preacher." As in the foregoing passage it concludes the section describing the vanity of pleasure and enterprise, so it forms the practical conclusion of the passage on human inability to remedy the injustice of society,² and of the section concerning the vanity of riches.³ Once it assumes a negative form: "A man to whom God giveth riches, wealth, and honor, so that he lacks nothing for his soul of all that he desires, yet God gives him not power to eat thereof, but a stranger eats it; this is vanity."⁴ Again, it occurs in passages referring to God's providence: "I know that there is nothing better for them than to rejoice, and to do good (*i.e.*, to enjoy pleasure), so long as they live. And also that every man should eat and drink, and enjoy good in all his labor, is the gift of God."⁵ Then the same truth is inculcated by contrast, as it were: "In the day of prosperity be joyful, and in the day of adversity consider; God has made the one, side by side with the other, to the end that man should not find out anything that shall be after him."⁶ Finally, Qôhéleth is not forgetful of the part that man himself must contribute to his own happiness: "Rejoice, O young man in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thy heart, and in the sight of thy eyes: but know thou, that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment."⁷

While the foregoing passages insist on the fact that God dispenses human happiness, they also show what is the object in which man is to place his happiness on earth. To summarize the teaching of the Preacher on this point, he believes that man's earthly happiness is to consist in the natural satisfaction that accompanies the exercise of his faculties and the state of his present condition. The sensible feeling of this satisfaction may and does vary in various faculties and various subjects; the glutton will not relish the intricacies of metaphysics as much as the delights of the table, and the mathematician may perceive a keener satisfaction in the solution of a problem than in the sport of the huntsman; the jockey may jump things because he is afraid, and his pleasure of getting over the fence is worth an occasional spill. It is, therefore, this pleasant excitement providence has connected with the exercise of our faculties, whether they be intellectual

¹ ii. 24-25.

² iii. 22.

³ v. 18 ff.

⁴ vi. 2.

⁵ iii. 12-13; Cf. viii. 15.

⁶ vii. 14.

⁷ xi. 9.

or sensual, which, according to Qôhéleth, must form the basis of our earthly happiness. It is true that the conditions of men vary, and that different men are called upon to exercise different faculties; but then it must be kept in mind that the child may feel happier over his rattle than the monarch over his throne and crown; "the sleep of the laboring man is sweet, whether he eat little or much, but the fullness of the rich will not suffer him to sleep."¹ And if the human heart be content and happy, what difference does it make whether the satisfaction be based on a great amount of what is really external to human nature, or be produced by small exterior goods. "Better is an handful with quietness than two handfuls with labor and striving after wind."²

Before proceeding further we must answer a difficulty that has been lurking in the mind of the reader for some time. In the preceding pages we showed that, according to Ecclesiastes, "all is vanity," the "all" including all earthly goods taken independently of God; in the last paragraph we maintained, on the contrary, that all human labor includes a satisfaction sufficient for human happiness. How are we to explain this apparent discrepancy? In the first place, there is quite a difference between the subjects of the two apparently contradictory propositions; the phrase "all earthly goods taken independently of God" conveys a meaning entirely distinct from that of the clause "all human labor." Now the reader cannot be astonished at seeing different predicates attributed to entirely different subjects. A study of the matter from another point of view will show that this answer is not a mere dialectic quibble. We do not believe that the reader will find a real contradiction between the following two statements: "The sound of no single organ-pipe, or of all organ-pipes together, taken independently of the mind of the organist, is the ordinary constituent of harmony"; and, on the other hand, "each organ-pipe, properly touched, emits a sound that is in itself a sufficient factor of harmony." Now what the sound, however continuous, of each single organ-pipe or of all the pipes touched simultaneously, is with regard to harmony, that is the relation of any single earthly good, or of all earthly goods taken together, with regard to man's happiness. And again, as each organ-pipe emits a sound in itself sufficient to become the factor of musical harmony under the proper direction of the musician, so does every human action and condition produce a feeling of satisfaction that may, at least temporarily, satisfy the human heart, if

¹ v. 12.

² iv. 6.

properly disposed by divine providence. And thus it comes about that God elicits the most beautiful as well as the most varied harmony from the heart of man, from some a continuous "Dies iræ," from others a perpetual "Gloria in excelsis," from others, again, harmonies that interchange between the "Miserere" and "Alleluia," according to the season of the ecclesiastical year; but from every heart there ascends, as far as God's providence is concerned, a continuous music that excels the harmonies of the spheres as much as spirit transcends matter. To return to the language of Ecclesiastes, we find the summary of his doctrine on human happiness expressed in the words: "Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart; for God has already accepted thy works. Let thy garments be always white, and let not thy head lack ointment. Live joyfully with the wife whom thou lovest all the days of the life of thy vanity, which he has given thee under the sun, all the days of thy vanity; for that is thy portion in life, and in thy labor wherein thou laborest under the sun."¹

A second exception is, at times, taken to the doctrine of Qôhéleth as stated in the last paragraph; we are told that such a view of life and happiness radically destroys all high ideals of action. Why should men exert themselves to their utmost, if they can be happier with less labor and trouble? There is a semblance of truth in our opponents' observation; from a merely intellectual point of view, man might aspire to a higher standard of life, if a less degree of what is called culture did not confer earthly happiness on him. But then man is not all intellect, as he is not all will, nor all matter. Human happiness must reckon not only with man's higher faculties, but also with his lower needs and powers. He requires something not only "de rore cœli," but also a good deal "de pinguedine terræ," in order to feel comfortable. And we are really inclined to believe that Qôhéleth knew human nature better than our opponents do; the former takes man as he finds him in the concrete, the latter reason "a priori" on what man might be if he were an angel, or if he were to live here forever. It may not be pleasant to be told that the fabric of this world is beyond and above one; but, at the same time, it would be folly to attempt a remodeling of the wheel of nature at the expense of one's success in life.

Thus far we have considered Qôhéleth's major premise "man's happiness of life depends entirely on God." The next statement

¹ ix. 7-9.

that God will grant happiness to those who fear Him and keep His commandments needs less explanation, for we know that throughout the Old Testament virtue and vice are spoken of as being visibly rewarded on earth. God declared at the very giving of the law that He will show mercy to thousands of those who love Him and keep His commandments, and visit the iniquity of those who hate Him to the third and fourth generation.¹ The whole of Lev. xxvi. and of Deut. xxviii., are replete with promises of earthly blessings to those who will walk in the way of the Lord, and threatenings of temporal afflictions upon those who shall transgress His law. The faithful fulfillment of these promises and threats in the early stages of the Jewish history convinced every Israelite that "God judges the righteous, and is angry with the wicked every day." This belief is spread over the whole Old Testament like a net of fine threads; in his turn, Qôhéleth appeals to it repeatedly. Almost in the very beginning of the book, after God has been represented as the author of human happiness, we are warned: "To the man that pleases Him, God gives wisdom, and knowledge, and joy; but to the sinner He gives travail to gather and to heap up, that He may give to him that pleases God."² Later on, the writer treats of the difficulty of steering the middle course between excess of austerity and excess of joyousness, and again adds: "He that fears God shall come forth of them all."³ A few lines below there is question of a new danger; how is man to avoid the choice of a companion of life that will make his domestic state "more bitter than death?" "Whoever pleases God," is the answer of Qôhéleth, "shall escape from her, but the sinner shall be taken by her."⁴ Even obedience to the civil ruler, rendered for the sake of God, will find its reward in this life: "Keep the king's command, and that in regard of the oath of God. . . . Whoever keepeth the commandment, shall know no evil thing, and a wise man's heart discerns time and judgment."⁵ Since, therefore, God alone can give man happiness, and since He gives it only to those who fear Him and keep His commandments, Qôhéleth rightly concludes: "Fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole man."⁶

(3) We have considered Qôhéleth's negative answer to his own question "what profit has man of all his labor"; we have reviewed also his positive answer to the question, and found that it opposes the first answer only apparently. But there is a practical difficulty

¹ Ex. xx. 5, 6.

⁴ vii. 26.

² ii. 26.

⁵ viii. 2, 5.

³ vii. 18.

⁶ xii. 13.

that is not only not soluble by the light of the Preacher's second answer, but is rendered more manifest and even palpable. By limiting the bar of judgment to this side of the grave, the inspired writer yields no explanation of, or succor under, the distracting sight of the righteous suffering all their life, and then dying for their righteousness, and of the wicked prospering and prolonging their days through their wickedness. These facts are not at all unknown to Qôhéleth: "And moreover," he says,¹ "I saw under the sun, in the place of judgment, that wickedness was there; and in the place of righteousness, that wickedness was there." The suffering caused by this perversion of order is described thus: "Then I returned and saw all the oppressions that are done under the sun, and behold, the tears of such as were oppressed, and they had no comforter; and on the side of their oppressors there was power, but they had no comforter."² At times the writer insists on the ineffectiveness of virtue with regard to happiness of life: "What advantage has the wise man more than the fool?"³ and again, "there is a righteous man that perishes in his righteousness";⁴ at other times he urges the apparently inverted ratio between virtue and happiness: "There are righteous men unto whom it happens according to the work of the wicked, and there are wicked men, to whom it happens according to the work of the righteous."⁵ Towards the end of the book we are repeatedly warned that vice and virtue have no influence on man's earthly happiness: "There is one event to the righteous and to the wicked, to the good and to the clean and to the unclean, to him that sacrifices and to him that sacrifices not . . . there is one event unto all."⁶ A little further on the writer seems to contend explicitly that all depends on chance, not on providence: "The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of understanding, nor yet favor to men of skill, but time and chance happen to them all. For man also knows not his time; as the fishes that are taken in an evil net, and as the birds that are caught in the snare, even so are the sons of men snared in an evil time, when it falls suddenly upon them."⁷ The seeming opposition between theory and experience is stated once more: "Then said I, Wisdom is better than strength; nevertheless, the poor man's wisdom is despised, and his words are not heard."⁸

The psalms that were written under such distressing circum-

¹ iii. 16.

² iv. 1.

³ vi. 8.

⁴ vii. 15.

⁵ viii. 14.

⁶ ix. 2 ff.

⁷ ix. 11-12.

⁸ ix. 16.

stances¹ endeavor to allay the prevailing scepticism in the moral government of God, by declaring that the righteous shall ultimately prosper, and that the wicked shall ultimately be cut off in great misery. Even the Book of Job, which so successfully shows that not all suffering is owing to the vindictive justice of God, but that some afflictions are mere trials of virtue and others are of the nature of a preventive medicine, only confirms the opinion that the righteous are visibly rewarded here, inasmuch as it represents their calamities as transitory, and Job himself as restored to double his original wealth and happiness in this life. What truth there is in the opinion we hear at times expressed that the other Old Testament books do not appeal to any reward or punishment in the next life we cannot here investigate; at any rate, Qôhéleth solves the riddle of the distribution of pain and pleasure in this life by an appeal to the judgment of God in the next. Here, then, is the connection of Qôhéleth's third answer, with his question "what profit has man of all his labor?" It would be against the wisdom and goodness of God that man should have no reward for his good deeds; but experience shows that, at times, man has no reward for his labor in this life; therefore "God shall bring every work into judgment" in the next life. Ecclesiastes supposes the first statement to be evident from the principles of common sense; he appeals to his own experience, as we have seen, for the second statement; the conclusion will solve the difficulty satisfactorily on the supposition that what is adjusted by God himself in the next life will satisfy all the demands of justice and equity.

It has been often denied that Qôhéleth admits the existence of a future life; a few remarks on the texts connected with this question will therefore not be out of place. When Ecclesiastes sees wickedness in the place of judgment, he consoles himself with the consideration: "I said in my heart, God shall judge the righteous and the wicked; for there is a time there for every purpose and for every work."² But why, then, does God allow this perversion of the moral order? "I said in my heart, it is because of the sons of men that God may prove them, and that they may see that for themselves" (*i.e.*, to procure their own earthly happiness) "they are but as beasts." And how does Qôhéleth prove this statement? "For the sons of men are subject to chance, and the beasts are subject to chance; even one destiny befalls them: as the one dies, so dies the other; yea, they have all one breath,

¹ E. g., Pss. xxxvi., xlvi., lxxii.

² iii. 17.

and" (in this respect) "man has no pre-eminence above the beasts."¹ This equality of condition is still further confirmed: "All go unto one place, all are of the dust, and all return to dust again."² And now an exception occurs to the mind of Qôhéleth: Is not the spirit of man immortal, and does not, therefore, man excel the beast in spite of all that has been said to the contrary? The writer rules this objection out of court; he is dealing now with the world of sense, subject to our experience, while the soul's immortality is above the domain of sense: "and who sees the spirit of man that goes upward, and the spirit of the beast that goes downward to the earth?"³ This hope of a future adjustment of all that appears to be wrong in the present course of the world is expressed repeatedly by the Preacher: "There is no man that has power over the spirit to retain the spirit, neither has he power over the day of death; and there is no discharge in that war; neither shall wickedness deliver him that is given to it."⁴ The slowness of God's judgment appeared, at times, very grievous to Ecclesiastes, but in this trial, too, he sought consolation at the same source: "Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil. Though a sinner do evil a hundred times, and prolongs his days, yet surely I know that it shall be well with them that fear God, which fear before him; but it shall not be well with the wicked, neither shall he prolong (his) days, (which are) as a shadow, because he fears not before God."⁵ If we turn to the end of the book, we find that the Preacher insists on the same doctrine: "but know thou," he tells the young man whom he had exhorted to cheerfulness, "that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment."⁶ Again, after a description of old age, the writer adds: "man goes to his long home, and the mourners go about the streets; and the silver cord is loosed, and the golden bowl is broken, and the pitcher is broken at the fountain, and the wheel broken at the cistern; and the dust returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit returns to God who gave it."⁷

There is a passage in the book to which unbelieving commentators often appeal in order to show that the Preacher did not admit any reward in the future life; a sensible paraphrase of the text gives it a quite different meaning: "To him that is joined with all the living there is hope," for whatever his present sufferings

¹ iii. 19.

² iii. 20.

³ iii. 21.

⁴ viii. 8.

⁵ viii. 11-13.

⁶ xi. 9.

⁷ xii. 5-8.

may be, the morrow may bring a change in his condition. The fate of the dead is fixed forever, and no more susceptible of improvement; hence the old proverb, "A living dog is better than a dead lion." "For the living know that they shall die," and have therefore an additional stimulus of action in this thought; "but the dead know not anything" of this kind, "neither have they any more reward" for the good they may accomplish. On earth "the memory of them is forgotten," so that their reward does not consist in earthly honors. "As well their love, as their hatred and their envy, is now perished," so that their present state is wholly different from their earthly condition, though the writer does not describe it according to its positive properties; hence he continues, in the same negative strain, "neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun."¹ Like other inspired writers of the Old Testament, Ecclesiastes only maintains that our future state of life shall not have the labors and enjoyments of the present; even the New Testament finds it more convenient to state that neither eye nor ear has perceived the delights of our condition after death than to describe the same positively.

To systematize, therefore, the doctrine of the Preacher on the problem of human happiness, we may reduce it to the following statements: 1. Man cannot be happy on earth by mere enjoyment of earthly goods, whether they pertain to his lower or his higher life, whether they be enjoyed singly or collectively. 2. Man's earthly happiness consists in the satisfaction and delight which God has coupled with the exercise of the human faculties as long as it harmonizes with the call of man's duty; hence the practical formula of this principal reads, "fear God, and keep his commandments." 3. When, owing to adverse circumstances, the performance of one's duty implies suffering rather than happiness, one is not therefore to abandon one's post, but rather rejoice in hope; "for God shall bring every work into judgment, with every hidden thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil."

Even with these leading ideas before us, the Book of Ecclesiastes presents many difficulties, springing either from the present state of its text, or the connection of its incidental proverbs and snatches of poetry with the general drift of the work. The former source of trouble has been amply illustrated throughout this paper; we subjoin here a poetic allegory as an illustration of the latter, following Bickell's theory of the Hebrew verse:

¹ ix. 4-6.

- “ Now come the days of evil,
And years of lack of pleasure,
When sun and moon are hidden,
New clouds end every rainfall.
- “ The house protectors tremble,
The men of strength grow feeble,
The window-light now darkens,
The street-doors have been bolted.
- “ The mill sounds, sparrows twitter,
The daughters of song fly low,
Afraid of airy regions,
Of terror by the wayside.
- “ The grinders lessen and cease,
The almond-tree shall blossom,
The grasshopper be burdened,
The caperberry shall fail.”¹

The foregoing lines are easily understood by the reader if he remembers that the whole passage refers to the infirmities of old age; the house protectors are the arms, the men of strength are the limbs, the window-light represents the eyes, the street-doors typify the ears, the mill is the mouth, the daughters of song are the lips, the grinders are the teeth, the blossom of the almond-tree is the grey hair, the burdened grasshopper is the stooped frame, the dissolution of the over-ripe caperberry symbolizes the general decrepitude of the human body.

If, then, the Book of Qôhéleth bristles with difficulties, where is the secret of its charm that has attracted so many readers? First, the work treats of a subject that is nearest and dearest to every heart; secondly, the treatise has been written by an author, however secondary may be the human authorship of an inspired book, who has lived the doctrine he teaches; he has experienced the alternate pendulum-like attraction and repulsion which the human heart feels with regard to the pleasures of sense; he knows the dry hollowness of human wisdom and science; he has tasted the intoxication and supreme annoyance of power; he has found out the anxiety and care involved in the possession of riches; he knows from experience that “all is vanity.” Not to develop our statement with regard to the writer’s second and third principle, we may draw the reader’s attention to another little trait of Qôhéleth in order to vindicate him against the charge of selfishness. We rather indicate the passages than quote them: “Two are better than one, because they have a good reward for their labor. . . .”²

¹ xii. 1-5.

² iv. 9 ff.

Again, life's happiness is not to be a single-blessedness: "Live joyfully with the wife whom thou lovest. . . ." ¹ Finally, even the family is not to keep the blessing of its earthly happiness to its own circle alone: "Cast thy bread upon the waters, for thou shalt find it after many days. Give a portion to seven, yea, even unto eight, for thou knowest not what evil shall be upon the earth." ²

A. J. MAAS, S.J.

WOODSTOCK COLLEGE, MD.

THE CONSECRATION OF CHURCHES; ITS ORIGIN, MEANING, AND RITE.

THE mission of the Church is amongst men, in all their variety of change, of personal influences, of national prejudices. Now it may be laid down as practically true that conversion comes by the will rather than by the intellect. The will has to be enlisted before even the strongest evidence of truth can work its natural influence on the mind. If the will and the sentiment be not disposed to hearken, criticism and dialectics will be invoked in vain. No man, unless perhaps some monomaniac among the stoics, has ever turned into a new course of life on the mere conclusion of a syllogism. We are not mere thinking-machines. Our sentiment has as much to do with the shaping of our lives as our thoughts. And why not? Is it not as much a part of the whole man as our reason? On the one hand reason reins it in, and on the other hand sentiment controls reason, inasmuch as it may leave it unclouded or may warp it by predisposing influences, just as we may by the influence of personal affection turn another aside from what might be a settled conviction if left to himself. It would seem that for such a purpose our Divine Lord left with his Church the discretion of accidental development. Certain elements he established, and these have remained untouched. He formed, for instance, its essential constitution; He instituted the Sacraments, with the matter and form of each; He made it the

¹ ix. 9.

² xi. I, 2.

depository of the fulness of revelation from the day of Pentecost. But when and under what circumstances it should lay the several truths of that revelation before the world with the seal of infallibility which He gave it; under what formulæ it should declare them to the faithful; what forms external worship should take; with what ceremonies it should invest the administration of the Sacraments; in short, the formation of its liturgy—these things the Church was to provide according to the needs of the faithful, their disposition, the temper of the times, the genius of a people. There is in the Church, therefore, an element that is unchangeable and an element that is variable, just as, in natural objects, there is the substantial form which remains and the accidental form which may come and go, the object itself preserving its identity throughout.

In the process of development through which the liturgy of the Church has come to us we have evidence of the prudence of its pastors, and can discern the finger of God. Many have been led into the Church not so much by direct proofs of its Divine origin as attracted by the beauty and harmony of its ceremonial. Nor must it be thought that theirs is not a reasonable submission. Why should there not be a religious instinct as well as a natural instinct? How many things do we not daily do for which we can offer no reason to another, and yet are convinced that we are right—a deeper conviction than is begotten of syllogisms? It is the logic of instinct, of common sense. Why do we love to dwell in the midst of one scenery more than another, sit before a masterpiece and turn away our eyes from a daub, but that our æsthetic sense tells us it should delight us more? If we should further inquire why the former should please us more, we at once pass into the region of reason and become prosaic. The spell is broken, the curious charm has departed, as when a child breaks up a music-box and finds within the evidence of a well-arranged and instructive mechanism, but learns to regret the unwise curiosity that has destroyed the music. God has given us a sense of the beautiful, and not without a purpose; it is to enable us to discern an ideal in the beauty of nature or art, and that ideal is the reflex of Him who is beauty itself. God has given us the faculty of reasoning from the things which we see to the things which we do not see; so He has given us also a mysterious faculty which takes us from nature to God by linking in our feelings the created and the uncreated beauty, without bidding us to go through the prosaic process of disputing every inch, of asking the reason why at every step we take.

It is only in a certain class of minds that the structure and composition of the liturgy and ceremonial of the Church have that attractive influence. They are those to whom nature has given a vivid imaginative faculty, and who have carefully improved it by a certain amount of liturgical knowledge. It is an accident of character which, though it is a privilege to have, it is no demerit to want. But those in whom this faculty has been improved by culture are often drawn into the fold of Christ by some unaccountable influence and at once, or become well-disposed to give it a fair trial before the tribunal of their judgment, by the persuasive beauty or the suggestive reality which they discern in the Catholic ceremonial. Protestantism has produced nothing like it. The best attempt of Protestantism to construct a liturgy is the Anglican prayer-book, and that is little more than a rude plagiarism of the Roman breviary. The accommodated sense of Holy Scripture, of its psalms and its parables, is woven into the ceremonial of the Sacraments and the sacramentals with an intuition of its spirit which brings out its meaning in the various phases of our spiritual life from the baptismal font to the graveyard. It is only a tradition drawn from the school of Christ himself when He was here, and preserved by the Holy Spirit when he had gone, that could so manifest the reality of His religion before men, and weave its supernatural character into the daily careers of human existence. No externs could do it. They may learn a good many things about it from the writings of the Fathers and from the letter of the Gospels as a school-boy learns grammar, but they can never take in the fulness of its spirit, can never feel it. Cardinal Wiseman in one of his essays—that one on “Religion in Italy,” we believe—observes that “Protestantism is the religion of one day in the week.” He was showing how the Italian peasantry bring the supernaturalizing leaven of religion into the duties of daily life. And did not St. Paul say, “Whether you eat or drink, or whatever else you do, do all for the glory of God”? Hence, from the beginning the Church has sanctified every person and thing by devoting them to God. In the Christian commonwealth which the Church formed out of the chaos made by barbarism, the kings and emperors were anointed, as the priests are ordained and the bishops are consecrated. We have still our ceremonies for our secular officials; it serves as an evidence of their installation, but has no reference to God. There is in the Catholic liturgy a form of blessing for our food, our crops, our ships, and our houses.

I have written all this before coming directly to my subject in

order that what I have to say may appear in the fulness of its meaning.

Our Divine Lord instituted a sacrament by which persons are consecrated to the service of God. A bishop is consecrated, a priest is ordained. Following the analogy of Holy Orders, the Church devotes an edifice to the worship of God by the ceremony of dedication. We shall see later on that there is a solemn and a simple dedication; the former is called consecration, the latter is called benediction. But let us, first of all, see the grounds on which the Church sets apart a building exclusively for Divine service by a special ceremony. It seems, indeed, just as natural to set apart or consecrate certain places as well as certain days to the worship of God; and that has been done under the law of nature, as in the written law and in the law of grace. No other law than the inspiration of natural appropriateness commanded Jacob when he "set up for a title the stone which he had laid under his head, pouring oil on the top of it and called it the house of God."¹ Solomon dedicated the temple.² It was dedicated again by Zorobabel after the Babylonian captivity. It was sacked and profaned by Antiochus Epiphanes (B.C. 170), and was restored and dedicated again fifteen years later by Judas Maccabæus.³ The pagans also had their temples dedicated to their gods. After the taking of Veii Camillus dedicated a temple to Juno—"ædes Junonis reginæ ab eodem dictatore dedicatur;"⁴ but the ruins of the Roman temples are evidence enough without quoting any more instances. Calvin, the Centuriators of Magdeburg, and others among the early fruits of the sixteenth century heresy, saw in this sanction of antiquity only Judaism and the paganism of Rome. But hardly anything could be more short-sighted or untrue. Our Divine Lord did not abolish all the religious rites of the Jews. He did not come to "abolish the law, but to perfect it." Of course the Church would stand convicted of Judaism if she revived any of those rites—such, for instance, as the ceremony of the Paschal lamb, which had reference to the Messiah, promised, but not yet come. But the dedication of temples to God's service was not of these; moreover, it did not belong to the ceremonial but to the moral law, and the moral law was retained for Christian observance. That the pagans also dedicated their temples shows that the practice came independently of any Divine positive law, that it had its origin in the law of nature. One is not

¹ Genesis, xxviii. 18 and 22.

³ I. Maccab. 4-36.

² Paraleipom., 7.

⁴ Livy, Lib., v. Chp. 31.

tainted with paganism precisely, because he happens to follow certain pagan practices. As there were in paganism some doctrines that were true, there were also some practices that were right. One should not refuse the light of the sun because it happens to shine on sinners. We should not reject one of God's good gifts because it should happen to be given also to those who disown its Author.

It has been objected, also, that an inanimate thing cannot be made sacred by men. But, in the old law, the tabernacle, the altars, the temple, were called sacred. St. Paul calls Christians "Saints," not by reason of their virtue precisely, but because they were consecrated to God. We call God "Holy" in a different sense from that in which we speak of the holy character of men and things. God is holiness itself; men and things are sacred, *i.e.*, segregated, inasmuch as they are destined for God's service. All that men can have is a participated holiness; all that things can have is a relative holiness. It is in the same sense that we call things good and true in reference, namely, to God, who is goodness and truth. Again, every place is sacred to God, because He has destined everything for Himself. Nevertheless, a special and solemn consecration of a place or thing exclusively for religious worship serves a useful and necessary purpose. It reminds men more sensibly of the presence of God; it inspires them with a keener consciousness of the "place where His glory dwelleth." It is quite true that God might be worshipped in one place as in another, for His Omnipresence pervades all. But in practical religious life we must forget the things that might be, to take account only of the things that are. God is everywhere, and can be worshipped anywhere. Our Divine Lord prayed wherever He went on His mission to men, but He prayed in the Temple also. He told the Pharisees that His "house is a house of prayer," and He rebuked them for making it "a den of thieves." That rebuke implied the consecration of the Temple to the exclusive purpose of prayer, and its sacredness from profane uses. Those, therefore, who would deny the meaning of a consecrated building which God Himself has sanctioned are so far led by an influence other than His Spirit. Those who refuse to go to worship God in a building dedicated for that purpose on the make-believe plea that He is to be worshipped neither in Jerusalem nor in Garizim, but that He is to be worshipped "in spirit and in truth," betray a disposition to worship Him neither in spirit nor in truth, nor in any other way.

We find traces of Christian buildings consecrated to Divine

worship back to the lifetime of the apostles. In this, however, we must distinguish between the solemnity and the reality. In apostolic times, and for two centuries after, the question between the Church and the Empire was not as to how she was to live, but whether she was to live at all. The faithful had to worship God in hidden places; nevertheless they had consecrated places of worship as formally distinct from private houses, although they were attached to or were sometimes part of them. St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians: "Have ye not houses to eat and drink in? or despise ye the church of God?"¹ He was upbraiding them for eating in churches, because they were sacred. Again, "God is not the dissension but of peace; as also I teach in all the churches of the saints. Let women keep silence in the churches."² "There is," says Philo, "in each place a house consecrated to prayer, in which the mysteries of an honest and chaste life are celebrated."³ But, whilst persecution raged actively they worshiped "in the fields, in solitude, in ships, in prison, in inns,"⁴ wrote Dionysius Alexandrinus. Dionysius the Areopagite, who lived in apostolic times, distinctly says that altars were anointed with oil and consecrated by a bishop.⁵

With the conversion of Constantine full freedom came to the Church. He gave Christians not only leave to live, but also leave to choose the manner of living. Henceforth they invested the dedication of churches, as well as other rites, with a solemnity of ceremonial which they did not dare to introduce before. The celebration lasted several days, several bishops were usually present, the Sacred Mysteries were celebrated with a new pomp, and discourses appropriate to the occasion were delivered. Eusebius has left a description of the consecration of a church in Jerusalem, in A.D. 335. It was built by Constantine, who summoned the bishops assembled at the Synod of Tyre to be present. In those early times churches were, as far as possible, consecrated on the occasion of a council or synod being held, in order to secure the assistance of a large number of bishops. In those early times, also, the dedication of a church was thought so necessary that it was not allowed to say Mass in it until it was dedicated. In the beginning of the sixth century, Felix IV. made a distinct prohibition to do so unless for very grave reasons. The enemies of St. Athanasius charged him with even holding an

¹ I. Cor., ii. 22.

² I. Cor., xiv. 33, 34.

³ Apud Eusebium *Hist. Eccl.*, lit II., cap. 16.

⁴ Apud Eusebium *Hist. Eccl.*, lit VII., cap. 22.

⁵ *De Eccl. Hierarchy*, cap. V.

assembly of the people in a church not dedicated. Hence, in those times, when dioceses were large, and many churches had to be built, bishops were busily engaged in consecrating them. Thus, St. Basil, on the occasion of the consecration of a church, for which the people had been waiting from midnight, apologizes to them for his delay; he had been consecrating another at a distance. After the profanation of the Church of St. Agatha, to which the Irish College in Rome is attached, by the Arian Goths, St. Gregory the Great restored and consecrated it, and preached a homily there on the occasion. In the collection of Canons compiled by Gratian several decrees are to be found which show the great importance which was attached to the dedication of churches by the early Christians, and the great solemnity with which the rite was invested. Constantine had several churches erected in Rome, and they were dedicated by Pope Sylvester.

We should naturally expect that before Constantine's conversion there was no solemn rite of dedication, or any written law on the matter. But no sooner was the church made free for its mission than a regular liturgy began to be formed, and amongst the earliest rites was that for the dedication of places for divine worship. Pope Sylvester issued a decree that churches were to be dedicated by a bishop, that the walls should be anointed with holy oil, or at least that the building should be blessed inside and outside with holy water. This is perhaps the most convenient place to explain the difference between benediction and the consecration of a church. Not many churches are consecrated, but every church must be blessed. The word "dedication" is a generic term—from *de* and *dicare*, to devote to. It implies the mere fact of devoting a church to Divine service, and prescinds from the ceremony by which the votive offering is made. Therefore, according as the ceremony is solemn or simple, there is a solemn or a simple dedication; the former is called consecration, the latter is called benediction or simple dedication. It appears that at first all churches were solemnly dedicated or consecrated; but as time went on the Christian religion grew apace, and churches were multiplied so fast that bishops could not meet all the demands on their time, if they had, besides their other duties, to travel great distances as fast as churches were erected throughout their dioceses, and go through the long ceremony of consecration. Hence a provisional form of dedication was introduced, which any priest might do with the permission of the bishop; that is, the simple dedication or benediction, which consists in reciting certain prayers and sprinkling the church inside and outside with holy water.

Since the benediction of a church is but a provisional dedication, no more account is taken of it once the church is consecrated.

But once a church is consecrated, the consecration remains as long as the church remains. In this there is an analogy between the consecration of a church and those sacraments which imprint a character and can be received only once. The Church consecrates persons by ordination, and it consecrates things by dedication. The reason why the sacraments of orders, baptism and confirmation leave a character is to be found in the purpose of their institution; for, as in all things else, it is their purpose determines their nature. Now, the purpose of these three sacraments, as distinguished from the others, implies deputation to do or to receive something.¹ The deputation involved in each of these sacraments involves the irrevocable destiny of the person who receives them. He may prove himself unworthy of his destiny and false to his mission, but the destiny remains nevertheless. Once a man is baptized he is bound by the law of a Christian for ever; when a man is confirmed he is a soldier of Christ for ever; when a man is ordained priest he becomes a priest for ever. As money is coined for currency, as officials of all kinds have some ensigns of their office to denote their rights and their duties, so does each of these sacraments truly imply a deputation for ever, leave on those who are deputed a character which endures for ever; and since it endures for ever, it would be vain to attempt to have it imprinted again. Those who receive these characters may become undutiful, but they are bound to their destiny withal; a son does not yield up his sonship by becoming a bad one. This sacramental character in the new law takes the place of circumcision in the old-law. The sacraments of the old law had of themselves no spiritual virtue, they effected nothing internal in the soul; the Jews received from them only a legal and external satisfaction. Their character, *i.e.*, circumcision, was consequently merely external and legal. But for an analogous reason the sacramental character of the new law is spiritual.² From what has been said it will be seen that the impression of a character is owing to a sacramental peculiarity which involves a deputation to something. Analogously churches, by being consecrated, are deputed also, that is, set apart for Divine service, and so receive the character appropriate to their purpose. The character

¹ Deputatio ad aliquid faciendum vel recipiendum. Summa Theol. St. Thom. Pars 3—quæst 63, Art. 6.

² St. Thomas (*Ibidem*) teaches that it belongs to that kind of *qualitas* called *potentia*, *i.e.*, potentia per quam homo ordinatur ad ea quæ sunt cultus Domini.

of consecration lasts as long as the building lasts, because churches are not consecrated for a time but for ever. On the other hand, because a simple dedication completes its purpose, and of its nature ends in consecration, its character cannot any longer remain; there would be no meaning in their retaining the mark longer, as there would be nothing for which to mark them out.

Since the consecration of churches is sanctioned by the law of nature and of grace, and was practised by those who lived in the midst of apostolic tradition, it must be at least a rite good and pleasing to God. It is, moreover, an act done by the Church of Christ, and the prayers of consecration are offered in its name. It is therefore but natural that it would have some special effect. I will state here a few of the spiritual advantages which accrue to a church from its consecration. Of course, an inanimate thing is incapable of receiving grace. Nevertheless, St. Thomas¹ says that by consecration a church acquires a certain spiritual virtue which makes it specially apt for Divine service. Persons entering it with the right dispositions are inspired with a certain devotion and are better disposed for Divine things, provided no irreverence prevent those effects. Temptations less attack one there, for it has been exorcised of the spirit of evil. One of the liturgical prayers of the Church is: "Visit, we beseech Thee, O Lord, this habitation, and drive away from it all the snares of the enemy." That spiritual virtue is not, of course, any quality left in the walls by the consecration. But the consecration of a church is one of the sacramentals, such as the blessing of water, the churching of women, or the wearing of scapulars. These produce spiritual effects according to the dispositions of the person, *ex opere operanti*, as it is called; and there is quite the same reason for believing that prayers offered in a consecrated church are, other conditions being the same, more efficacious than if offered elsewhere.² "For there is undoubtedly in that place a certain power of God. For He that hath His dwelling in the heavens is the visitor and protector of that place."³ Moreover, a consecrated building represents the Church, the Fold of Christ, and is therefore called that name. It would seem, therefore, that any prayers offered in a consecrated church, with the due dispositions and conditions, are offered as if

¹ Pars III. quæst 83, art. ad 3—"Ecclesia et alia osmodi inanimate consecratur, non quia sunt gratia susceptive, sed quia ex consecratione adipiscuntur quamdam spirituales virtutes per quam apta reduntur cultui divino, ut, scil. homines devotionem quamdam exinde percipiant ut sint porationer ad divina nisi hoc propter irrevientiam impediatur."

² Suarez—De Religione, lib III. cap. 7.

³ II. Maccab., chap. 3, vs. 38, 39.

in the name of all the faithful praying in common as the Mystical Body of Christ, and this whether they are offered by the whole congregation during Holy Mass or by any one of the faithful for private devotion. All the faithful make up the Christian family; any consecrated church is its home; and the prayers duly said in it at any time, or by any member, are the prayers of the Spouse of Christ. Hence, before the ceremony of consecration, a church is exorcised to cast out the power of the evil one. St. Thomas¹ gives it as the well-founded opinion of some that venial sins are remitted by entering a consecrated church under the same conditions as they are remitted by the sprinkling of holy water.

In early times a church could not be lawfully consecrated by anyone without faculties from the Pope. For many countries no such permission is necessary, and the bishop of the diocese in which the church is has alone the right of consecrating it. The vicar-general may not do it, even though he were a bishop; for although it is not an act of Episcopal orders, Canon Law has juridically made it so and restricted it to the bishop of the diocese; and it is so exclusively the right of the Ordinary that the Metropolitan may not do it, even though he were a cardinal. A cardinal has the exclusive right of consecrating his titular church in Rome; that was decided only in recent years by Leo XIII. in a question which arose in connection with the consecration of the Church of San Pietro in Vincoli; for it was doubted whether the Cardinal Titular or the Cardinal Vicar of Rome had the right. This law holds also for the churches of religious orders, except in certain circumstances which must occur so seldom that it would be needless to name them here. A bishop, either because he has not yet been consecrated or for any other reason he may deem fit, can delegate another bishop to consecrate in his stead. He cannot delegate a simple priest to consecrate, but he can delegate him for the simple dedication or benediction. The Pope alone can give a simple priest the faculties for consecration. Although the dedication of a church is not a sacrament, Canon Law has so ordered that, whilst solemn dedication is to be numbered amongst the acts of the Episcopal order, simple dedication belongs to the acts of Sacerdotal order. Hence any bishop can consecrate any church validly, although he would do it unlawfully outside his own diocese without permission; a simple priest consecrates invalidly without Papal faculties, and he blesses unlawfully without the permission of the bishop. A necessary condition for the law-

¹ St. Thomas (*Ibidem*)—"quidam *probabiliter* decunt, etc."

ful consecration of a church is the inalienability of the church to be consecrated. A church may be alienated and turned to profane uses, either because the ground on which it is built is not freehold, or because it is liable for debt the payment of which is guaranteed by a mortgage on the building or on the ground. Hence, before a bishop can lawfully consecrate a church, there must be perpetuity of tenure, and immunity from pecuniary burdens.

The rite of consecration consists substantially in anointing with chrism twelve crosses, either cut or painted on the walls within, pronouncing at each anointing the words: "Sanctificetur et consecretur hoc templum, in nomine Patrie, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, Amen." But there are other elements of the rite which, although not essential, have a symbolic meaning and are very interesting. The whole rite of consecration consists of the consecration of the exterior, the consecration of the interior, and the consecration of the altar, together with the placing of the sacred relics. The consecrating bishop blesses holy water in front of the church, then makes three circuits of the outside, sprinkling the walls each time at a different elevation. He then comes to the principal door, as on Palm Sunday, and demands entrance in the words of the Twenty-third Psalm: "Lift up your gates, ye princes, and be lifted up, Eternal gates, and the King of Glory will enter in." He is answered by the deacon from within in the following verse of the Psalm: "Who is this King of Glory?" and the answer comes from the outside: "The Lord who is strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle." This petition and response is repeated three times before the door is opened, and on entering he says: "Peace be to this house"; to which the deacon answers, "And on thy entrance into it." The choir then sings the words addressed by our Divine Lord to the repentant publican: "Zaccheus, make haste and come down, for to-day I must abide in thy house." All this is symbolic. The bishop represents our Divine Lord, the deacon the custodian of the building; the words spoken to Zaccheus are to denote the blessed effect of God's presence. Then the letters of the Greek and Latin alphabets are inscribed on the floor from corner to corner—which is done because the mysteries of faith which are to be taught there were preached in those two languages at the time the ceremony was arranged. The harmony of this will appear clearer when it is remembered that the bishop, on demanding entrance the third time, strikes the door with his pastoral staff to symbolize the effect which the Gospel preached in the name of Christ has upon the hearts of those who do not yet

believe. The church is then sprinkled with holy water and candles are lighted; it symbolizes Baptism, and the spiritual illumination which comes of it. Then the crosses on the wall are anointed with holy oil; it is symbolic of Confirmation, which perfects the gifts of baptism, or the Blessed Eucharist and Holy Mass through Holy Orders, which is symbolized also in the cross and the chrism. A mixture of water, ashes, salt and wine is used; the water is man cleansed from original sin, the ashes is mortification and penance, the salt and wine denote the savor and joy which are the fruit of penance. May we not see the sacrament of matrimony symbolized when it is consecrated and represents the spouse of Christ "without spot or wrinkle?" Thus, as the consecrated material building represents the Church of Christ, and is called by that name, so does the rite of its consecration symbolize the various channels of grace through which the spiritual church sanctifies the faithful.

I have said that Canon Law recognizès an analogy between the consecration of a church and those sacraments which imprint a character on the soul. The character of its consecration remains as long as the church remains. But as Canon Law has fixed this analogy, so has it determined its limits. A consecrated church ceases to exist from two causes; by *execration* or by *pollution*. A church is execrated by the destruction, or even by the abrasion, of the walls. The consecration is considered as adhering to the walls only, or rather to their outer crust; and consequently, though the roof should be destroyed, whilst the walls remain uninjured the consecration remains. Even though the walls are in part destroyed by accident, or for the purpose of repairing them, provided the greater part of them is not destroyed at any one time, the church is not execrated. A church is polluted by certain acts which, according to the Canons, render it unfit for Divine worship. As we are here dealing with a positive law, only those acts pollute a church which are expressly mentioned by the Canon Law. Moreover, as those Canons have had in view the religious sentiment of the faithful, the acts mentioned must be external and public. Such acts are, the burial of an unbaptized or an excommunicated person; voluntary homicide; bloodshed voluntarily caused, etc. In these cases the church must be reconciled by blessed water mixed with wine and ashes if the church had been consecrated, by blessed water alone if it had been simply dedicated. A simple priest may perform the rite of reconciliation in a church that had been simply dedicated; the bishop of the diocese alone can do it in the case of a church which had been consecrated.

Churches are dedicated to God alone ; because a church as such is a place for sacrifice, and a sacrifice is offered only to God.¹ But they are usually dedicated under the invocation of some Saint. St. Augustine says : " We do not build churches to our martyrs as to gods, but memorials as to men whose souls live with God."² In erecting such memorials to the saints we do honor to God, for we thus immortalize the names of those who were made holy by His grace ; their sanctity is His work. Only a perverted Christianity would let those vanish from the memory of men whose life and death are the best evidences of God's providence and power. In the Roman Catacombs the sacrifice of the Mass was offered up over the graves of the martyrs. When the Christians were free to build churches they, in some instances, as in the case of the Church of St. Agnes, built them around the martyr's grave, removing for that purpose other graves less notable. But generally they erected what was called a *cella memoriæ* over the cemetery where the remains of some remarkable martyr rested. These were called after the name of the saint in whose memory they were built. Their religious instinct led them to raise memorials to other martyrs for which there was no room over the cemeteries, and so churches were built in their honor in Rome itself. The custom thus obtained of dedicating churches wherever they were needed under the invocation of some saint. We cannot offer any historical authority for this, but from a study of the history of the Roman Catacombs we are convinced that our present custom of dedicating churches in honor of the Saints is the historical development of the custom which the early Christians had of offering up the Holy Sacrifice over the graves of the martyrs and of assembling around them for Divine worship.

M. O'RIORDAN, D.Ph., D.D., D.C.L.

¹ St. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, lib. 8, cap. ult.

² *De Civitate Dei*, lib. 22, cap. 19.

THE OPPORTUNITIES OF EDUCATED CATHOLIC WOMEN.

ONE of the most satisfactory phases of our Catholic educational system is that represented by our convent schools. Those who assist at the annual closing exercises of our female academies cannot fail to be struck by the solidity and progressiveness, and especially by the suitability of the education given therein to those who are preparing for the responsibilities and privileges of womanhood. The studies pursued in our representative convent schools reflect the brightest glories of the past, and satisfy the highest reasonable aspirations of the present in the matter of female education. Some of the more *masculine* studies, which reason and experience claim to be unsuited, if not positively injurious to the right development of the female faculties, are, it is true, absent; but all the studies which are best calculated to draw out and foster the special gifts of womanhood are very much in evidence. Modern languages, literature, and composition, music and other fine arts, history and elementary mathematics and science, needlework and domestic economy, are pursued to an extent and with a thoroughness that leaves nothing to be desired; and higher branches, such as Latin, philosophy and advanced science, are open to those who may need them, whether in some of the existing academies or in the college about to be established at Washington. And these studies are set in such innocence and winsome sweetness that the convent graduate shines forth as a model of twofold gracefulness, human and divine.

The most thoughtful non-Catholics recognize the incomparable worth of our convent-school education, and gladly avail themselves of it in ever-increasing numbers. They thus put in relief the folly of those Catholic parents who pass by the convent school to place their children in fashionable establishments at the sacrifice, very often, of true life and form and grace for the bare bones of knowledge bobbing up and down in the caldron of social excitement. Even the mere worldly wise, provided they possess true parental instinct, know that the safeguards and discipline, the purity and sacrifice that form the atmosphere of the schools conducted by nuns are the best environment to develop that activity and self-restraint, that gracefulness and reserve, which are the beau ideal, the charm of true womanhood.

Our convent schools are the especial joy and glory of the Church, and their marvelous success may be attributed in large measure to the deep interest taken in them by the chief pastor of every diocese, and by the general body of clergy and laity. This interest is founded on something deeper than the desire to see definite educational results. The Church, being the guardian of Christianity, is bound to regard herself in a particular manner as the guardian and champion of the rights and privileges of womanhood. All the prestige that woman has in modern civilization is due to Christianity, and to the Church's fidelity in preserving its tenets in this as in other respects. The darkest page in the history of ancient paganism is that which records the universal degradation of womanhood. This degradation was all the greater in proportion as material civilization was high, just as strongest lights cast darkest shadows. Whether we look to Greece in the age of Pericles, or to Rome in that of Cicero, we find woman enslaved and despised at the domestic hearth, and suffered to appear in public life only at the cost of morality and decency. Travellers tell us of a similar, yea, more appalling state of female degradation at the present day in China, notwithstanding its more than two thousand years of a civilization which is, from many points of view, brilliant. Indeed, wherever we look outside of Christianity we find the daughters of Eve suffering far more than her sons from the social disorders consequent on the Fall. And it is probable that their wretched condition would have gone on increasing in inverse ratio to the advance of material civilization, had not the great Restorer, "in the fulness of time," restored to womanhood its lost rights and privileges. The new Adam, the Incarnate Word of God, had created a new Eve, and deigned to make her a co-operatrix with Him in the sublime work of the Redemption. The rights and privileges of motherhood were restored, and the transcendental glories of virginity superadded in the person of Mary, the Virgin Mother of God :

" Virgine Madre, figlia del tuo Figlio,
Umile ed alta più che creatura,
Termine fisso d'eterno consiglio
Tu sé colei che l'umana natura
Nobilitasti, sì che 'l suo Fattore
Non disdegnò di farsi sua fattura."

Mary's mission as co-redemptrix of the human race restored woman in a supereminent degree to her original destiny, which was to be a "help unto man like to himself" (Gen., ii. 18). Around her gathered those holy women who shared in the bitter-

ness of the Passion and in the joys of the Resurrection. The Apostles and disciples were helped in their work by similar holy women to whom St. Paul so often refers ; and the perpetuation of the work of the Redemption through the Church has been helped in no slight degree in all ages and climes by the "pious and devout female sex."

The sacrament of matrimony restored the union of "bone of my bones, flesh of my flesh" which had obtained in the beginning ; and the Divine approbation of virginity by the Son of God secured to woman that freedom of choice, that sacred independence which finds its highest expression in the consecrated Spouse of Christ. It is to the eternal honor of the Church that she has preserved and safeguarded, fostered and defended, in a very marked manner the restored rights as well as the superadded privileges of womanhood. She has braved the wrath of sensual tyrants, she has sacrificed kingdoms in defence of the marriage bond. "What God has united let no man put asunder," has been with the Church as unalterable a policy, as immutable as in the mind of its author—God. And from the inviolability of the marriage-bond have come to woman all those honors and privileges of hearth and home and society which paganism and unbelief would deny her in the most brutal manner. Nor has the Church less respected and enforced the sacred rights of single life, whether in the world or in the cloister. The latter, especially, she has hedged round with those wise safeguards of canonical legislation which have enabled the lamp of virginity to burn brightly and securely through the darkest ages.

And on the solid foundations of restored rights and privileges and attendant duties the Church has ever striven to further the growth and development of woman's faculties to the very highest and broadest extent consonant with right reason. She can point to St. Catherine, who taught Philosophy in the schools of Alexandria; to Hypatia, the teacher of Clement; to St. Paula, the friend and counsellor and inspirer of St. Jerome; to Teresia, the colaborer of St. Paulinus; to St. Radegunda of Poitiers, the Queen of Christian poetry; to St. Gertrude, who translated the Scriptures into Greek and sent over the sea for Irish masters to teach music, poetry and Greek to her nuns at Nivelles; to the learned Hilda, who was consulted by bishops in synod; to St. Catherine of Bologna, the celebrated miniature painter and musician; and to countless others, all through the centuries, whom she encouraged to cultivate their intellectual gifts to an extent that should satisfy the loftiest aim of the most advanced advocates of the higher education of women.

In recent times, more especially, women have been called upon by Divine Providence to take a part in the general work of the Church which recalls their wonderful achievements in the early days of Christianity. When the fell blast of infidel revolution laid low or withered nearly all that was good in Christian France, numbers of her daughters were raised up by God to found and organize those works of charity and education—those modern congregations of women—which have been such a fruitful agency for good in the present century. In France itself they have bound the wounds made by godlessness, and have instilled a spirit of wondrous activity; and their influence has spread abroad through every corner of the globe. Wherever Catholic missionary zeal finds a field—in the most far-off countries, and in the deadliest climates—are to be found those noble communities of women, such as the Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny, who are helpers in spreading the gospel like unto the holy women of early times.

And not only France, but all other European countries have witnessed this upspringing of female devotedness and activity—Ireland, in particular, on emerging from the dark night of penal laws, in the beginning of this century, found her Nano Nagles and Mother Macaulays ready commissioned by God to restore more than the pristine splendor of Kildare's ancient cell. And, like all good, this new heroism of womankind has spread abroad, and found fruitful fields of operation in the young Church of this country, and of the various colonies. It may, indeed, be said that the best female activities of all countries and nationalities have centered here in the United States. There is no one phase of good work, whether within the Church or without, at all comparable to our conventual establishments. There they stand in every city, and in almost every town of the land—convent schools, academies, orphanages, hospitals, houses of refuge—rivalling in structure and appointments, and acknowledged by the world to surpass in fruitfulness of results, the richly endowed state or other institution. There they stand, monuments to what can be done by the *vergine* and *madre*, the virgin's mind and the mother's heart, for developing the faculties of her own sex, and for uplifting bruised humanity.

It is under such influences that American Catholic women are being educated, whether in the parochial schools or in the academies. No better schools could be conceived for drawing out and strengthening the faculties of womanhood. For purely intellectual purposes they are not surpassed. It is no exaggeration to say that the best educated women in America are to be found within con-

vent walls; and their pupils are welcome to all the opportunities for intellectual culture that their teachers enjoyed, or that modern progress has brought into requisition. And, as to formation of true womanly character, where could modesty and strength, patience and zeal, sympathy and devotedness, piety and patriotism be cultivated better than in those gardens enclosed by the evangelical counsels of perfection, and watered by the tears of love strong as death.

And if the opportunities of receiving the very best education are for our Catholic girls thus excellent and widespread, the opportunities for putting it to good account are none the less so. There has probably never been in the world's history such a goodly field for woman's highest efforts as that presented by the interests of the Church in America. Here, as in few other countries, the true woman is universally respected, and every avenue of usefulness thrown open to her. Here is a new country and a younger branch of the olden Church requiring, as all youth and newness require, activity and sacrifice for their development. In such conditions woman finds her most congenial and most brilliant sphere of operations. All that the mother is to the child woman can be in a new order of things, whether in Church or State. The Church in the United States, filled though it is by the vigor of Divine life and organization, has still much development in matters partly external and temporal, but which make for an increase of its influence as well as for the happiness of its members. Of these we may mention what may be called the intellectual and the social needs of the Church in the United States. Woman, in the person of our nuns, is already doing heroic work to satisfy intellectual wants for both sexes in our primary schools, and for her own sex in the academies. She is doing in these two cases for the Church under the inspiration of the highest motives what is being done for the State under the influence of well-earned salary. And the same high inspiration leads her to so perfect her work of sacrifice that it will not fear competition with the salaried work outside. But there is a wide field of intellectual work open more particularly to the mothers of families or to single women living in the world. Take, for instance, the taste for good literature and for things intellectual. It has to be acknowledged that our Catholic literature is, as yet, very poor, and that what we have of it is very little encouraged. It is somewhat in the condition of a vicious circle. Catholics are slow to write for publication because there is but a very restricted reading public, and the reading public is small because the supply of reading is so

meagre. In this matter woman can do incalculable good. As regards writing, there are some branches of literature that almost belong to her by right, and others wherein she can excel. All the books that appertain to the literary instruction of the young naturally belong to her, just as their education is best confided to her care. Histories and stories and biographies well and interestingly written would find a large market among Catholic school children, and establish a taste for literature of a higher kind. This special literary work can be successfully handled only by woman. Nor need she confine herself to it. There are other and wider fields where Catholic women have excelled. The work done by many of them for the various magazines is of the very highest order, and there is no reason why the number of such writers should not be increased. In this way a taste for Catholic literature will be developed. Catholic women who write books or articles will do more for spreading a taste for good literature than any other agency. The book that mamma loves will interest the child, and the article written by a lady friend is sure to be popular. It is to be desired that more and more of the pupils of our academies would thus utilize the training they have received. Who can calculate the good done by the works of the late Mrs. Craven, or of Lady Fullerton, or of Kathleen O'Meara? Yet none of them had a better field for such work than what an American Catholic authoress has. It is regrettable to think that so much literary power lies dormant with American Catholic women in the midst of such pressing calls for its exercise.

But it is in the line of social-work, more especially, that there is in this country a wide and fertile field for the educated Catholic woman's best gift. There is no closing our eyes to the fact that our people are, as a whole, low down in the scale of social acquirements and influence. This state of things can be partly explained by the fact that most of our English-speaking Catholics landed here bereft of their ancient civilization, with the marks of penal manacles upon them, having nothing to recommend them to society except their brains and high morality. And here many roads to wealth and prominence are forbidden to them by faith and conscience. But no one can deny the eminent capacity of our people for the highest social rank. See those children approaching the Holy Communion table for the first time, or see them ranked in file for confirmation or for reception into some religious sodality; or see those young ladies at the academy commencement, or those young men at that of the college. Surely in all these cases one sees the ideal material for social life—that beautiful combination of natural and supernatural gifts which even

the outside world must admire. The very richness of those social gifts forms a particular danger and temptation for the educated Catholic young lady. If she yields to vanity and selfishness, she will use her gifts to kick off the ladder whereby she has ascended, turn her back on her own, and grasp at the higher social eminence beyond. Many such a one is found who spurns the low estate of her home surroundings, rejects the somewhat rough but generous companions of her childhood for the refined foppery of the young man of fashion, who has learnt to bow and flatter and make obeisance until such time as his passions lead him to pastures new. The existence of such cases is to many minds an argument against what is called the "over-education" of Catholic girls; but, assuredly, those cases are the result not of the use but of the abuse of education. All true education, and notably that received in our convent schools, should develop humbleness of mind, sympathy with suffering, the ambition to work for the uplifting of others. It would be disastrous, especially in this country, to educate Catholic girls to be, or to consider themselves, "grand ladies." Grand ladies do no good. They live for themselves and their vanities. They spend in vulgar adornment what would feed the hungry and clothe the naked. They waste in gossip the precious time that could be devoted to good works. They restlessly aim at rivalling other grandees, instead of working to alleviate the lot and improve the social status of the brethren of the household of the faith. What we want, and what we have, thank God! in such numbers, are the educated women who feel that their first duty is to their own; the women who will strive to attract the less educated young men from the saloons and the street corners; the women who will invite their poorer and rougher acquaintances to their entertainments, and thus encourage them to a higher social life; the women who will contribute not merely money, but their time and labor, to charitable and social works; who will not be ashamed to meet for Catholic objects any Catholic woman of generous impulse and unblemished character. We want women who will be the salt and light of that particular world to which they primarily belong—the world of their kith and kin, the world illumined and enlivened by the Divine Spirit. We want women whose highest ambition will be to share with Mary in co-operating in the Redemption—women whose motto will be that expressed by a pious writer in the words,

"I live for the heavens above me
And the good that I can do."

JOHN T. MURPHY, C.S. SP.

ENGLAND'S SECOND GREAT COMMONER,
GLADSTONE.

IT is by the dropping out of such lives as that of Mr. Gladstone that we are enabled to apply the aqua-fortis to the spurious philosophy of socialism, the creed of universal equality. An empire may lose an army and a fleet, and other armies and fleets, and still survive. But the loss of one man such as the late great tenant of Hawarden outweighs that of armies. Minds like his are moral leverages such as Archimedes never dreamed of. They do not often appear, and while we have them with us we perhaps do not appreciate them as they deserve.

The broken shaft above a tomb, so often seen as a symbol of the uncompleted life, is strikingly typical of the unfulfilled mission of the deceased statesman. To very few men of the illustrious plane is it given by Providence to behold their lifelong purpose in a great cause realized to the full. Washington, for whom Gladstone felt and expressed the profoundest admiration, stands unique, if we regard the proportion of things, in this respect. Yet there was some parallelism in the aims and characters of the two men, though an immense disparity in their times and opportunities. They were both singularly unselfish, and there was the manly shrinking from tinsel reward and servile adulation which marks the true republican about each. But the parallelism ceases there. Washington was a patriot; Gladstone was a statesman and—a politician.

Not the faintest trace of "the pride that apes humility" was visible in the characters of either of these great men. It was their natural instinct to recoil from adventitious honors. We may find a contrast for their behavior under the temptation of titular adornments in the case of the late poet-laureate. A good many years ago a distant relative of Tennyson's bequeathed to him a fortune, on the condition that he add the devisor's name, by means of a hyphen, to his own. The poet rejected the money and kept his name. But when royalty came and proffered a tinsel title in the same breath as brought nobility to the big brewers of Burton and Dublin, he had not the loftiness to withstand the allurements. Not so with the fine old Commoner now gone to his rest. He for long had the giving away of titles, but he never sought any for

himself, and when it was proffered it was respectfully declined. An earldom or a dukedom could bring him nothing that he valued. In a monarchical country like Great Britain such a mental attitude was not easily intelligible, though to an American it may appear rational, on a retrospect of the temptations and decisions of the country's fathers when the hour of liberty brought the hour of election between royalty and democracy.

Mr. Gladstone was never a favorite at Windsor, for he scarcely ever appeared there save as the ambassador of the democracy, bearing a sort of ultimatum in the shape of a bill red-hot from the anvil of fiery debate, intended for the relief of the people from some intolerable injustice, or giving them a larger share in the government of the nation. It is believed, however, that the Prince of Wales did not share the aversion in which his royal parents held the great statesman; neither did the gracious lady, his wife, since one of the last messages received by Mrs. Gladstone prior to her husband's death came from her. It was significant. It simply said, "I am praying for him." These few words speak volumes of the character of the princess and the hold which the distinguished sufferer had obtained over her heart and mind.

The history of Mr. Gladstone's ministerial career is the history of modern progress in England. Before his day the whole science of statesmanship consisted in the arts of curtailment, denial, and repression of rights which Magna Charta and the Declaration of Rights purported but failed to secure. Even the Reform Act of 1834, won only after a conflict that went very near being a revolution, had achieved very little for the enfranchisement of the masses. Labor was held in a state of worse than Egyptian bondage. Laws of terrible severity, enacted by a capitalist Parliament, and enforced by employer magistrates, prevented the working-man from protecting the fruits of his industry by association with his fellows. Corruption was rampant in the electoral system; the working-man and the schoolmaster were almost wholly unacquainted. The misery and oppression of the working-classes often found expression in murderous outrages and pauperizing strikes. It would be difficult to find a darker or more melancholy picture than that presented in the political and industrial condition of England at the time Mr. Gladstone took office under Sir Robert Peel. Yet before he died he had the happiness of seeing every one of the evils which then existed swept away, mainly through the efforts of the Liberal party and mostly at his own initiation. By the operation of the Local Government Act the people of England are made supreme in everything relating to their insular interests.

The complement of this measure is the Agricultural Rating Act, by means of which the long-standing inequality between urban and rural taxpayers was adjusted. These measures, the control of the School Board, and the change from the system of open voting to that of secret ballot, make the English people masters of their own destinies as truly as the people of the United States. They now enjoy all the advantages of a democracy, without any of its glaring and flagitious drawbacks such as we find them here under the "machine" and "boss" system. And it is true to say that in every step which led up to this enviable state of things Mr. Gladstone was the guiding spirit.

Looking back at the long public career of this great statesman, and the many grievous abuses which he was instrumental in removing, it is impossible to escape the conviction that his individual personality represented a force as powerful as any modern revolution. How wild and delusive, then, the fundamental idea of the levelling socialist, the perfect equality of mankind! Men of this kind are not mere accidents. They are chosen instruments, and it is vain to speculate by what mysterious process of arrangement they are borne to the surface of events.

Mr. Gladstone differed from most other English Prime Ministers in the forces which he represented. He was the incarnation of the *thought* of the country and the age; the rest, for the most part, were the expression of its force or its finesse. Furthermore, he represented the *conscience* of the people—a long dormant, perhaps unexpected quantity.

Religious tendencies had not been conspicuous characteristics of English Ministers down to Mr. Gladstone's time. With the exception of Lord Derby, the men who filled the *rôle* of Prime Minister in modern times were mere worldlings, when they were not downright bigots. Peel and Russell belonged to the latter category; Palmerston to the former. But the serious and devout tendency of Mr. Gladstone's mind manifested itself even at the outset of his political career. Like all those who are truly devout, he was tolerant and just to those from whom he differed. His search for the truth in religion began at an early age. He was so strongly drawn toward Rome, even before the Oxford movement began, that many entertained the hope, even to the end, that he might die in the faith of Rome. That he was sincere and earnest in his quest of truth there can be no doubt. But his mind was of a peculiarly subtle, and we might say casuistical, fibre, so that many who followed his arguments at times found no little difficulty in grasping his meaning or perceiving the applica-

bility of his arguments. Logicians so profound may impose even upon themselves. We have seen, in the case of Mr. Balfour, that when men engaged in political life enter the region of metaphysics their worldly insight ceases to be of any practical service to them, and they fail to discern where the true and the false bifurcate.

Although Mr. Gladstone does not appear to have been troubled, like Mr. Balfour, with any serious doubts regarding the fundamentals at least of religion, he must have failed, in the last analysis, to grasp the vital principle of the singleness of authority and the depository of Divine grace, or become too mentally clouded in his final hours to wrestle with the problem. The failure appears to have arisen from his political environment and an inveterate habit of mind. Peculiar interest attaches to this aspect of Mr. Gladstone's life because of his early interest in Catholicism, his long friendship with Newman, his generous opposition to the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, and his subsequent repeal of that discreditable enactment. His later conflict with the Vatican disclosed a weakness in his character which could hardly have been suspected by any one who had followed his previous course in political polemics. But we must, in extenuation, recall the fact that he was smarting under the sense of defeat at the hands of those Irish members for whose country he had thought he had done so much that in gratitude they might forego even a little principle. He had not as yet learned to know them, or realize how much depended on that principle for whose sake they risked the loss of so powerful a friend. There is nothing for which the Irish hierarchy and clergy have so steadfastly contended as for the religious principle in education, and the measure which he and Mr. Forster were endeavoring to get through Parliament as a settlement of the Irish claim for higher education was such as could by no possibility be accepted. The Irish party opposed it, and as a result the Ministry were defeated. Stung by this blow, the man who disestablished the Protestant Church and gave the Irish a Land Act felt that he must express his sense of ingratitude, and so he sat down and wrote an article on Papal Infallibility for the "Contemporary Review," to be followed by his pamphlets on "Vaticanism."

This episode turned out to be so memorable in its sequel that it merits more than passing reference. For Mr. Gladstone's sake it is to be regretted that he yielded to his irritation; for the sake of the truth of the Catholic position the incident may be regarded as almost providential. The pamphlets provoked a rejoinder from

Cardinal Newman so crushing and complete that Mr. Gladstone had no spirit left to continue the contest on the ground originally taken up; in fact he retreated, saying that the main purpose of his writing had been attained in demonstrating that the loyalty of Roman Catholics had been untainted and unshaken by the promulgation of the new dogma. Nothing could have been more serviceable or timely than this memorable discussion. It served to clear away a mass of uncertainty, even among Catholics, as to the exact scope and significance of the dogma, and to place the relations of Church and State in all places of mixed denominations in their true light. But it was not without its ill effects, for the time at least, upon the fortunes of the faithful. In "Vaticanism" Mr. Gladstone had stated that Catholics could not be loyal to the State if they acted consistently with their religious teachings, and it was upon this hint that Prince Bismarck and Dr. Falck began the long and intolerable persecution of the Kulturkampf. The new laws were enforced with merciless rigor for many years, yet the German Catholics remained loyal to the State, thus furnishing a living proof of the falseness of the proposition; and the most signal evidence of the power of truth and innocence over false logic and spiteful action based on it is found in the fact that the German Government at length recognized the futility and the folly of such a code, and raised no difficulty when it was proposed to efface it from the statute-book.

The literature as well as the legislation arising from this pamphleteering episode marks a distinct chapter in the advancement of true principles and constitutional freedom. Issues had often previously been raised as between Church and State, but they were chiefly matters of jurisdiction and prerogative. Here the point was intellectual and constitutional. Hence the literature to which it gave birth to was unique and precious.

Valuable as the previous works of Cardinal Newman had been from a spiritual standpoint, the reply to "Vaticanism," as a theologico-constitutional summing-up, remains simply priceless. It was a treatise not merely for the day which called it forth, but for all days and all countries of civilized rule. Gladstone's learning was reckoned vast; when it became a question of constitutional and ecclesiastical interpretation, he showed beside the great profound Newman merely as a sciolist. It is impossible to read the mercilessly dignified and icily cutting rebuke of this wonderful argument without perceiving the immense superiority which the disputant who preserves his temper possesses over the antagonist laboring under the sub-fever of momentary passion. Mr. Glad-

stone's pamphlet on the first blush appeared to be a formidable indictment. Its dissection by the master-hand now provoked to the task proved it to be a piece of ill-fitting, disjointed and irrelevant logic. Every weapon found in the arsenal was made to recoil upon the rash hand that drew it forth. Those portions of it, in especial, which deal with the limitations of Papal Infallibility and the area of individual freedom of thought among Catholics have been of inestimable value in the resuscitation of Catholicism in England. They do not meet with unqualified approval, it is true; but what merely human dictum ever did? But they disposed, once and forever, of Mr. Gladstone's preposterous position that Catholics loyal to the head of their Church were merely bond-slaves as regards thought and will in all matters pertaining to doctrine and civil allegiance. It was not the mere logic of verbal statement or definition which Mr. Gladstone had to face if he dared to reply; it was the argument of what was actually going on as a result of the Infallibility dogma. Catholics had been treated by him as robbed of their freedom of opinion; while on every side the press was gleefully pointing to the contradictory arguments and opinions used by Catholics regarding the nature of the dogma and the policy of its formulation. The limitation of this right of private judgment must, *prima facie*, be no less imperative than the limitation of the Infallibility dogma itself, in view of the fact that, beside the Church, everywhere we have the organization of civil society, with its laws and magistrates, obedience to whom is no less necessary to the general welfare than obedience to the spiritual law. The Swiss bishops had summed up the position thus succinctly:

“It in no way depends upon the caprice of the Pope, or upon his good pleasure, to make such and such a doctrine the object of a dogmatic definition. He is tied up and limited to the Divine revelation, and to the truths which that revelation contains. He is tied up and limited by the Creeds already in existence, and by the preceding definitions of the Church. He is tied up and limited by the Divine law and by the constitution of the Church. Lastly, he is tied up and limited by that doctrine, divinely revealed, which affirms that alongside religious society there is civil society, that alongside the ecclesiastical hierarchy there is the power of temporal magistrates, invested in their own domain with a full sovereignty, and to whom we owe obedience in conscience, and respect in all things morally permitted and belonging to the domain of civil society.”

Cardinal Manning also replied to the extravagant pamphlet; so

did the Bishop of Clifton, the learned Dean Neville, and several other theologians of distinction. Perhaps of all these the arguments of Cardinal Manning were most effectual in compelling the author's retreat or sullen silence. It was a solemn warning of the consequences which his discordant trumpet-blast was likely to entail. "He has not only invited, but instigated, Catholics to rise against the Divine authority of the Catholic Church. He has endeavored to create divisions among them. If Mr. Gladstone does not believe the authority of the Catholic Church to be Divine, he knows they do.

"If he thinks such a rising to be 'moral and mental freedom,' he knows that they believe it to be what his own litany calls 'schism, heresy, and deadly sin.' If he believes religious separations to be lawful, he knows that they believe them to be violations of the Divine law. I am compelled, therefore, to say that this is at least an act of signal rashness."

No one who is honest and unprejudiced can look back at this painful rencontre and give an unqualified endorsement to Mr. McCarthy's recent summing up of Gladstone's impelling motives in his political action—"Nothing ignoble or selfish, or merely conventional." Petulance and unreasoning anger and attribution of false motives to others are ignoble and decidedly conventional—the ear-marks of ordinary weak mortality. The charge that the Irish members who opposed his education policy were slaves of Rome was unworthy of him; the expectation that the Irish bishops would have sacrificed that principle of a religious training for which they had held out for many a decade, under every stress of temptation and poverty, was discreditable to his judgment as well as to his idea of the obligations of conscience and duty. We must only make allowance for the excitement of political passion, and treat the incident as an aberration to be looked back upon with regret by any truly great mind. We believe Mr. Gladstone did most earnestly regret it, as in every subsequent dealing of his with Irish questions he carefully avoided any reopening of this delicate business, and left to Mr. John Morley and his successors in the Irish Office the delicate duty of dealing with the claims of the Irish hierarchy in the matter of education.

In strong contrast to Mr. Gladstone's attitude in this transaction was his course at a much earlier period over the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill. There was a breadth of view and a foresight in his utterances that raised him high above all others who took part in those memorable debates. The bill, he said, if it effected anything, would only check the tendency of English Catholics to

develop national sympathies and increase their absolute dependence on Rome. It could not, at the same time, check Catholic influence or organization, as its provisions did not interfere with the holding of synods or the introduction of canon law. It would be simply an inoperative display of a persecuting spirit, exercised in response to an act of the Pope which had a purely spiritual purpose and should be exempt from spiritual animadversion. The little miniature of a penal law, as he described Lord John's measure, would only throw back the Roman Catholics of England and prevent their improvement. He appealed passionately to the spirit of religious liberty and the steady march of the recognition of the rights of conscience, of which England boasted of being the most conspicuous defender, as influences to defeat the illiberal proposal. It is interesting to note that on this occasion, and this occasion only, Mr. Gladstone ventured to play the prophet, and still more interesting to find that his prophecy was fulfilled. He confidently predicted that in a few years the pendulum of public support would swing back to the side of the small minority for whom he spoke. The presage was received with a burst of derisive cheering. But it was literally fulfilled, and the prophet himself became the Prime Minister. He proposed, twenty years afterwards, the repeal of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, and so absolutely inoperative had been the measure, and so metamorphosed the public sentiment, thanks to the winning and high-minded ways of Cardinal Wiseman and Cardinal Newman, that hardly a murmur of dissent was heard in reply.

Insularity is the parent of bigotry, and fortunately Mr. Gladstone's private position was such as to prevent any danger from this evil. His father had been a wealthy merchant, and when his son chose political life instead of the ministry his means enabled him to procure for him all the advantages which education and travel could confer. In the year 1838 he visited Rome. He bore an introduction to Dr. Wiseman from a mutual friend named Rio, an artist and dilettant of singular genius. His reasons for wishing an introduction to Dr. Wiseman were given in his own words by the writer :

"I am most earnestly anxious," wrote Mr. Gladstone to M. Rio, "to become acquainted with the practice of the Roman Catholic Church, with its moral and spiritual results upon its members. It is of the utmost importance to the adjustment and development of my own convictions regarding the doctrine of the visibility of the Church, and the necessity of that doctrine to counterbalance the tendency to indefinite subdivision and ultimate infidelity which springs from the notion of a limitless private judgment."

Here it is permissible to pause and indulge in a little speculation. Had Mr. Gladstone not been a politician and a constitutional statesman, his untrammelled mind might have led him into the same grooves of inquiry and reason as drew his most valued friends into the bosom of the Church. But there was the rub. He found himself compelled by law and by association and conventionality to give a loyal support to the Anglican Establishment. He never could have been Prime Minister, very probably, and so never have effected the overthrow of that monstrous anomaly, the Irish Establishment, or effected all the other good he did, had he followed the warmer dictates of his spiritual leanings toward their logical end. As it was, he tried to satisfy them by accepting the compromises of Ritualism and imitating the non-gravitating attitude of his close friend, Dr. Pusey.

The failure to grasp the cardinal principles of Catholicism, nevertheless, seems extraordinary in the case of a thinker who set out with such a laudable motive as the desire to investigate the doctrine of the visibility of the Church, and the power of that doctrine to counteract the tendency to subdivide and break away. That he had a keen appreciation of the value of authority we have proof in the almost pathetic letter he addressed to Pope Leo XIII. imploring him not to give any decision on the Anglican Orders controversy which might have a disturbing effect upon the cause of union. That letter in itself was an admission of the authority which in theory he repudiated, but found it impossible to deny. Here we behold a state of mind which to anyone but a statesman must seem hopelessly inexplicable and self-contradictory. We cannot wonder at the Nonconformists being amazed and indignant at some of the passages in his memorable letter to the "Times." Nothing is plainer than the position of Nonconformists. Authority for them has no meaning in a spiritual and canonical sense. They represent the principle of revolt *ad infinitum*. If Mr. Gladstone's reasoning was right, as a Welsh Baptist, the Rev. Walter Wynn, pointed out in a letter of remonstrance to him—one out of hundreds—then the basis upon which Nonconformist Church policy was based was unscriptural and insecure. This directness of vision to Mr. Gladstone seemed obliquity. He could not comprehend the mental process, he said, in reply, by which his reasoning had been alarming to anyone. The common Christianity of separated bodies of Christians was strengthened the more each was able to acknowledge the soundness of truths or usages held by any. He desired the unity of different denominations of Christians on such bases as they mutually possessed, as a thing of

great consequence in the face of non-Christians. Mr. Wynn had asked him why, if he were not desirous of seeing all Christendom again brought under the sway of the Pope, he had discussed his opinion on the subject of Anglican Orders at all ; and Mr. Gladstone's reply was simple and frank : " I honor the Pope in the matter, as it is my duty to honor every man who acts as best he can with the spirit of courage, truth and love." This reply may have silenced the Baptist minister, but it may be questioned whether it satisfied him. Those who consult oracles often go home wondering.

If the " Nonconformist conscience " could never comprehend the mind of Mr. Gladstone, it must be because of its Celtic fibre. Nonconformists are plain folk ; Mr. Gladstone was a Scot *pur sang*, although born in England. Celtic temperament discerns many shades and hidden strata of thought imperceptible to the ordinary vision ; and this peculiar quality is strikingly displayed in the dialectic subtleties of the mediæval schoolmen, among whom the Celtic element formed so dominant a proportion. Mr. Gladstone's mind was in many essential respects the scholastic one. Yet, although it was Celtic in its quality, it seemed to be deficient of the Celtic playfulness and the Celtic poetry or imaginativeness. Perhaps this was because of the bent imparted to it by political life. A certain grave dignity pervaded even his lighter flights of oratory and literature, and an appreciable amount of austerity differentiated his manner and mode of expression from that of the higher types of Celtic scholarship. But he had, more than any English statesman of our era, the true Celtic enthusiasm in a great cause. Once his sympathies and his genius were enlisted for some high moral or social end, his ardor and passion were magnificent, and they exerted that mesmeric force of contagion which is the peculiarity of great leaders of men, in the field or in the senate-hall. Whatever his inconsistencies and aberrations about Catholic principles, on one point Mr. Gladstone stood so valiantly for the same idea that the Church has maintained that his effort can never be forgotten. This was the question of divorce. No man in civil life ever stood up so manfully as he for the maintenance of the marriage contract in all its pristine Scriptural integrity.

The battle which Mr. Gladstone waged for morality in this great question was no mere perfunctory piece of advocacy. It was a subject which enlisted all the finest instincts of his character. Hence, when he threw himself into the breach he came armed at all points, spiritually and intellectually. To lawyers, learned in the law, like the attorney-general, Bethell (afterward Lord

Westbury), who had charge of the bill for Lord Palmerston's government, he proved himself an astonishing antagonist. They might quote old statutes; he could quote more. His erudition, whether in canon law, statute law, or international law, was immense—not alone upon this point, but indeed upon every subject that ever came up for public discussion. His memory was quite equal to Macaulay's; he could readily, and without refreshing, quote whole chapters of Scripture or the poets, and even the text of particular statutes. Nor did he suffer in his own original effort from this familiarity with other authorities by making their ideas the grooves for his own thought, as many lively-remembered speakers are often inclined to do. The originality of his style, both as to arrangement of argument and felicitous adaptation of phraseology, maintained itself down to the end of his life's chapter. Those addresses he delivered in the House of Commons against the Divorce Bill made everybody listen. They were a revelation at the time—the first arguments founded upon the moral law and Scriptural authority which the House had listened to, perhaps, since the days of Wilberforce. Nor did Mr. Gladstone restrict himself to the walls of Parliament in the endeavor to arouse the public conscience against what he believed to be an iniquitous proposal. He wrote against its principle in the pages of the "Quarterly Review" and in some of the leading daily papers. With no avail, however. The bill became law, but the law was always bitterly condemned by Mr. Gladstone. It is curious to find his biographer, Mr. Justin McCarthy, endeavoring to palliate the iniquity of such legislation by saying that divorce existed in England before that period, and throwing doubt upon the expediency of such lofty religious standards as Mr. Gladstone fought for in such a cynical worldly assemblage as the English House of Commons. Too much, it is to be feared, is sacrificed to the "historical temperament," in this and some other passages, by that distinguished author.

It is permissible to surmise that had Mr. Gladstone been left to himself his generosity would have led him to deal more equitably with the educational claims of the Irish Catholics than he ever attempted. It should not be forgotten that, forceful though his personality was, he was surrounded by lieutenants hardly less so, and he was bound to consult these in all propositions of legislation in which what were recognized as Liberal principles were involved. Three of these lieutenants in especial were formidable foes to all denominational claims, and were, moreover, men of vast influence in the Liberal sphere. In Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr.

Fawcett, and Mr. John Morley he had men who were looked up to as authorities on educational systems, and who were more or less imbued with the secularistic theories of John Stuart Mill. Mr. Forster was Chief Secretary for Ireland, and Mr. Fawcett Postmaster-General, under the administration which was responsible for the Irish University Bill. Mr. Morley was Secretary later on. The utmost either of these would ever agree to, in satisfaction of Catholic claims, was the elimination of the religious character from the University system and throwing it open to all. The bill drawn up by the Liberal Cabinet proposed to transform the University of Dublin into a non-denominational institution, and to make it the teaching as well as the examining body for all Ireland. The theological difficulty was proposed to be met by allowing Trinity College, the Queen's Colleges, and the Magee Presbyterian College to include that course in their curriculum, but there was no power in the proposed central University, under its charter, to examine in this essential department of university learning. It is hardly to be wondered at that the scheme failed to secure public support. It did not meet with the approbation of those whose just claims it was brought forward to satisfy, while the Protestants were as emphatic as the Catholics in denunciation of a design which struck at the foundation of their exclusive University and attempted to nullify a former royal charter. To the Catholics a University without a faculty of theology would be as "Hamlet" minus the title-character of the play. But the ridiculous feature of the proposal did not stop here. Theology has, as necessary adjuncts, to call in moral philosophy and modern history, and so it was also contemplated in this unfortunate University Bill to withdraw the teaching and examining in these subjects from the powers of the University. Looking back at the incident now, and bearing in mind the passionate attachment of Mr. Gladstone himself for theological studies and polemics, it is almost painfully surprising how he ever could have persuaded himself, or allowed himself to be persuaded by his colleagues, into the belief that the proposals contained in this measure could ever find acceptance in Ireland as a settlement of the University difficulty. It was little wonder that it elicited the sarcastic description, from Mr. Disraeli, of a University that was "not universal" in its teaching. But the truth is that the age was saturated with John Stuart Mill. He was the grand authority on all subjects, as Mr. Herbert Spencer sets up to be now, and his cold and deadening influence hung over the mind of Liberal England more deadly than the Puritan pall of an earlier period. But John Stuart Mill's philosophy was

never acceptable to the Celtic mind. No inspiration was needed by the Irish members on the course they should adopt with regard to this inept University Bill, and it was preposterous for Mr. Gladstone to attack them, as he subsequently did, as slaves of the Irish bishops and the Vatican because they recognized the folly and inefficiency of the scheme. This is the episode in Mr. Gladstone's life which has most interest for Catholic readers, and Mr. McCarthy, in his otherwise satisfactory biographical sketch, mitigates its disagreeable features by passing over it lightly and apologetically. There is little sense in this course. Mr. Gladstone was a great man, but he had his human weaknesses, of which wounded vanity and vexation of spirit at times formed no inconsiderable part.

It is difficult to say whether, this incident apart, we ought to admire the departed statesman more for his great achievements as a political reformer or an indefatigable and accomplished scholar. Truly no other man since Bacon's day united the character of student and statesman so effectively. But Gladstone towered above Bacon immeasurably, both in opportunity for realization of political aims and in integrity of personal character. There is not much parallelism any way; and, indeed, in looking around for parallels, the field is almost bare. Mr. Gladstone was at once the Achilles and the Ulysses of the Liberal party, and he was wonderful in the length of time for which he held that unique supremacy in the workshop of public debate and the making of thought into living fact. In philosophical wisdom he bore no comparison to Burke; he excelled him in adapting such wisdom to the practical opportunities of the time. He was inferior to Burke in magnanimity, but he did not fall below him in generous philanthropy or ardent indignation against widespread and powerful wrongdoing. He was fortunate in the political enemies he had to encounter. The meretricious and showy Disraeli was his chief foe-man and rival in ministerial power for many years of his life, and the shallow nature of his legislative policy and his "plunging" foreign statesmanship formed so conspicuous a foil to Gladstone's progressive tendency at home and conservatism abroad that one might think there is a dramatic mind presiding over the development of natural life and the making of history, so sharp are the personal and the *zeitgeist* contrasts. Mr. Gladstone was a reformer from conviction of the need and justice of reform; Mr. Disraeli was a reformer—once in his life—from policy. His memorable feat of "dishing the Whigs" by the introduction of the Reform Act of 1867 stamped him as a sort of political Grimaldi. By

means of an alliance between the Tory forces he led and the "Adullamite" Liberals, led by Mr. Robert Lowe, he succeeded in defeating the Franchise Reform Bill of the Liberal party; and when Earl Russell and Mr. Gladstone, who had framed it, were driven from office, he introduced a measure which eventually proved more sweeping in its political changes, and in order to pass it he accepted the alliance of the Radical wing of the Liberal party to compensate for the loss of the Conservative wing by whose help he had defeated the Liberal Administration. The cynical indifference to principle exhibited in this episode proved that Disraeli's animating motives were much the same as those of a captain of *condottieri*; while the changes noticeable in Mr. Gladstone's political views no less palpably point to the results of the natural evolution of thought and the study of the needs and grievances of the people. To find such a man taunting Mr. Gladstone with inconsistency in politics shows that he regarded political life somewhat as a *nisi prius* advocate does the law—a thing to be gambled for as in a game of skill. The period of thirty-six years had elapsed since Mr. Gladstone, under all the influences of conservative Oxford, had spoken and voted against the Reform Bill in the debating society there, and he was then little more than a boy. His public life during that period had been educative and formative. He acted with the Conservatives for a good many years, but the glacier forces of Liberal conviction had been silently operating on the sharp scales of this ancient prejudice toward a new political configuration. As he himself explained, he had been "bred under the shadow of the great name of Canning and the yet more venerable name of Burke, and his youthful imagination was impressed in the same way as the mature imagination of the right honorable gentleman (Disraeli) was then impressed"; and so he had conceived that fear and alarm of the first Reform Bill as the Tory leader felt. But there was this further difference between their cases, which could not be perceptible then, but was destined to be plainly manifested ere many months had supervened—that the aversion which Mr. Gladstone confessed was real, while that of his rival was merely pretended.

But although Mr. Gladstone commenced his political life as a professed Conservative, there was from the very outset the germ and strain of the reformer. In his address to the electors of Newark—the pocket-borough for whose representation he was selected by the Duke of Newcastle—he pronounced against the proposed Reform Bill—that of 1832—and against that desire for change which threatened to produce, "along with partial good, a melan-

choly preponderance of evil." This was a singular departure for a Tory politician to take, for none had been found until then to admit that any good whatever was to be expected from the proposed change in the political adjustment. But Mr. Gladstone went further still. He dwelt with much emphasis on the condition of the poor and the proper reward of labor. He also pronounced in favor of the education of slaves and their preparation for gradual emancipation—for slavery was an institution in the British colonies when he began his Parliamentary career. The time was auspicious for his entry. The Reform Bill had been carried, and the men who had led the agitation for it were the leading Parliamentary orators of the day—Earl Grey, Lord Brougham, Daniel O'Connell, and several other masterful minds. With Daniel O'Connell Mr. Gladstone was particularly impressed. It could not but be that the maxims of progress and freedom which he heard in those days from the Liberal benches touched some latent or incipient chords of sympathy in his heart, though no notes came from them just then.

Sir Robert Peel was one of those who had a large part in shaping the character of Mr. Gladstone, and, like Mr. Gladstone, he was one of those who had their early political convictions entirely changed, by a gradual process, from the logic of events and the force of personal contact with men and the world. Peel's economical policy, which finally found expression in the passage of the Corn Laws Repeal Bill, was the result of an exhaustive inquiry into the conditions of the commercial and industrial system of Great Britain and her colonies, and was at first a narrowly conservative one. From the future champion of free trade Mr. Gladstone accepted the post of President of the Board of Trade—a post which carries Cabinet rank—and it was here that he first showed that a man who never took kindly to mathematics in his college days might become the most skilful master of vast and intricate financial problems. It is a singular fact that no English Chancellor of the Exchequer ever approached Mr. Gladstone in the art of unfolding the voluminous outlines and minutiae of a budget, or ever invested a statement dependent in a great measure on statistical recital with the attractions of a deep philosophical thesis, as he invariably did. His first revelation of this peculiar talent was made in 1843, and it is a coincidence that suggests the hidden affinities of moral forces that he should have retired soon after from the office because of certain questions which arose in connection with the Maynooth grant, and which he thought might affect his relation toward the Established Church. Who could

have dreamed at the time that before many years had passed the same man would have been engaged in the task of legally terminating the life of the Established Church in Ireland, part and parcel of the one to which he was so steadfastly attached—and abolishing at the same time the connection between the Government and the College of Maynooth? It was a curious augury.

The scrupulous quality of Mr. Gladstone's mind was strikingly displayed in the way in which he ceased to be President of the Board of Trade. Sir Robert Peel's ideas of conciliating Ireland ran in the direction of increasing the grant to Maynooth, setting up a system of unsectarian "Queen's" Colleges, and establishing a police force sufficient to overawe the country. To one item in this programme—the increase in the Maynooth grant—Mr. Gladstone objected. The reason he gave was that he did not sufficiently understand the question to speak in favor of the proposal, though he might be able to commend it when he had had leisure to examine it. Hence, although he was strongly urged by friends like Archdeacon Manning, who had not yet seceded, to remain in the Cabinet because of the great service he might be to the English Church, he felt conscientiously bound to leave. The fact that he afterwards spoke and voted, as a private member of Parliament, in favor of the increase in the Maynooth grant proves no paradox; it only shows that in private life he had been enabled to give that attention to the subject that in his official capacity was beyond his power. In this incident we have the most valuable clue to Mr. Gladstone's character and the mystery of his influence over his friends and supporters. Even in England, where public office is certainly regarded as a public trust, and political reputation is no figment with the majority of high political officials, the resignation was regarded as somewhat Quixotic on the part of a young and rising politician. But when the motive was thoroughly understood, and Mr. Gladstone's general character placed in the scales along with it, the theory of eccentricity or erratic knight-errantry quickly kicked the beam. His great intellectual and oratorical powers, combined with a charming gift of conversation in private life, had made him hosts of friends; the fascination he was thus enabled to exercise was vastly intensified when it was seen how delicate was his conception of public honor.

The clue thus afforded enables us to explain satisfactorily how it came to pass that in the course of years Mr. Gladstone's political leanings and convictions underwent a change not the less completely antithetical for the fact of being slow and gradual. Given a man with a profound sense of justice, a scrupulous nicety in

personal dealings, and a susceptible ardent nature, sympathizing with all subjected to preventible suffering, and it will be impossible for him long to give his support to those social and political theories upon which the Tory and aristocratic system of Great Britain rests. The miseries of the mass of humanity will be brought home to him in a million ways ; his sense of justice will revolt at the political inequalities which prevent the toiling millions from improving their social and intellectual position by the machinery of the constitutional law. Especially will he be touched by the spectacle of the sufferings of the female and infantine portion of the population, whose dependent condition makes them the innocent victims of the hardships which an oppressive social and political system entails upon the sterner and more responsible section of mankind. These things stir no emotions in the average Tory partisan. If Tories do ever attempt any ameliorative legislation in their regard, it is because they are impelled thereto by the pressure of their political opponents.

Mr. Gladstone's conversion might not have been so long delayed had he carried out the intention which he had at one time formed with regard to Ireland. He wrote to a close friend of his so far back as the year 1845 on the subject of making a short tour of the island. His foresight on the subject was very remarkable. "Ireland is likely to find this country and Parliament so much work for years to come," he wrote, "that I feel rather oppressively an obligation to try and see with my own eyes instead of using those of other people, according to the limited measure of my means eschewing all grandeur and taking little account even of scenery, compared with the purpose of looking from close quarters at the institutions for religion and education of the country and at the character of the people." It is greatly to be deplored that he never carried out this excellent idea. Had he done so, the Irish famine might have been averted and the abortive rebellion of 1848 been unattempted. Sir Robert Peel went over instead, indulged in his famous "jaunting-car" tour of six days, and then hastened back to gestate his police force plan after consultation with the permanent officials of Dublin Castle. Mr. Gladstone only saw Ireland—and then only for a few days in the retirement of Lord Meath's Kilruddery seat,—thirty years later. There is nothing more astonishing than the neglect of English statesmen in this regard. They coolly undertake to settle the most tremendous legislative difficulty of modern times without attempting to inform themselves of the real wants and wishes of the people who only are affected by the legislation

they propose. When we consider that the island is only three hours' sail from the shores of England, this neglect appears simply astounding. Before the advent of Mr. Morley, the only prominent Englishman of our age who had visited Ireland for the purpose of gaining a practical knowledge of its people and their condition was Mr. Bright, and what he learned in his tour was turned to good account in the many sympathetic speeches he afterwards delivered on the subject. This melancholy fact is the more to be deplored and marveled at when we consider the immense injury inflicted on Ireland by the writings of a different class of tourists—cynics like Carlyle and Thackeray who hated the people for their misery no less than their religion, and who spoke of them as "human swine" and slaves who ought to be scourged for their gross superstition in going on pilgrimages to Croaghpatrick and Lough Derg. With the intensity of such devotion Mr. Gladstone might not, perhaps, quite sympathize, but he certainly would have respected the spirit which prompted it and would have been the last man in the world to sneer at it.

This writing has no biographical scope or intent, but merely aims at leading inquiry and study in the direction of the motives and sources of inspiration of a great master-mind whose influence made itself felt on the great affairs of our time in a way almost unexampled. The secret of this far-reaching influence is to be sought for in the deep conscientious enthusiasm of Mr. Gladstone's character. This was not a feature that only came with the later period of life, as in so many other cases, where the zeal of maturity endeavors to atone for the indifference or mere worldly expediency of motive or conduct of early days. We find Mr. Gladstone taking the same attitude several times over great international issues. He differed from most Englishmen of note at the period of the Crimean War, when the question of making peace with Russia was mooted. His view of the morality of war was put forward with singular boldness and lucidity. Russia had intimated her willingness to give Turkey the power of opening and closing the Dardanelles, and this, in the view of Mr. Gladstone, was a reasonable offer of settlement. "If we now fought merely for military success," he said, "it would appear immoral, inhuman, and un-Christian. If the war were continued in order to obtain military glory we should tempt the justice of Him in whose hands was the fate of armies to launch upon us His wrath." When Mr. Gladstone used these words he had resigned his position in Lord Aberdeen's Government,—that of Chancellor of the Exchequer,—as he could not agree with its policy. A similar conscien-

tious reason was assigned by him, many years later, with regard to the Boer war. He shrank from persevering with it, he said, through fear of "incurring blood-guiltiness"—an admission that the policy of his Tory predecessors with regard to the Transvaal was one of unjustifiable aggression. Yet he was not always consistent in this regard, as we may perceive from his stern repression of the revolt of Arabi Pasha—a revolt that had the strongest possible grounds of moral justification. The oppression under which the Egyptian fellaheen groaned was a thousand times more galling and intolerable than that of the subjects of King "Bomba," which in earlier years had called forth his memorable letters and orations on the state of Naples. But we must not conclude, because there was seeming inconsistency at times in Mr. Gladstone's dealing with great international problems, that he was not animated by motives which satisfied himself in all. He was not a man of expediency, as he very frequently proved during his long public career, but an exception to the great majority of men placed at the summit of political power.

Those who sit in judgment on such men, because of their failure to sweep away great abuses in the social or political system seem to overlook the fact that no reformer can effect anything until he has the support of public sentiment, and can count upon that of his party as well. Thus, one of the reasons alleged by Mr. Gladstone for his assault on the Established Church in Ireland has been frequently quoted against him as a negative proof that justice did not always prompt his policy. "It was the intensity of Fenianism," Mr. Gladstone had explained, that first opened his eyes to the injustice of the system. Something dramatic was, undoubtedly, needed, in order to awaken public opinion and elicit support in the policy which the Premier had resolved on as a step toward the pacification of Ireland; hence Mr. Gladstone's argument to the fears as well as the justice of the English constituencies. But there can be little doubt, from what we know of his previous study of Irish affairs, that he waited but for the proper "psychological moment" to give expression to his ideas of the inequity of the whole Irish system, executive, judicial, ecclesiastical and civil. We know from his published letters that he had long felt misgivings about the position of the so-called Irish Church. His attitude subsequently on the Land question proved him to be animated by the genuine spirit of justice and sympathy for the victims of oppression. The phrase "thick as snow-flakes," by which he described the showers of eviction-notices scattered by the grasping landlords, gave historical force to a philippic prompted by genuine

feeling and abhorrence of harsh dealing by the landed aristocracy. These memorable passages of legislative reform may well be studied by the philosopher and psychologist. As long as human action and the human heart are the proper study of mankind, so long must the subtle and complex character of Mr. Gladstone's reasoning, as applied to great human problems, form one of the most interesting of inquiries.

As a literary man, Mr. Gladstone has left a reputation hardly commensurate with his great promise and his undoubted ambition in that direction. With all his vast range of reading and personal observation he was not possessed of that charm of style which ought to be the result of his rare opportunities of training and uninterrupted reading. And yet it was not from any want of appreciation of style in others that he does not show any great desire to cultivate it himself. We gather this from many of his writings and speeches, notably from that portion of "Gleanings of Past Years" which compares Macaulay and Carlyle. The fact that he had been a literary opponent of Macaulay's over the work "Church and State" did not make him either less of an admirer of the showy historian or an apologist of his defects.

Homer, Dante and Milton appear to have been the poets who most swayed Mr. Gladstone's feelings, yet in very late life he became so enamored of Horace as to give us a very passable rendering of the Odes. The closing years of his life, freed from the sublime worry of statecraft, exhibit a rare example of that ideal Elysium of the patriarch contemplated by that pleasant singer himself :

Frui paratis et valido mihi,
Latoë, dones et, precor, integra
Cum mente, nec turpem senectam
Degere, nec cithara carentem.

He turned in his later hours from the study and interpretation of the profane poets to lyrics more in accordance with the solemnity of a valediction. Newman's Cecilian hymn, "Praise to the Holiest," was of great solace to him, and we have the statement of one who was near the death-bed scene that a poem of the erudite Jesuit, Father Matthew Russell, was the very last piece read to him on earth. This fact seems so remarkable that we are justified in quoting the piece. It is one of those which have appeared in the "Irish Monthly" over the same signature, and is entitled "My Last Rondeau." The lines are these :

My dying hour, how near art thou?
Or near or far my head I bow,

Before God's ordinance supreme ;
 But, ah ! how priceless then will seem
 Each moment rashly squandered now !

Teach me, for Thou canst teach me, how
 These fleeting instants to endow
 With words that may the past redeem,
 My dying hour !

My barque that late with buoyant prow,
 The sunny waves did gaily plough,
 Now, through the sunset's fading gleam,
 Drifts dimly shoreward in a dream.
 I feel the land breeze on my brow,
 My dying hour !

Though this great soul failed to realize the final truth before he passed away, it is comforting to know that he touched the hem of Christ's Spouse's garment, so to speak, by accepting the solace derived from those thoughts of two of her most distinguished children, before the seal of numbness came upon lips and will. The prayers of many of Ireland's Catholic people, responsive to the request of the Archbishop of Dublin, begged for the grace of a penultimate revelation of the true way. Who knows but it may have been vouchsafed, though the mind was powerless to signify the desire of the soul ?

The study of this greatest of England's Premiers' life must soon absorb the attention of many minds. It presents so many sides, that not to the politician nor the scholar nor the economist alone will it be interesting. Gladstone was history in action dealing with the profoundest problems, international, social, and psychical. He was not all at once a Nestor or a Ulysses ; he had his share of the weaknesses from which even high statesmen are not exempt. But he dealt with public affairs in a spirit of honor and rectitude, and so conferred upon statesmanship a dignity in which it has not seldom, unhappily, been lacking. We await the fuller biography of him with the expectation that it may enable us to form a more intelligent idea of his inner motives and theories of just government than the works yet written enable us to do. Mr. McCarthy's "Life" is agreeable and graphically written, but it is naturally defective, because synoptical. We must have the correspondence of the deceased statesman,—or as much of the vast mass, at least, as will serve to illuminate his greater achievements—before we can grasp the lesson of that rare life and weigh it in the scales of impartial appraisement.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

SIR JOHN T. GILBERT.

MANY more brilliant men have died during the century, few more really useful to letters and history, than Sir John Thomas Gilbert, who recently passed away, at a sudden call, in Dublin. It is difficult, in this age of show and meretriciousness in the field of literature, to appraise the merits of such a worker as he. For him accuracy was everything. In the search of historical truth he never spared an effort, no matter how laborious. Were it necessary to verify a statement of importance, arising in the course of any large work upon which he was presently engaged, he would travel to the libraries of Copenhagen, or Upsala, or Cologne, to verify it by means of MSS. which he knew to be there. And in the exact placing of historical MSS. there was no scholar better versed. It was only necessary to mention the name of any authoritative historical work to him in order to learn where one should go to look for it.

There was more, perhaps, of the archæologist than the historian about this painstaking scholar. If what is styled "the historical temperament" signifies the steadfast resolution to get to the bottom of the truth in all great questions of public import, no man was more highly endowed than he. But if what is understood be the faculty of Macaulay, the power to present great and seemingly commonplace occurrences in glowing and impressive word-pastels, no writer was ever more inadequately equipped. His style was entirely destitute of the Celtic adornment; it was terseness and simplicity crystallized. And the most singular feature in connection with the fact was that the style was by no means the man in this case. The deceased gentleman was a Celt every inch—a man of wit and playful fancy, simple-hearted as a child, and fond of innocent, child-like gaiety. And it is perfectly true to say that no man ever loved learning for learning's sake more devotedly than he. He sacrificed his private means, his time, his health, in pursuit of the truth of history, and in especial in so far as it related to the sufferings of the Catholic Church and the Catholic people in Ireland; for no sincerer or less ostentatious upholder of the faith of St. Patrick ever breathed than this gifted

scholar. Love of religion and love of country were his great characteristics. The name and fame of Ireland were as dear to him as to the most passionate patriot. It is well-known that these proclivities of his were an immense obstacle in the way of his worldly success.

It was only very recently that the priceless labors of this eminent scholar found any recognition in those quarters whose approval is essential to real success in all monarchical countries. The Queen's jubilee at last brought the title which the historian's labors had long before richly merited. He was sixty-eight years old when the honor came, and had earned the thanks and gratitude of the whole English-speaking world of letters for his masterly contributions to exact history. Sir John Gilbert's principal published works are: "History of the City of Dublin," 3 vols., 8vo., 1854-59; "History of the Viceroys of Ireland, 1172-1509," 1865; "Historical and Municipal Documents of Ireland, A.D. 1172-1320," 8vo., 1870; "National Manuscripts of Ireland," 5 vols., large folio; "History of Affairs in Ireland, 1641-52," 6 parts, 1879-81; "History of the Irish Confederation and the War in Ireland, 1641-43," 2 vols., 1882; various Treatises on History and the Literature of Great Britain and Ireland, published by the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, London, 1870-83; "The Chartulary of the Cistercian Abbey of St. Mary, near Dublin," 1883; "the Chartulary of Dunbrody Abbey," 1884; "Register of the Abbey of St. Thomas, Dublin," 1889; "Calendar of Ancient Records of Dublin," 1890; and "Documents Relating to Ireland, 1795-1804," 1893.

To the general reader the "Street History of Dublin" is the most interesting of all this series. It is a work almost unique. Not only are the various streets of the Irish metropolis treated of, but the individual houses of the streets, the famous personages who lived in them, the vicissitudes of each locality, and the famous events of which, in the course of centuries, they were the theatre. Without any pretence of style, we venture to declare this remarkable civic chronicle to be as entertaining a piece of literature as ever was compiled. For this work he was awarded the Cunningham gold medal of the Royal Irish Academy in 1862. A work of a vastly different character was his republication of the ancient MSS. of the Dublin Corporation. These precious documents, which are contained in the muniment room of the Town Council, embrace many charters—the original one of Henry the Second, another of Elizabeth's, one of James the Second's, and another of William the Third's. They are immense sheets of parchment,


and all splendidly illuminated. The text of the earlier ones is in Norman-French and mediæval Latin ; that of the latter in obsolete English. Mr. Gilbert's great forte was as a decipherer of these almost esoteric scripts. He was versed in every form of abbreviation and every forgotten grammatical term of mediæval days, and his renderings of those obsolete charters have proved of much substantial value to the Dublin municipality as well as of high interest to scholars and historians.

It may be added that Sir John Gilbert's "History of the Irish Confederation" has proved of immense service in the clearing up of the monstrous fables of the Cromwellian chroniclers. The facts as to the pretended massacre are carefully inquired into, and the documentary evidence adduced dispels all doubts about the real character of that formidable political movement.

On the publication of all these works, we believe we are correct in asserting, as we have had his own assurance as to the principal ones, Sir John Gilbert was a heavy pecuniary loser. But he never got discouraged, so great was his zeal for the prosecution of the truth and the interests of the Church and people whom he so ardently loved. Besides this depressing circumstance, he sustained heavy losses by reason of the failure of the Munster Bank a few years ago, and for a time grave fears for his health were entertained by his friends on that account. Up to that period of his life he had been leading a bachelor's life, but it was at the time that his fortunes appeared to be darkest that one of those strange things happened which serve to remind us of the silver lining of life's clouds. It was announced that he had married the gifted Irish authoress, Miss Rosa Mulholland—a fact at which every one who knew him rejoiced. It is consoling to think that the later years of the patient scholar's life were lighted by such sympathetic companionship, and the thousands who have been captured by the charming novelist's work will prize her all the more highly while they respectfully sympathize with her in her sudden bereavement.

Sir John Gilbert held the post of Librarian of the Royal Irish Academy (an honorary office) almost continuously from the year 1861 until his death. He was born in Dublin, where his father was Consul for Portugal, in 1829. He was educated at Dublin and in England. In 1867 he was appointed Secretary of the Public Record Office of Ireland, an office which he continued to hold until its abolition in 1875. He edited "Fac-similes of National Manuscripts of Ireland," by command of the Queen. He was a Governor of the National Gallery of Ireland, a Trustee, on behalf of the Crown, of the National Library of Ireland, Inspector of

MSS. in Ireland for the Royal Commission on Historical MSS., Librarian and Member of the Council of the Royal Irish Academy, Dublin; Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London, Trustee of the National Library of Ireland, Hon. Professor of Archæology in the Royal Academy of Arts, Dublin; editor of a series of publications entitled, "Historic Literature of Ireland," and also editor in the collection of "Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland." He received the Gold Medal of the Royal Irish Academy, and was thanked by the Corporation of Dublin for his antiquarian labors. He gave an impetus to Celtic studies by effecting the publication of some of the most important manuscripts in the Irish language, now lying on the shelves of the Royal Irish Academy, and forming a collection probably unequalled of its kind. This is a fact which ought to have more recognition among Celtic scholars than it has hitherto been accorded. But indeed he was a man who sought very little of the world's recognition in anything to which he bent his unselfish mind. He sought for higher things than this world can give, and we sincerely pray that he has now found them.



Scientific Chronicle.

BISHOP BAGSHAWE AND THE EVOLUTIONISTS' CYCLES.

Bishop Bagshawe is one of the most formidable foes of the Darwinian hypothesis of creation, and he states his views with the directness and logical force of a steam-hammer. Not long ago he took up the familiar assumption of the descent of the horse, put forward by Mr. Edmonstone, an enthusiastic Darwinite, and dealt with the heads of his argument thus categorically: "Organs in a rudimentary condition plainly show that an early progenitor had the organ in a fully-developed condition," says Darwin. "Pray, why must the Creator have evolved one out of the other, instead of immediately creating both forms? That He should have created a vast number of species on one general plan, with innumerable and beautiful variations, is much more likely than that He should have evolved one out of another. 1. Because there is no evidence of any evolution having taken place in historical times. The animals on ancient monuments in all respects resemble modern ones. 2. Because experience proves that cross-breeds do not continue to be fertile, and that, therefore, no new species can be evolved. 3. Because the varieties and improvements which the care of man can make in some half-dozen species of domestic animals come to an end and revert to a common type so soon as man's care, with its root-crop feeding, etc., is withdrawn. 4. Because the evolution of species by natural selection and sexual selection only is evidently an impossible result. The chances are millions to one that no new species, nor even variety, could be evolved by fortuitous accidental variations. If varieties produced by exact and careful breeding cannot be perpetuated without the same care, how much less could they be produced without it?"

Darwin's weakest point is his avoidance of the difficulty of the origin of life. Nor does Huxley or Tyndall or Herbert Spencer or Romanes throw any light worth a moment's thought on that profound mystery. But what is more disappointing still, they are unable to explain the most familiar and every-day phenomena in the mental world—the method of operation of the human intellect and the human will—matter that may be studied, one might say, with as much ease and facility as the phenomena of the physical world. The theories of the evolutionists are chiefly daring inferences; Bishop Bagshawe demonstrates clearly that their method of argument is two-edged, and can be as easily utilized for the demolition of the theory as for its construction.

Regarding Father Cortie's recent lecture on "The Age of the Sun," Bishop Bagshawe thus answers some of the Darwinian critics:

“Father Cortie, the Jesuit astronomer of Stonyhurst, did not use the argument attributed to him, viz., that the fact that the speculations of astronomers were considerably at variance was a sufficient reason for rejecting the hypotheses of biologists. His argument was that Darwinism is inconsistent with the received doctrines of astronomy. Darwin reckons at least two hundred millions of years as necessary for his supposed evolution. Astronomy tells that the light and heat of the sun have not existed much more than a tenth part of that period. Darwin does not pretend that there is even the least existing proof of his supposition. The received theory of astronomy is that the expenditure of the sun’s heat is supplied by its contraction, and reckoning from the amount of heat thus supplied and expended, assigns to it a past duration of twenty million years, and a future duration of five millions, when, according to Newcomb, the sun will be reduced to one-half his present volume. Darwin’s improved and ridiculous imaginations should yield to the calculations of astronomical science.”

Astronomy is regarded as one of the exact sciences, and its great ascertained facts and laws are matters of mathematical demonstration, not mere deduction and speculation. Hence the force of Father Cortie’s logic and Bishop Bagshawe’s, as compared with the uncertain and merely speculative basis of the Darwinian theorists.

SOME SIMPLE DISINFECTANTS.

The philosophic Bishop Berkeley was a fanatical believer in the virtues of tar-water as a sort of universal panacea. Tar-water has good anti-septic properties, there is no doubt, but it is not very easily procured. But lime-water is much better, and is universally procurable. It is a most valuable agency in cases of diphtheria. Its local effect is most useful in cleansing and purifying the throat, and its mode of application is the easiest imaginable. It requires no spray apparatus, no douching, and no effort at gargling. It is sufficient to have the patient slowly swallow a teaspoonful or more every hour, in order to get good results from its use. This fact is of the greatest importance in treating children, who are too often cruelly tortured in the attempt to make local applications to the throat. In diphtheria cases a disinfectant is an indispensable precaution, and one of the most readily accessible and most efficacious is sulphur. The most convenient method of fumigation is to drop a small pinch of sulphur upon a hot stove, if there is one in the room; if there is no stove in the room, a few coals on a shovel or other convenient utensil may be carried into the room, and the sulphur dropped on the coals. A little experience soon enables any one to determine how much sulphur to burn in each room. If a little too much sulphur is used, causing offensive fumes, the doors and windows may be opened for a minute or two. Sulphur fumes are found to permeate every crevice in the house, therefore the product is a most effectual method of disinfection and preventative against the spread of disease.

THE TELESCOPE FOR SUBMARINE EXPLORATION.

An extremely ingenious adaptation of electricity to optics, for the purpose of examining sunken wrecks, the bed of the sea, or objects lying thereon, has been made by a Russian engineer. It is claimed for this invention that it is serviceable at as great a depth as sixty feet; and in all probability this large scope may be increased by improvement on the original mechanism and idea in accordance with the invariable law of scientific discovery. The apparatus is composed of a pair of glasses similar to the field-glass, to the further ends of which are long cylinders which are placed in the water. At the extremity of the cylinders or tubes are shorter tubes, leaving the former at right angles, and at their extremity are hermetically sealed zinc cases with glass fronts containing incandescent lamps. The object examined is illuminated by the lamps, and the image passing through the lower tubes is reflected upward by means of mirrors placed where the tubes are joined. Here it is properly magnified by lenses before entering the retina of the eye.

THE GOLD CURE FOR SNAKE-BITE.

Pasteur is dead, but his spirit lives in his pupils. One of the most brilliant of these, Dr. Calmette, is stationed at the Anamite port of Saigon, where he is director of the Bacteriological Institute. He is credited with a discovery which must prove invaluable in tropical and sub-tropical countries, where venomous reptiles are most deadly. It is an antidote for snake-bite. The peculiarity of this antidote is that its application involves no pain or ill-effects, as many other antidotes do. The antidote is, moreover, described as perfectly efficacious. It consists of a 1 per cent. solution of chloride of gold, ten drops of which, injected into a guinea-pig, pigeon, or rabbit, immediately suffices to destroy the toxic nature of a drop of the snake venom. Five to ten cubic centimetres of the solution are sufficient to counteract the poison of a bite which is fatal to a dog, a monkey, and probably a man. The dose gives no ill effects. It causes no pain, and by increasing it absolute immunity from the poison is obtained. The sole condition to be fulfilled is that the solution should be reliable, sterilized, and kept in a dark phial to preserve it from the influence of sunlight. It is injected with an ordinary hypodermic syringe.

In connection with this subject we find a remarkable instance of what we may call natural homœopathy noted in the *Paris Revue Scientifique*. M. Paul Bert, a former Cabinet Minister, if we mistake not, has given up politics for natural history, and especially the study of entomology, and in the ever-widening field he has made some very valuable observations. Amongst other discoveries he records is that of the efficacy of the hornet's virus in counteracting the poison of the viper. According

to him and to M. Cloez, the poison of the carpenter-bee owes its activity to the presence of an organic base in union with an unknown fixed acid. According to M. Langer, in the venom of the bee there is found a small quantity of formic acid, but the toxic substance is an alkaloid that resists heat and cold as well as the action of acids. But although there is thus disagreement on the subject of the chemical composition of this poison, it is not the same with its physiologic action. P. Bert, having caused the carpenter-bee to sting sparrows, saw them die from stoppage of respiration, in complete paralysis; and recently M. Langer has killed rabbits and dogs by inoculating them with bee-poison, their symptoms being similar to those of poisoning by the bite of the viper. The poison extracted from the stings of fifteen hornets, injected into the leg of a guinea-pig, caused a lowering of temperature by 4° , which lasted thirty-six hours. At the point of inoculation were produced redness and swelling, which finally reached the abdomen and ended in mortification of the skin. In a similar experiment, where the same dose of poison was heated to 80° for twenty minutes, there was no general injury and the local action was confined to a slight temporary swelling. Likewise the inoculation of a glycerinated maceration of hornets caused only slight local troubles. But the organism of the animals that received this poison underwent such modifications that they became able to resist a subsequent inoculation with viper's poison. This resistance is such that a guinea-pig thus immunized can support, without the least danger, a dose of viper's poison capable of killing him ordinarily in four to five hours. The duration of this immunity varies from five to eleven days. Thus the poison of the hornet possesses a slight antitoxic action against that of the viper; while, when inoculated at the same time as the latter, it retards death considerably.

THE METAL TRANSMUTATION THEORY AGAIN EXPLODED.

Recently we commented on the efforts made by Dr. Emmens to prove that the transmutation theory was not chimerical, but a fact demonstrable by experiment. Dr. Emmens was so far successful in getting his views accepted as to induce our own governmental authorities to give his process a trial, but with what result we are left in the dark. We may, however, conjecture, for a very eminent authority has put the theory to the proof, and found it untenable.

Sir William Crookes has tested the process for deriving gold from silver, under the doctor's own directions, and declares that it is an utter failure. He assayed a great many Mexican dollars before he could find two that were free from gold. These were subjected to the process for 100 hours and no gold appeared. This experiment ought to dispose of the fallacy once for all, as it would be hard to find a more competent scientific expert than the inventor of the famous Crookes' tubes.

MENTALITY TO SUPPLANT MEDICINE.

Medical science is perhaps the most prolific in progressive results of all the branches of study. Within living recollection there has been a complete revolution in the theory and treatment of disease, and the general aim of the new school is to discard medicine as much as possible and work on purely natural and constitutional lines for the restoration of health. Other and greater triumphs are dreamed of by many enthusiasts. The power of the mind alone, acting under scientific regulation, is looked to as the great hygienic agency of the future by at least one enthusiast. Professor Gates, of Washington, has been closely studying the influence of the emotions upon the health, and he has published some startling deductions and speculations thereanent. He has made many experiments upon animals—and here, we think, he and other investigators err in concluding that the human subject may be subject to the same physical laws and manifest like effects under like treatment. But his experience, and his hopes based on it, are worthy of serious attention. He argues in this way :

“Mind is life. Life is not something different from mind. The life of a cell is its mind. The activities of a cell are psychological activities, and therefore the regulation of the psychological activities of cells and multicells is the basis of the long-looked-for fundamental laws of cure ; therein lies the key to the mystery of disease and pain and evil, and therefore also lies the Ariadne’s clew to health and happiness and success. I think no impartial mind can review with me the evidence upon which these conclusions are based and doubt for a moment that life and vitality and psychic processes are solely mental processes. If so, then we are in sight of the law of health and disease and crime, and we see it not by faith or through mysticism or symbolism, but through the medium of verified facts which are conquerors of scientific knowledge, and the study of this law comes within the province of strictest scientific research. If we can know how to regulate mind processes then we can cure disease—all disease. There are two methods of regulating the mind in an organism—first by varying the environment conditions and the bodily conditions of the organism, and thus bringing about modifications of the mental activities ; and, second, by causing the organism voluntarily to vary its own mental activities, and thus change its bodily structures and its chemisms and environments.”

Discussing brain-building as a means of curing disease, he asks : “If destruction of cortical areas produces disease of corresponding organs, may we not expect that the strengthening and up-building of these areas will produce development and health in these organs?” He believes the same curative methods may be effectively applied to the morally diseased, declaring that the time will come when criminals will not be allowed to grow up as criminals, but the state will see to it that criminally inclined children are cured during early school years.

It must seem that here we have a fallacy akin to that which formed

the stumbling-block for Archimedes. If he had but his fulcrum, he would, no doubt, have moved the world. The human mind may be easy to study—to some—but not so easy to steer. If men could only learn how to control the wind, there would be no great difficulty about aerial navigation. But the laws of thought and will are a far more profound problem than the laws of meteorology, and so we fear that Professor Gates's bold hypothesis may never reach actual demonstration.

A NEW ASPECT OF "NATURAL SELECTION."

It is not long since a scientific gentleman of Chicago dwelt on the value of suicide to the human race in depriving the world of the life of the useless insane and the epileptically inclined. This repulsive view has its counterpart in the estimate of the value of intemperance toward the same end recently put forward by Mr. G. A. Reid in *Science*. His argument is ingenious, and it seems to rest on a basis of fact, but which when examined closely will be seen to be nothing more than inference and general deduction. Still, the matter has attracted much attention, and it is useful to notice it. He argues in this fashion :

"Certain powerful narcotics (*e.g.*, alcohol and opium) are great causes of elimination. Races (*e.g.*, Greeks, Italians, South Frenchmen, Spaniards, Portuguese) which have long possessed a cheap and abundant supply of alcohol are the least prone to excessive indulgence of all races on earth ; while other races (*e.g.*, Anglo-Saxons, Scandinavians, Russians, etc.), which have had a less extended experience, are more prone to intemperance. Yet other races (*e.g.*, savages of all kinds, whether inhabiting the frigid, the temperate, or the torrid zones), who have had little or no experience of alcohol, crave for that narcotic so intensely that, in the presence of an abundant supply and the absence of prohibitory laws, they perish of excessive indulgence.

"Let the reader think awhile. Why does he not get drunk? Is it because he constantly resists the craving, or because the craving does not exist in him? I think he will say, 'the latter.' But has he no acquaintance, reared and living under much the same conditions, who drinks to excess, though all his interests call him to abstain? I think he is sure to have such an acquaintance. Now, in this respect nations like the Italians or the Spaniards are mainly composed of individuals like my reader, while nations like the American Indians or the native Australians are mainly composed of individuals like his unfortunate acquaintance.

"Here is a significant fact : old records seem to prove that the classic races were anciently much more intemperate than at the present time. For instance, the temperance question was formerly a burning one in Greece, where unhappy Helots were made to furnish 'awful examples'

to the aristocratic youth. Here is another: the deadly narcotic opium has been in use for some hundreds of years in India, and never or very rarely does a native of that country take it to excess; it has been in use for about two hundred years in China, and most of the Chinese are temperate, though some take it to excess; it was recently introduced into Burmah, and, practically speaking, all Burmans take it to such excess that they perish of it, and, therefore, in their own country the English have forbidden the use of opium to Burmans alone, while permitting it to all other peoples, just as in Canada alcohol is forbidden to the aborigines alone. Here is a third: tobacco causes little or no elimination, and, therefore, the craving for it is as strong in races that have longest used it as among races to which its use is comparatively strange."

Mr. Reid has been attacked for starting this theory, chiefly by friends of the temperance movement. But surely nothing can be gained by treating a purely scientific problem from such a standpoint. Scientific men have a high duty to perform to society in noting the truth in whatever field of investigation they adventure, and their motives should not be questioned by those who are also laboring for the welfare of mankind, through from a different starting-point.

BALLOONING IN RAILWAY PROPULSION.

Interest in aëronautics is re-awakened by the report that Professor Andree had been heard from. The news, unfortunately, proved to be too good to be true, and people have almost given up hope of ever seeing or hearing from that bold explorer again. The general subject of ballooning is one, however, that can never fail to awaken interest and invention; and, since the era of hostilities with Spain set in, attention is being given to the various ways in which aërial navigation may be utilized either for the purposes of direct warfare or scientific purposes in connection with war. Some of the plans proposed are as startling as anything ever dreamed of by Jules Verne in his wildest fits of scientific prophecy. We learn that the War Department is actually considering the merits (?) of a machine contrived so as to be able to soar into the air with a load of a thousand pounds, and capable of being steered wherever wanted. The thousand pounds weight, in this case, is contemplated to consist of dynamite, and it is the humanitarian intention to let this ballast go when the machine is vertical over a city or an army, and watch for results. If the idea of this machine can come within the scope of practice, it may possibly be the most humane thing ever invented, for war would then have become so like the great catastrophes of nature—such as earthquakes and volcanic eruptions—in its effects, that no two nations able to procure such dreadful engines of destruction would ever dream of resorting to it. Toward such a result, indeed, the

trend of military science seems to be just now. There are fields of more genuine usefulness, however, for the science of aërostatics, and one of these is the supplying of the motive-power to the mountain railway. This idea has actually been tentatively applied in the hill-country of Bavaria, and the experiments have been pronounced satisfactory. A balloon is attached to the roof of a railway car, with the result that the force of the traction is directed vertically. A single rail is used, for the double purpose of directing the course of the train and keeping the balloon captive. To this end, the rail is made T-shaped, and the car grips it from the sides and from below. It is anchored to the ground at distances of about fifteen feet. In the descent the propelling force is gravity, and the balloon acts as a check to prevent accelerated motion. A ballast of water, taken up at the top of the mountain, provides the additional downward force required. The truck carries the water receptacle, which can be opened by the aëronauts during the journey. The truck and receptacle together weigh about 660 pounds, and when there is no wind the receptacle carries about 1100 pounds of water, making a total weight of 1760 pounds. When it is windy the strain between the balloon and the truck is diminished by letting the water out of the receptacle, thus compensating for the difference in power. The difference in weight caused by passengers entering or leaving the car is regulated by the use of separate weights. The inventors, Messrs. Volderauer and Brackebusch, purpose making a balloon with a diameter of 65 feet 7 inches, and a lifting power of 10,560 pounds. The balloon, car, net, rope, etc., weigh 4620 pounds, and an allowance of 3300 pounds is made for passengers and aëronauts, leaving a margin of 2640 pounds.

FALSE TEETH MADE ASSIMILABLE TO THE HUMAN SYSTEM.

It is given out that a Moscow dentist, Dr. Zamesky, has solved the problem of supplying the human mouth with false teeth which will grow into the gums as firmly as natural ones. The inventor is said to have performed several successful operations on dogs, as well as human beings. The teeth are made of gutta-percha, porcelain or metal, as the case may be. At the root of the false tooth holes are made. Holes are also made upward into the jaw. The tooth is then placed in the cavity. In a short time a soft, granulated growth finds its way from the patient's jaw into the holes in the tooth. This growth gradually hardens, and holds the tooth in position. It is stated that it does not matter whether the cavity in which the tooth is to be placed is one from which a natural tooth has been drawn recently, or whether it has been healed for some years.

When first it was reported that human bones had been successfully

grafted from the osseous structure of inferior animals we thought an era in physiology had been reached ; but when we find that such foreign matter as gutta-percha is susceptible of assimilation to the human maxilla, the vista of possibilities presented by the discovery might form easily a new chapter of "Alice in Wonderland."

MINERALOGY AND ETHNOLOGY OF THE PHILIPPINES.

Much haziness of notion prevails with regard to the now interesting Philippine Archipelago, and as there seems to be a strong likelihood that Americans may soon possess a deeper concern in the subject than any other people, it is fortunate that some more definite and reliable information is becoming available. Mr. Frank Karuth, F.R.G.S., president of a great English mineral syndicate in the Philippines, has forwarded to our Government, through Ambassador Hay, a very valuable synopsis on the geology and ethnology of the islands, giving many particulars of its mineral wealth. Mr. Karuth says, amongst other things :

"I know of no other part of the world, the Alaska Treadwell mines excepted, where pay ore is found within a few hundred yards of the anchorage of sea-going vessels. So far the fringe only of the auriferous formation has been touched. There is no brook that finds its way into the Pacific Ocean whose sand and gravel do not at least pan the color of gold. Heavy nuggets are sometimes brought down from the sierras, where, I believe, there are promising fields for hydraulic mining. Alluvial gold is also got in the Island of Mindanao, especially in the districts of Surigao and Misimis, on its northern coast. Extensive deposits of copper ore occur in Luzon, which will probably prove remunerative when means of transport have been devised. Galena, both auriferous and argentiferous, is found in veins in Luzon and Cēbu, sometimes accompanied by zinc blends.

"I do not know of the occurrence of true coal in the islands. The beds which have been intermittently worked in the islands of Cēbu and Masbate consist of lignite of very good quality. Some years ago large outcrops of such coal were found near the beach in the Island of Masbate, but most of it, which could be got without mining, has been removed for the use of interinsular steamers. One of the syndicate's engineers, a man of experience as manager of coal mines in Lancashire, found Masbate coal quite useful for steamers. He calculates the quantity of coal available in a concession of about 60 acres at 1,200,000 tons. The Masbate beds are so tilted as to form an angle of 70° with the horizontal.

"I have also evidence of the occurrence of gems in an upper valley of the sierra. One of the engineers observed in a sample of roughly washed alluvial gold brought down by the aborigines certain small

stones, which, on examination in the School of Mines in Kensington, were found to be rubies and hyacinths.

“The number of the islands which form the Philippine Archipelago will astonish many readers. It is said to approach two thousand. There are two amongst them larger than Ireland—namely, Luzon with 42,000, and Mindanao with 38,000 square miles; and there are other islands with 5500, 5000, 4500, 4000, 3500, and 3000 square miles. . . . The character of the fauna and flora of the Philippine Islands is, to a certain extent, of the Melanesian or Australian type, and differs widely from that of the Malayan Archipelago, from which it is separated by a narrow but very deep strip of sea. The Philippines rejoice in that distinctly Australian bird, the cockatoo, as an indigenous member of their avifauna, and in the entire absence of the tiger or any other representative of the large *Felidæ*. There are reasons for the hypothesis that the Philippine Islands are peaks, mountain ridges, and table-lands of a submerged continent, which in a very early geological period extended to Australia.

“Almost everywhere in the islands are the results of volcanic forces in evidence, although the number of active volcanoes is small. The volcanoes, active and extinct, are grouped in two lines, running, approximately, east and west. Earthquakes are not infrequent, and the buildings are designed to resist them. The more violent seismic disturbances appear to be confined to certain centers, amongst which the neighborhood of Manila, the capital of the islands, situate in Luzon, seems to be prominent.

“The Archipelago lies between 4.40 and 20 north latitude, and 116.40 and 126.30 east longitude. The seasons are divided into hot and cool, or wet and dry, and vary according to the aspect of the country. Regions exposed to the southwest monsoon have their wet season, whilst on the other side of the mountains people enjoy the dry season. The rainfall is not excessive for the Tropics, nor is it continuous, for occasional breaks lessen the discomforts of the wet season. The climate is very healthy for the Tropics, and diseases—*e.g.*, yellow fever—are unknown.

“The bulk of the natives are of a race akin to the Malays, though pure Malays are only settled on the south coast of Mindanao and the neighboring islands, where at times they give a little trouble to the authorities. In the interior of Luzon and some of the other islands the remnants of a race of natives of undoubtedly Papuan origin are found, still as untamed, and given to roving through the forests, as the Spaniards found them over three hundred years ago. They, like their Australian kinsmen, fly from civilization and succumb when forced into contact with it.”

Mr. Karuth, it is interesting to note, gives, besides this technical and scientific information, much more that relates to the characteristics of the native populations and the influence for good which the much-abused Spanish religious orders have been in the Archipelago. This

matter, though out of place in a scientific reference, may be brought under notice in order that when the subject again comes up for discussion one may know where to look for impartial and authoritative testimony on the subject. The chief authority upon whom Mr. Karuth relies in corroboration of his own deductions is Mr. Palgrave, for many years British Consul in the Philippines; and it may be stated, briefly, that this witness, although presumably a Protestant, speaks in terms of unqualified and unstinted praise of the Spanish priests in the Philippines and the admirable character of the civilization which they have been the means of spreading there.

THE CARE OF CHILDREN'S FEET.

We do not usually bestow the attention we ought on the feet of children. The fashion of keeping them confined in the one pair of boots for perhaps months at a time is almost universal. This custom is too much allied to Chinese ideas for our enlightened hemisphere and present-day knowledge. If children could be brought up barefooted in the fields or on the seashore, it would be far more conducive to health and comfort than the system of cramping the feet up in clumsy, unyielding shoes. The "Hospital" has done well in drawing attention to this subject:

"It matters very little to a child's future well-being that at some period of its childhood the sleeves of a jacket have been too short or the skirt of a frock too scant; but the compression of feet in boots too tight, or, even worse, too short, may be a cause of torment in future years. The feet may indeed want some protection from cold and wet, but during a great part of the year children may safely and healthfully go barefooted. Some mothers, by no means of the poorer class, are convinced that the comfort and symmetry of the feet in maturer years are largely to be gained by giving them freedom during the time of growth."

Certainly freedom from corns, excrescences always traceable to tight shoes, is one of the minor blessings of life.

THE USES OF SALICYLIC ACID.

We are aware that many medical men acknowledge the benefits of salicylic acid, especially in the treatment of rheumatism and its cognate maladies, but we are also aware that an intense aversion to it is entertained by quasi-medical and State authorities. It is unlawful to use it in the making up of food in the State of Pennsylvania, and in many other States its sale is absolutely forbidden. In Europe, also, a good many enactments prevent its sale or adaptation to the preservation of food.

The action of salicylic, according to an article in the *Sanitarium*, is powerfully antiseptic. It retards the action of organized ferments like the yeast plant and putrefactive bacteria. It hinders and prevents fermentation, the souring of milk, and the putrefaction of milk. Its action upon unorganized ferments is even more powerful. It completely arrests the conversion of starch into grape-sugar by disease and pancreatic extracts. This action is directly opposed to the process of digestion, and, were there no other reason, the use of salicylic acid should be universally condemned for this one.

Still, the effect of extreme precaution of this kind may be to make the faculty lose sight of the benefits of salicylic in rheumatism and its obscure offshoots.

STILL ANOTHER MARVEL OF ELECTRICITY.

There seems to be an illimitable field for the scientific explorer in the domain of electricity. We hear of another discovery in that marvellous field, more astonishing than any yet made known. This is the process of improving our visual range by means of this universally adaptable agency. A Galician schoolmaster, named Szczepanik, is reported to have made an improvement in the teleelectroscope, by which seeing, or rather the transmission of visual pictures, by electricity is rendered possible. The transmitter consists of two strips of mirror, one horizontal and the other vertical, which oscillate in unison, so that the lines of the object under observation, continually changing in their reflection in the first, are broken up into points in the second reflector. These points are converted into electricity by their action on a cell charged with selenium, whose electrical tension changes with the color of the light to which it is exposed, the currents it gives off varying in energy with the color. The currents are again converted into color in the receiver, where a pivoted prism takes up from the electric light created by them the tint corresponding to the intensity of the transmitted current at each pulsation, a red ray being the equivalent of feebler energy and a blue of stronger. The rays are thrown by the prism on a mirror, and thence reflected on a screen, where the succession of the color vibrations is so rapid as to produce on the eye the effect of a continuous image.

This discovery points to further fields, in the inquiry into the hidden relations between color and the mysterious all-powerful fluid whose nature, familiar as we are with its effects, is as much a mystery to us as the canals in Mars.

Book Notices.

LIFE AND LETTERS OF THOMAS KILBY SMITH, Brevet Major-General United States Volunteers. By his son *Walter George Smith*. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. Octavo, 476 pp.

This is a military memoir, and such books are not ordinarily noticed in this REVIEW, but we have been tempted to make an exception in this case because of the unusual interest attaching to the volume, and because we have at hand a criticism from an eminent and eloquent priest, himself once a soldier, an author of great ability, which he permits us to print, although it was written in a private letter.

We refer to the Rev. Father Fidelis, C.P., who in the world was James Kent Stone. Writing from the Monastery of SS. Giovanni e Paolo in Rome, he says:

“Apart from the personal sympathy which I would naturally feel, I consider the letters by far the most graphic that I have ever read from the camp, as well as of high literary worth as giving a fascinating portraiture, a manifestation of character all the more attractive because given so unreservedly, to those whom he loved, without the slightest thought of taking the public into his confidence. And it is a lovable character, so frank, impetuous, fearless, affectionate. This is no pale portrait, no dry narration of facts; there is light and shade everywhere. Even his failings are interesting; they are not ugly ones, and they are manifested so artlessly, a careless or a cynical reader might think him vain and proud. But the vanity, what there was of it, was of a very harmless kind, a boyish, unaffected, undisguised delight in fine things, horses, servants, equipments, and all the pomp and circumstance of glorious war. And so far from being proud, his humility, to an appreciating critic, is almost touching. And it was a humility which grew deeper with years. He desired fame, it is true; he wished to be appreciated by his fellow-citizens; he felt keenly what seemed to be injustice; but he placed no high estimate on himself; and when justice was delayed he complained not, but resigned himself with a gentleness the more beautiful because in contrast with his naturally ardent temperament. Towards the end of his military career all traces of chafing and restlessness seem to vanish, and are replaced by a certain serenity of patience which is very winning. . . . What a pleasure it must have been to serve under him! No wonder his men loved him, though he did swear at them now and then!

“I was speaking of the quietness and resignation which grew more apparent towards the end of his course, *e.g.*, in the beautiful letters

from Mobile. How much he must have suffered! One cannot help thinking of the fiery young poet, who, when he had fallen upon the thorns of life, poured out his soul in the passionate address to the 'Wild West Wind':

" 'A heavy weight of hours has chained and bowed
One too like thee—tameless, and swift, and proud.'

"Proud, in the hateful sense of the word, he certainly was not, as I have already remarked. And a very convincing proof of this is found in the fact that he was utterly void of envy. One of his shining qualities was generosity of spirit, a quick and glad appreciation of excellence in others, which is wholly incompatible with selfish egotism. He was a marvellous judge of character; he detected incompetence infallibly; but how rarely does he stop to puncture it, and never does he linger over its dissection. No, he loved best to praise, and was happiest when he could vindicate a comrade or a friend. Notice in particular his defence of Sherman and of Grant, especially the former, to which he returns again and again in the letters to his mother. For it must be borne in mind that these great men had not then come to the forefront, and were assailed by many calumnies. His estimate of these two leaders of destiny is surely the best and most accurate ever made at that early date, before the scroll of fateful events had been unrolled; and when read in the light of their subsequent careers, it is simply wonderful. After all these years, when the tumult has died away, and the actors in those stirring scenes have followed one another into the silence of the past, we are impressed with a certain admiration at reading these graphic delineations and well-delivered judgments, in which we feel that not a word needs changing. The writer has anticipated the verdict of history.

"Graphic is a term which may be well applied to his style in general. Although he had not enjoyed the advantage of regular academic training, he had been an eager student in the school of great minds, and was at home in the splendid domain of English literature, the best and richest which the world has ever known; and his modes of thought and expression had been formed, perhaps unconsciously, after the model of England's noblest authors. It is a style clear and strong, nervous and yet fluent—a style plastic enough for the moulding of the most diverse forms of thought, and ready to answer any demand of his impetuous spirit—sometimes pensive, sometimes chatty, again rushing like a torrent or sweeping like the stately flow of the 'exultant and abounding' river he loves so well to describe. Even in the haste and heat of the battlefield itself there is no obscurity, no bungling; we recognize always the same fine, firm hand. The letters written during the Vicksburg campaign are particularly vivid. The running of the batteries, for instance, is a lurid picture which lingers in the memory. We must remember, of course, that these reflections and descriptions of his are

improvisations, poured out for those he loved, without thought of manner. Had he written at leisure, and for the great public, he would doubtless have pruned and polished in those comparatively rare cases where revision might seem necessary. Had he made profession of letters rather than of arms, we may be sure that he would have left a permanent mark on the literature of his time. Certainly he had the instincts of the scholar. There is abundant incidental evidence in these pages that even amid the hurly-burly of campaigning he kept up his reading. And how he loved his books! Instinctively we picture to ourselves the grizzled warrior, by the flickering camp-fire or in his wind-shaken tent, poring over the 'treasured volume,' which he had brought from home, dear to him as saddle or sword, or which he had pounced upon amid the spoils of war as a coveted prize. . . .

"A phase of his character which his severely impartial biographer has refrained from emphasizing was his deeply religious spirit. It is true, indeed, that this more serious aspect of his nature was never brought into prominence, never obtruded; he made no parade of the faith that was in him; and a superficial reader might here again entirely fail to understand him; yet a sympathetic perusal of the letters leaves no doubt that the underlying principle and basis of his life was a deep and abiding faith in God and in revelation. Like those "giants in heart," his Puritan ancestors, he 'believed in God and the Bible.' He trusted in the Lord with a certain childlike simplicity, and without hesitation. What at first sight might seem like a strain of fatalism resolves itself, on closer inspection, into an interior conviction that his hour had not yet come, combined with a readiness to go whenever that hour should arrive. And to faith he added hope. He looked forward to life to come, to an 'endless end,' to that blessed and eternal reunion which alone gives solution and interpretation to the mysteries of human life. His familiarity with the Scriptures, and notably with the writings of the Hebrew prophets, suggests the idea that he carried his Bible with him, and read it, too. Bits and phrases of Holy Writ which were evidently ready at hand in his thoughts, aphorisms and similes which offered themselves unsought to his swift-moving pen, could hardly have been the dry recollection of the past, but seem to imply rather a fresher acquaintance, a more intimate and devotional knowledge of the sacred text.

"And this spirit of latent piety—which, though reserved, was none the less genuine, cropping out unnoticed here and there, like rock-embedded ore—was blended with an affectionateness of soul far more evident, and unstintedly revealed. He loved his comrades. But above all, he loved his mother, his wife, his sister (that 'dear Sister Helen') and his children. His earthly paradise was in the circle of his home. Rarely shall we find, in the literary remains of those men whom the world has known, an affection equal in its tenderness and constancy to that which is here displayed in the epistles to his mother. How careful he was to shield her from anxiety! How punctual in writing, lest

she should have time to fret! How quick to ward off any suspicion in her mind that he, her son, had been unfairly dealt with! And how he yearns, with a boy's heart still, for her sweet, maternal caresses! Taken as a whole, these letters are, more than anything else, a monument of filial devotion. It is scarcely so remarkable that he should have loved his wife and children as he did—many men have done that; but it does, I think, challenge unwonted admiration when we find a man of action, in the fulness of mature years, who had formed ties of his own, and given hostages to fortune, still clinging to his mother's love with all the artlessness of childhood. For the rest, it is astonishing that in the rough-and-tumble of campaign life he could have written so faithfully to all. We wonder whether any other soldier ever wrote so many letters home.

“One of the things which most impresses a reader of the letters is the many-sidedness of his character and the versatility of his brilliant mind, and at the same time the ease with which his flexible style accommodated itself to every mood. There is a lulling, pensive smoothness in the letters from Mobile Bay which fairly casts a spell of quietude, and is in marvellous contrast with the rush of the breathless letters from the battlefield, and perhaps still more with the rollicking humor with which at times he bubbles over. Notice, for instance, the passage in which he anathematizes the flies at Corinth. It is worthy of Laurence Sterne at his best; and it was written, nevertheless, not in the leisure of a comfortable study, but post-haste from the rough camp. Compare, again, the letters to his mother and to his children. In expressing the opinion that he is at his best in the former I did not mean to disparage the latter. They are always interesting, and full of information and excellent counsel. But the difference of *manner* is apparent. In his letters to his mother he is impetuous, ingenuous, artless; whereas in addressing his children he is uniformly didactic and measured, and never loses sight of his purpose. The letters to his children are those of a sage, those to his mother are the outpourings of a youthful heart. In the former he writes like a man of sixty, in the latter like a brilliant boy of sixteen. In reality he was then somewhat over forty.

“Of his children, it seems to me that Fr. Maurice resembled him most in character and temperament. A marked contrast of course there was, but we think it was one of training rather than of natural gifts and bent. The discipline of an ascetic life, which he embraced just when his powers had reached their development, and in which he so heroically persevered, had taught him lessons of stern restraint. He never relaxed his hold upon himself, never let himself go. But if he had not thus used the curb, if he had given the free rein to his intellectual inclinations, we may imagine that the likeness would have been more striking. These observations will apply equally well to the similarity as well as the contrast between the styles, the literary mannerisms of father and son. Maurice's style was his father's style chastened almost to severity. Had he lived long enough to write much, he would have been stronger.

We have in mind a sermon, delivered in our church in Buenos Ayres, in which that beloved young preacher seemed more at his ease, more himself, than we have ever known him to be. We do not recall the occasion, but the substance of the discourse was a rapid and eloquent review of the triumphs of the Church. It struck us as a masterpiece, and we felt our heart beating quick with emotion and admiration. Whether the sermon was ever written out or not, we do not know. Naturally, the 'Study of Character' at the end of the present volume has for us an interest pathetic and intense. The concluding passages are a specimen of chaste and eloquent English which only a very cultivated hand could have penned.

"The biographer has done his work admirably well. If he has erred at all, it has been on the side of a too scrupulous impartiality. Had the same task been attempted by a disinterested hand, there would have been more of encomium, more attention to the hanging of the picture, more attempt to bring into a good light those noble and attractive features to which we have endeavored for a moment to hold our flickering candle."

NOTES ON ST. PAUL: CORINTHIANS, GALATIANS, ROMANS. By *Joseph Rickaby, S. J.*
London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers. Pp. vii., 455.

"Listening assiduously to the reading of Blessed Paul's Epistles, I exult with joy; I am delighted with that spiritual trumpet; I am warmed with affection listening to the words of a friend, whose person I almost think I see, and hear his words. But I do grieve and am annoyed to think that not all know this man, as they should."

In the day when St. John Chrysostom uttered these words there was good reason why the writings of St. Paul were not so thoroughly understood as they deserved to be; for the great commentary by the golden-tongued orator of Constantinople was not as yet within the reach of students, nor had St. Thomas, Cornelius à Lapide, Estius, Drach, and the numerous other more recent interpreters, shed light on the many things hard to be understood contained within the Pauline Epistles. It is within the memory of our own generation when the Catholic who sought a fuller acquaintance with the mind of St. Paul had no safe introduction thereto unless he were familiar with the Greek and Latin languages, in which the great commentaries were written. More fortunate are we of to-day who, even with our English speech, have access to the exegetic treasures of Cornelius à Lapide and Piconio, to say nothing of the less extensive though in many ways helpful and suggestive notes of Kenrick and McEvilly, and the almost living portraiture of St. Paul found in the English translation of his life by the Abbé Fouard.

The present work is a welcome addition to this not too extensive apparatus of exegetical study. The spirit in which the author writes may be illustrated by the following passage: "I am afraid," he says, "I have not made St. Paul quite easy reading. Popular notes on the Apostle might go the way with popular notes on the great Greek histo-

rian Thucydides, whom he greatly resembles in abruptness of style. With the one author as with the other, one must face difficulties, and not be afraid of the original Greek. Still one need not be a Greek scholar to profit by these *Notes*. I have labored everywhere to elucidate what exactly the Apostle meant to say, and as he was inspired for all time, to bring out that portion of his inspiration which is addressed to our age" (VII.). The author's long familiarity with ethical and social questions gives him a special facility in thus drawing forth and applying what might be called the "timely thoughts" of St. Paul. One familiar with the moral philosophy in the Stonyhurst series of manuals of Catholic philosophy will not fail to observe in Father Rickaby's commentary that sound sense and directness of expression which characterizes this earlier work.

The author has wisely, and certainly to the convenience of the reader, taken for his text Bishop Challoner's 1752 edition of the Rheims Testament, though not unfrequently improving the translation by collation with the original Greek. Though following, therefore, through the English, the Latin Vulgate in the main, he does not hesitate to depart from the latter reading in view of reaching more closely the literal meaning of the text. An instance where this latitude—which, of course, is otherwise perfectly justifiable—serves its purpose is in the very difficult passage I. Cor., xv., 51: *I tell you a mystery: We shall all indeed rise again, but we shall not all be changed.* What is this mystery—"something awful and secret, and a thing not known to all," as St. Chrysostom calls it? The Latin and the Rheims versions—that *while all rise again, not all shall have their bodies changed to incorruption, glory and power* (vv. 42, 43)—express nothing unknown, least of all to the Corinthians. We may well ask what historical authority there is for this reading, so perplexing and unsatisfactory. It has the support of nearly all the Latin fathers and Latin versions from the time of Tertullian (third century), and of one Greek MS. of the sixth century. On the other hand, it is countenanced by no other Greek MS., no Greek Father, no other than Latin versions, and, in the time of St. Jerome, not by all of them.

There are two variant readings. One, the less common, runs thus: *We shall all sleep (die, v. 18), but we shall not all be changed.* This is the reading of the Sinaitic Greek MS. (fourth century), and of a few other MSS. and versions. It is open to all the difficulties against the Vulgate reading. The other is the reading of the Vatican MS. (fourth century) . . . which is followed by the other Greek MSS. for the most part, and by almost all the Greek Fathers. The Vatican reading will translate: *We shall all—not sleep (die)—but we shall all be changed.* The question is: What does St. Paul mean by *changed*? In the next verse the meaning is clear: they who are *changed* are opposed to the *dead*, who *rise again incorruptible*: the *changed* then are the living, who *put on incorruption* without passing through death. Such, then, must be the meaning of *changed* in this verse also. Hence we gather

that there is no antithesis between *all* and *not all*: the same collection of persons is spoken of in both clauses. . . . The *all* are *all we* (good Christians, not a word said about the wicked) who are alive at the last day: *we shall not die but we shall be changed* to incorruption and immortality, and that "*in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye,*" etc. (v. 52). Then after showing the origin of the Vulgate reading from the Sinaitic MS., Fr. Rickaby concludes: "Of the meaning of St. Paul, after years of reflection, I feel confident that it is: "*None of us shall die, but we shall all be changed,*" the *us* and the *we* being the just who shall be found alive at the judgment-day. The doctrine of this exemption from death on the part of the just who shall be survivors at the last day the author shows to have been held by St. Augustine and by Tertullian (p. 133). "True," he continues, "*in Adam all die* (v. 22), that is, all are in the way of death; but in this last generation death shall be anticipated by the glorious *change*. St. Thomas says of them: 'Even though they die not, still there is in them the liability to death, but the penalty is taken away by God' (1, 2, q. 81 a 3 ad 3). St. Paul here uses the first person in what is called the *communicative sense*, not knowing when the coming of the Lord was to be. Here, and in I. Thess., iv., 15, 17, he associates himself with them who are to be alive at that coming; elsewhere (vi., 14; II. Cor., iv., 14), with them who are to be raised up, and consequently must have died before." The author has selected the four Epistles mentioned in the title above because of their natural relationship, and because they were probably written in that order by St. Paul himself. The reader of these luminous *Notes* will surely cherish the hope that Father Rickaby will continue to interpret the other Letters of the Apostle.

CHINESE PHILOSOPHY. By Dr. Paul Carus. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company. 1898. Pp. 64. Price, 25 cents.

This brochure appeared originally as an article in the *Monist*, and in that form was presented to the Emperor of China, whose Foreign Office had it previously rendered into Chinese for the convenience of His Imperial Highness. The members of that office reported that "the article shows that the writer is a scholar well versed in Chinese literature, and has brought together matters which indicate that he fully understood the subject he has treated." Encomium surely this from high authority, and itself as high as the lofty or rather profound nature of the theme allows; for, granting that there is a distinctively Chinese philosophy, and not simply a few Chinese writers who speculated more or less vaguely on philosophical subjects, the task of discovering and describing what that philosophy is, by reason of the uncertainty of the historical data, well nigh hopeless.

Dr. Carus finds, as near the beginnings of Chinese speculation as he can reach, a certain dualistic conception, the universe being regarded as the product of *Yang* and *Yin*. "*Yang* means 'bright;' *Yin*, 'dark.'

Yang is the principle of heaven; *Yin* is the principle of earth. *Yang* is the sun; *Yin* is the moon. *Yang* is, as we should say, positive; *Yin* is negative. *Yang* is, as the Chinese say, masculine and active; *Yin* is feminine and passive. The former is motion, the latter is rest" (p. 3).

These two "elementary forms" are symbolized in the Chinese classics by four doublets of unbroken and broken lines called the four *Siang* (figures), and by eight trigrams, to each of which a special name (such as sky, water, fire, etc.) and attribute and hieroglyph are attached. By a most perplexingly intricate system of permutations of these symbols all things are explained. Back, however, of the dualistic conception there was probably a monistic theory; for the *Yang* and the *Yin* are thought to have originated in a process of differentiation from the *T'ai Kih*, the "grand origin" *der Urgrund*, the source of existence. This latter conception was subsequently wrought out by *Cheu-tsz*, *i. e.*, Cheu, the Sage, who lived 1017-1073 A.D., and his disciple, Chu Hi. Whether, however, the Monism espoused by these latter sages was original with them or was, as is most likely the case, a revival of an earlier similar conception, or perhaps a modification of a true primordial monotheism, we have no historical data by which to determine—no more than we have the means of verifying the view advocated by Dr. Carus that the basis of the characteristically Chinese reverence for parental authority and, consequently, of their whole ethical system—which is but an application of the idea of filial piety to all human relations—is the *Yang* and *Yin* dualism.

The author places his readers, however, on still less reliable, though better discernible ground, both of principle and fact, when he makes the following assertion: "The higher monistic ethics, which becomes possible only on an advanced plane in the evolution of mankind, unites both the governor and the governed in one person, and expects every one to be his own king, priest and instructor, replacing the external relation by an internal relation. This principle of a monistic ethics was first proclaimed in the history of European civilization by the reformers of the sixteenth century, who taught self-dependence and claimed the liberty of conscience. Liberty of conscience, self-reliance, the right of free inquiry and free thought abolish personal authority, not for the sake of anarchy, but to replace it by the superpersonal authority of justice, right and truth" (p. 37). It is to be hoped that the members of the *Tsung Li Yamen*, if they understood these sentiments, excepted them mentally from their expression when they declared that the author understood the subject he has treated.

There are a few more such obtrusions of apriorism. Aside from them the pamphlet is interesting, instructive and suggestive, especially the part which treats of the various theories of interpreting that most mysterious of the Chinese classics—the *Yih-King*. The brochure owes not a little of its attractiveness to the neatness of typography, especially as regards the Chinese characters.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIÆ Dogmaticæ et Moralis unacum præcipuis notionibus theologiæ canonicæ, liturgicæ, pastoralis et mysticæ, ac philosophiæ Christianæ. Auctore P. J. Berthier, M.S., Ed. iv., aucta et emendata. La Salette in Gallia. New York: Benziger Brothers. Pp. 706. Price, \$2.50.

"Some books of close and continuous matter need an hour of quiet attention; some of a less precise kind may be read in times caught flying; and some may be taken up at any moment. A hard student once advised a friend to have 'five-minute books.' And many a book could be read through in a year by five minutes a day." This was Cardinal Manning's suggestion to the busy priest. Some such thought the author of the present work had in mind when forming his compendium of theology. There is no lack of works, he says, treating *in extenso* of the same subject, but there is often a lack of time to read them. And yet theological knowledge must never fade from the priest's mind. Hence it seemed to the author desirable that a book should be written containing a summary of such knowledge; "so that any priest, however occupied with the duties of the sacred ministry, might be able to peruse it in a year, by reading two or three pages a day, and might often in a half hour recall to memory an entire treatise" (p. 9). It is plain that a compendium of this kind—one presenting an outline of all the departments of theology together with a very brief introductory sketch of philosophy—can be a "five-minute book" only to those already quite familiar with its subject-matter. The author expressly disclaims it as a substitute for the study of larger works, but thinks that as a summary for review for the use of the young cleric who has just completed a course of theology, and for the busy priest in the ministry, especially in missionary fields, his work will answer a want. That it does so answer is in a measure proven by the fact that prior to the present fourth edition 18,000 copies of the work had been sold, and over 9000 copies of a French version of the Compendium had been called for up to 1897.

Père Berthier brings to his task a long experience both as a teacher of seminarians, as a voluminous writer, and as a missionary priest. He is, besides, the Superior of the missionaries of La Salette, who, besides their foreign missions, have in charge a work which could only be begotten and fostered by the faith and charity of Catholic France—the education, namely, of young men for the priesthood who through poverty and military proscription are unable until late in youth to give themselves to systematic study and yet cherish a desire to devote themselves to missionary duties. This meritorious work is described in the concluding pages of the present volume, and the reader is informed that all the income resulting from the sale of this and the author's other books is devoted to the work of Foreign Missions.

THE LIFE OF ST. AUGUSTINE, BISHOP AND DOCTOR. A Historical Study. By Philip Burton, a Priest of the Congregation of the Mission, and a Pilgrim to Hippo. Third edition, 8vo. Pp. 474. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1897.

Few men in history present to the biographer a more inviting personality than St. Augustine. As sinner, penitent, priest, bishop, confessor,

and doctor, he has attracted the attention of the world for centuries. His life has been written at different times by various authors, and at first it might seem strange that a new life of him should appear at this late day. But the author gives a good reason for his work, and the fact that three editions of his book have been called for in ten years is sufficient proof that his reason is thought sufficient.

He tells us that he resided in Algiers for two years in search of health. During that time he visited Hippo, Tagasta, Colama, Cirta, and some of the other scenes of the life and labors of St. Augustine. He became interested in the saint and in the history of the African church, and began to search for more information in regard to them. He had access to a very valuable library, well stocked with all that could be desired on the subject, and he made good use of it. The result is the present work. The author cannot be accused of presumption, for he offered his materials to other workmen, whom he thought could build better with them, but they refused to embrace the opportunity. Then he used them himself, and most successfully.

The object of the author is to present to English readers, St. Augustine with all his surroundings; to picture him as he really was, "with the mountains and plains, cities and towns, roads and rivers amidst which he lived and journeyed; the events in which he took active part; his most intimate friends and his most noted adversaries; his household, his home life, and his daily labors; his flock and his intimate relations with them; his relations with his episcopal brethren, and his work in the synods; his relations with the Popes; in fine, with all those circumstances and surroundings that reveal to us the whole man as he appeared to his contemporaries."

The plan is certainly comprehensive enough, but it cannot in a book of this size be exhaustive.

Father Burton has taken his facts, whenever possible, from original sources. He has relied only on authors of unquestionable authority, and the result of his labors is placed before the public in a very reliable and pleasing biography which will well repay the reader.

A DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, dealing with its Language, Literature and Contents, including the Biblical Theology. Edited by James Hastings, M.A., D.D. In four imperial octavo volumes of about 900 pages each, with maps and illustrations. Vol. 1, by subscription, \$6.00. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Dictionaries must be constantly renewed in order to be complete. While this is true of almost all dictionaries, it is particularly true, in recent times, of Bible dictionaries. This assertion does not suppose changes in the body of Divine revelation, but developments of our knowledge in regard to it. So much attention has been given to biblical study in the last half century that a very general interest in the great book has been excited. Every branch of the subject has been assiduously cultivated, and the fund of knowledge on the subject has been very much increased. Hence we have had works from

many sources on every phase of the question, and, while differences of opinion still prevail, and always will continue, it must be confessed that the renewed vigor with which scholars have approached the subject and pursued it has called the attention of the world again to that most sublime book, which it seemed for a time to have forgotten.

The appearance of this new biblical encyclopædia vindicates this assertion. Experienced and reliable publishers regulate their business carefully, and never undertake to bring an extensive and costly work from the press until they are sure that there is a demand for it. Messrs. Clark, of Edinburgh, and Messrs. Scribner, of New York, are publishers that rank with the highest, and therefore their action in publishing this important work at this time is a criterion by which we can judge of the interest in biblical studies in English-speaking countries.

It is not our purpose to review the book—many pages of this magazine would be required for that purpose—but to call attention to it.

“It is an encyclopædic dictionary of the Old and New Testaments, together with the Old Testament Apocrypha, according to the authorized and revised English versions. It is believed that in no other similar work can the student or reader obtain such scope and fulness, such absolute accuracy and authoritativeness of interpretation, and such convenience and accessibility. The comprehensive aim of this dictionary is to define all the words in the Bible not self-explanatory.” This quotation is taken from the prospectus. The literary work, the press-work, the illustrations and the maps have all been done in the best manner; but we must warn the readers of the *QUARTERLY* that as far as we know, or have been able to learn, not one Catholic author has been a member of the large staff that prepared the work for press. It is only fair to state this fact, in order that every one may accept the book for just what it is.

PHILOSOPHIA LACENSIS; INSTITUTIONES PSYCHOLOGICÆ. *Tilm. Pesch, S. J.* Vol. iii., pp. xviii.—551. Herder: St. Louis, Mo. 1898. Price, \$2.00.

Since the above notice of the second volume of Fr. Pesch's Psychology has been in type, the third and concluding volume has fallen from the press. The subject-matter here explained forms the *altera pars* of the whole work—the *psychologia anthropologica*. It naturally divides itself into four main divisions or “books.” The first of these books, constructed on the unmistakably Aristotelian plan, opens with a treatise on the object-matter of the human intellect, and leads the student inwards into the nature of intellectual action, and thence to the ever-recurring question as to the origin of ideas. Some two hundred pages offer sufficient space for a fair treatment of the purely intellectual functions, especially in view of the fact that the introductory material on psychic faculties in general and sentient in particular had been elaborated in the preceding volumes of the course.

The human will is studied in like method in the second book. The subject of liberty here gives the author occasion for some nice philo-

sophical dissection, both as regards the much abused term itself and the manifold phases of the opposing systems of determinism.

The third book, on the mutual relations of soul and body in their present union in the individual person, deals largely with the appetitive tendencies, the passions and emotions. An important feature of this portion of the work—a feature not explicitly contained in the Manuals familiar to the Catholic student—is the section treating of education. The *psychological precepts* bearing on this large subject are, it is true, very briefly summarized; but they embody the soundly philosophical principles involved in the training of the mind.

The fourth and closing book is devoted to the demonstration of the soul's immortality and its powers and mode of action after separation from the body.

An appendix on psychological materialism and another on the final end of man bring the work to its close. An alphabetical index, which, by the way, might well have been fuller, unlocks the wealth of doctrine contained within the fourteen hundred and more pages comprised within the three volumes of this elaborate course of neo-scholastic psychology.

Students of philosophy in this generation are fortunate in having such a thorough, learned, methodical, perspicuous and, as regards the material make-up of the work, attractive aid to their studies as is here presented. Would that we had something of the kind in English.

ANGELS OF THE BATTLEFIELD. A history of the labors of the Catholic Sisterhoods in the late Civil War. By *George Barton*. Large 8vo, pp. 302. Phila. : The Catholic Art Publishing Co.

A few days ago a young gentleman who had been wounded in Cuba, and who returned with shattered constitution to his home in the North, said, when speaking of his experience: "I wish to state that I am a Protestant, but the Catholic sisters who are nursing the sick and wounded are angels." It is not likely that this man had ever read Mr. Barton's book, or heard its title; and yet, speaking from the heart, he spoke of the Sister-Nurses as angels of the battlefield.

This book is more than usually interesting now when new angels are making a record for themselves no less admirable than that which their predecessors made more than thirty years ago. And who can say to what extent these new heroines have been influenced and encouraged by the lives of those who have gone before! Although their deeds have not been told on printed page until now, we may be sure that they have been faithfully preserved amongst the traditions of the communities of which they were members. Mr. Barton's book is a valuable contribution to the history of the Civil War—we cannot say now the Late War. He has very industriously and faithfully gathered together what information he could find in regard to the Sister-Nurses in the war. It was a difficult task. Sisters do not work for earthly glory or reward. They do not seek the admiration or praise of the world. On the contrary, they labor for the glory of God and the good of their neighbor,

and they look to eternity for their reward. Notoriety is repugnant to them, and inconsistent with their mode of life. Hence they would rather conceal their good deeds than make them known, and they consent to speak of them only through a sense of duty, and in obedience to the command of a superior. When we remember, also, the number of years that have elapsed since the close of the war, we will better appreciate the labors of the author and admire his success. He has really done remarkably well. His history is about as complete as it could be made under the circumstances, and the connecting links, giving sketches of persons, places and events, are skillfully supplied. Numerous illustrations accompany the text, which is well printed on excellent paper. If the present war is not soon ended, we hope that the second volume of "Angels of the Battlefield" will be promptly written.

INSTITUTIONES THEOLOGICÆ DOGMATICÆ: TRACTATUS DE DEO CREANTE ET DE DEO CONSUMMATORE. Auctore *Petro Einig, D.D.* Treveris ex officina ad S. Paulinum, 1898. Pp. vii., 171, ii., 68. Price, 3 marks.

If there be grades of importance in the various treatises that go to constitute a course of theology, the one dealing with the subjects assigned to the present work certainly deserves the first place. The tract "de Deo Creante" has to unfold the relations of God—as the efficient, archetypal and final cause—to the universe, as well as the fundamental relations of the hierarchies of creatures to their Creator.

The matters here treated are, besides, as difficult as they are important. Leaving aside the abstruse controverted questions concerning the divine concursus—God's co-operation with free will—and the elevation of the human and angelic natures to the supernatural order and destiny, the mere mention of the Mosaic cosmogony and the origin and nature of man suggests vast areas of speculation which can be hopefully described only by one who is familiar with its theological, exegetical, archæological, historical and philosophical features, and with the many-sided aspects it presents to well-nigh all the physical sciences. To treat these questions alone with anything like adequacy would require many such volumes as the one at hand. Dr. Einig makes no such pretense. He aims simply to present a systematized body of theological doctrine with just that amount of adjunct information from the other departments of knowledge into which his matter falls as is required to bring out the complete harmony between the truths of revelation and nature. The author is Professor of Dogmatics in the diocesan seminary of Treves, and in this capacity has in mind the needs of his own students. At the same time his treatise adapts itself readily for use in any theological course. His method is perfectly clear, his language perspicuous, the literary apparatus sufficiently full, and the mechanical features of the book such as to commend it for class purposes. Besides the tract on Creation, the present volume contains a brief treatise on the Final Consummation of Man and the Universe. Two antecedent volumes had treated of Grace and the Divine Nature. Two more, promised for the near future, are needed to complete the course.

DIE HEILIGEN SACRAMENTE DER KATHOLISCHEN KIRCHE. Fuer die Seelsorger dogmatisch dargestellt von Dr. Nikolaus Gihl, Subregens an derzbischoeflichen Priesterseminar zu St. Peter. Erster Band. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, \$2.75 net.

This is one of the concluding volumes of Herder's extremely valuable Theological Library, which consists of a series of ably-written treatises upon every department of theological science by the most distinguished names in contemporary German Catholic circles. It was for this collection that Cardinal Hergenroether wrote his great "Church History," in three volumes; Scheeben, likewise in three volumes, his "Dogmatik," and Schwane, in four volumes, his "History of Dogma," to mention only the best known of a series in which every contribution approaches as near to perfection as the present state of divinity permits.

The task of expounding the Catholic doctrine concerning the Sacraments has been committed to the care of Dr. Gihl, whose excellent work on the "Holy Sacrifice of the Mass," also comprised in this extensive library, demonstrated his ability to treat the important subject with a masterly hand. His first volume lies before us, and we have no hesitation in pronouncing it far and away the most satisfactory treatise on the Sacraments that we have ever read. The author, in this volume, exhausts the subjects of the Sacraments in general, Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist. The remaining Sacraments will be treated in a subsequent volume.

It is humiliating in the extreme to compare the great works made accessible to the learned Catholic laity of Germany, by which they are enabled to acquaint themselves thoroughly with every point of the Catholic teaching, and to defend their faith like skilled theologians, with the meagre elements of religious truth which are deemed sufficient for the faithful who are familiar only with the English language. When will it be possible for us to possess such a theological library as this of Herder's? How is it that our educated laity are content to pass through life with no further knowledge of their religion than they acquired in early youth from their catechism, or that they pick up in a desultory manner from an occasional sermon?

CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY. A Treatise on the Human Soul. By *Rev. John T. Driscoll, S. T. L.* 12mo., pp. 269. Albany: James B. Lyon.

"This treatise is an attempt to set forth the main lines of Christian philosophy as enunciated in the catechism and as systematized by the schoolmen, especially St. Thomas."

The study of philosophy, and especially of psychology, is becoming more common every day. It is no longer confined to universities, but is found in all high schools and normal schools. It is considered an important part of the curriculum of training-schools for teachers, and the graduates of these schools are expected to apply its principles to their work in the school-room. Hence the number of text-books has been increased very rapidly. Most of them, if not all, follow German rationalistic

leaders. In many instances the physical sciences and psychology have been so confounded that the truth has often been clouded, and sometimes destroyed.

To correct this evil the present work has been written. The author takes the catechism and St. Thomas for his guides, and therefore he cannot go astray. He believes with the Catholic Church that the teachings of the Angelic Doctor are as true now as they were when he first penned them; but he applies those teachings to the work of modern philosophical writers, especially in our own country, and thus helps us to clear away the clouds which these modern productions have cast upon the ancient truth.

The work is well done. Nor was it an easy work. It is not a mere outline, but a complete treatise, though not an exhaustive one. The arrangement is most helpful, the marginal summaries of the text being very acceptable.

Footnotes abound, and references to authorities are clearly given in every instance.

Father Driscoll's book is timely, and should receive a warm welcome.

MEDITATIONS ON THE SACRED PASSION OF OUR LORD. By *Cardinal Wiseman*. London: Burns & Oates; New York: Benziger Bros. 1898. Price, \$1.10.

The Passion should be, as Cardinal Wiseman remarks in the present work, to the Christian what the Law was to the Jew: "his meditation, sitting down in his house, or going on his journey, coming and going out." It should be ever "before and between his eyes, not merely by being mechanically imprinted on his forehead by his hand, but by being the scope and aim of all his actions, the tendency of his desires, the object of his love." (p. 2.)

The Passion, therefore, though peculiarly adapted to meditation during the Lenten season, is a subject which is never long absent at any season from the thoughts of the fervent Christian, nor, least of all, even when the Easter alleluias are echoing in his ears. Whatever, therefore, will help to a better knowledge, a deeper and more practical realization of the meaning and the lessons of the Crucifix cannot be unwelcome. A genuine help of this kind is this collection of Cardinal Wiseman's meditations. They form but part of a larger series of "Meditations" which the eminent prelate wrote for the use of the students whilst Rector of the English College in Rome. This special adaptation, however, in no way limits their matter or bearing. Based, as they are, on unusual principles, they show their patent application to every walk and phase of life. For the rest, we cannot more fittingly commend them to the clergy and laity than by adopting the encomium paid them by Cardinal Vaughan in his graceful preface to the present booklet: "The characteristic of these meditations, as indeed of most of Cardinal Wiseman's writings, is that you will nearly always find in them a 'hidden gem.' The beauty and richness of his mind seemed to illustrate and justify every topic he treated by suddenly striking some vein of thought or some point of feeling which, if not new, is at least presented in a new light or reference."

LIGHT AND PEACE. Instructions for Devout Souls, to dispel their doubts and allay their fears. By *R. P. Quadrufani, Barnabite*. Translated from the French, with an Introduction by the Most Rev. P. J. Ryan, D.D., Archbishop of Philadelphia. 12mo., pp. 193. Price, 50 cents. St. Louis: B. Herder.

These instructions were written in 1795 by Rev. Father Quadrufani, the Barnabite, and they contain a summary of spiritual guidance for earnest Christians in the ordinary duties of life in the world. The author tells his readers that he is not setting before them his own wisdom, but the wisdom of the great spiritual writers and theologians of the Catholic Church, Saint Augustine, Saint Thomas, Saint Philip de Neri, and especially Saint Francis de Sales. As the translator very well says: "The maxims of Father Quadrufani are specially adapted to the American character. Unlike many foreign religious works, whose spirituality often fails to touch the Anglo-Saxon temperament, this author's teaching is decidedly practical and practicable, and appeals in every way to the common sense, and fits in with the busy, matter-of-fact life of the average American Catholic."

Everything is so clearly and concisely put that the author seems to speak directly to us, and to answer our questions before we have asked them. That he succeeds is shown most of all by the ever-increasing number of his readers. The work has passed through uncounted editions in the original Italian, and through a large number of editions in the French and the German translations. An English translation published many years ago has been out of print for a long time. The present translation has been made from the twentieth French edition, and collated with the thirty-second edition of the original Italian published at Naples in 1818. The introduction by Archbishop Ryan is a strong recommendation of the work, and it is written in the Archbishop's happiest style.

THE FORMATION OF CHRISTENDOM. By *T. N. Allies, R. C. S. G.* Vol. iv. As seen in Church and State. 12mo, pp. 452. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

All who have read this work in former editions will rejoice in the appearance of the successive volumes of the latest edition, because they know the great value of the book and the incalculable good that will be done by it in its more accessible form.

Since the appearance of the first edition, in 1865, it has steadily grown in public favor, so that there was a demand for a third edition in 1897, although the second had come from the press as late as 1894. When the first volume of the second edition appeared Cardinal Vaughan said of it: "It is one of the noblest historical works I have ever read. . . . We have nothing like it in the English language. It meets a need which becomes greater daily with the increase of mental culture and the spread of education." Nor was this commendation singular. Every one who has read the book speaks of it in the same high terms.

The fourth volume treats of the Formation of Christendom as seen in Church and State. After speaking of the kingdom as prophesied

and as fulfilled, the author treats, successively, of the relation between the spiritual and civil powers from Adam to Christ and after Christ. He then shows the transmission of the spiritual authority from our Lord to Peter and the Apostles, as set forth in the New Testament and as witnessed in the history of the Church from A.D. 29 to A.D. 325. After showing the one episcopate resting upon the one sacrifice, he treats of the independence of the ante-Nicene Church as seen in her organic growth, in her mode of positive teaching, and in her mode of resisting error. He closes with an account of the Church's battle for independence against the Roman Empire. It is a most valuable addition to a very valuable work, and it cannot be spoken of too highly.

SERMONS AND MORAL DISCOURSES for all the Sundays of the year, for Holy Days and Feasts, and for Particular Devotions. Edited and in part written by *Rev. Francis X. McGowan, O.S.A.* 2 vols. 8vo, pp. 1275. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

Here is a very complete collection of Sermons for Sundays, Holy Days, Feasts, and Particular Occasions. Indeed, the preacher will find good matter for every occasion. The editor, and in part author of the sermons, Rev. F. X. McGowan, O. S. A., is well known as a pulpit orator in this country, and his reputation as an elegant and powerful speaker is a sufficient guarantee of the excellence of the work.

Father McGowan is very modest about his part of the work. He says: "We might have followed, as far as subject-matter and method are concerned, the paths of the old writers, and we therefore make no pretension to novelty. Our whole ambition has been to put in clear and plain language the thoughts of writers who have been distinguished as pulpit orators and as zealous exponents of our holy Faith."

As to the sources from which he has drawn, the author says: "We are much indebted to the *Promes* of Billot, the sermons of Perrin and other French preachers for the matter of the Sunday sermons; and to the Latin discourses of La Selve, St. Thomas of Villanova, and other former writers, for many suggestions as regard the sermons for festivals and saints' days. We have studied usefulness rather than profuseness, and have endeavored to carry out a reference to the needs and requirements of our American life."

Even a glance at the pages of this book will show the reader that the work is unusually good from every point of view, and worthy of patronage.

A GENERAL AND CRITICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.
By *A. E. Breen, D.D.* Rochester, N. Y.: The John P. Smith Printing House.

We extend a benevolent greeting to these first-fruits of St. Bernard's Theological Seminary, Rochester, one of the youngest and most promising seats of theological learning in this nation. Dr. Breen's large octavo volume of about six hundred pages is not a text-book in the ordinary meaning of the term. It is a series of lectures delivered by him as Professor of Sacred Scripture, covering the entire ground usually tra-

versed in a Scripture class. The lecturer presents the results of his extensive and varied reading in an interesting manner, which enables the hearer or reader to follow him without that sense of weariness that so often attaches to the study of Scriptural science. Being himself thoroughly at home in his department, and full of enthusiasm, he everywhere awakens interest in those who listen to him. He has, moreover, the advantage of youth, with many useful years, we trust, in store, during which he may continue his important labors, revising and rewriting his work, condensing and developing in places, as maturer experience will suggest. We also congratulate the publisher upon the typographical beauty and accuracy of the book.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE LIFE OF FATHER CHARLES PERRAUD. By *Augustine Largent*, Priest of the Oratory. Translated from the French, with Introduction by Cardinal Gibbons. 8vo, pp. 97. New York: Cathedral Library Association.
- PROPER OFFICES OF THE SAINTS GRANTED to the Barefooted Carmelites. Translated from the Latin. 12mo, pp. 424. Boston: Cashman & Co.
- ANCIENT INDIA; Its Language and Religions. By *Professor H. Oldenberg*. 8vo, pp. 110. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co.
- ENGLISH SECULARISM; A Confession of Belief. By *George Jacob Holyoake*. 8vo, pp. 150. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co.
- SPIRITUAL EXERCISES FOR A TEN DAYS' RETREAT, for the Use of Religious Congregations. By *Very Rev. Rudolph v. Smetana, C.S.S.R.* 12mo, pp. 280. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE REACTION FROM SCIENCE. By the author of "Disunion and Reunion" (W. J. Madden). 12mo, pp. 229.
- CATHOLIC PRACTICE, at Church and at Home. The Parishioner's Little Rule Book. By *Rev. Alexander L. A. Klauder*. 16mo, pp. 211. Angel Guardian Press, Boston.
- LITTLE OFFICE OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN according to the Roman Breviary. 32mo, pp. 127. Baltimore: John Murphy.
- PRAY FOR US. Little Chaplets for the Saints. By *A. Sewell*. 32mo, pp. 88. London: Burns & Oates.
- EXTRACTUM ex Rituali Romano, continentes: Communio Infirmorum, Sacramentum Extremæ Unctionis, Ritus Benedictionis Apostolicæ, Ordo Commendationis animæ in expiratione. 32mo, pp. 58. New York: Pustet & Co.
- BRUNO AND LUCY; OR, THE WAYS OF THE LORD ARE WONDERFUL. From the German of William Herchinbach. Revised by the *Rev. W. J. Eyre, S. J.* London: Burns & Oates.
- RACHEL'S FATE AND OTHER TALES. By *William Seton*. New York: P. O'Shea.
- JEWELS OF PRAYER AND MEDITATION. By *Percy Fitzgerald*. New York: Benziger Bros.
- CONFESSION AND COMMUNION for Religious and for those who Communicate frequently. By the author of "First Communion." 16mo, pp. 196. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XXIII.—OCTOBER, 1898.—No. 92.

LIVING NATURE.

IN a recent article in this REVIEW¹ we brought forward a number of biological facts sufficient, we think, to convince any unprejudiced reader that a mechanical conception of the universe is utterly insufficient and inadequate; that there is a guiding energy latent in nature; and that the different specific forms the living world offers to our curiosity and admiration, do not owe their origin to mere utility, but to some power external or internal, which we may at least distinguish as an X power.

These theses I took up, in 1869, and defended in my first book, "The Genesis of Species." My arguments have often been discounted by opponents who have falsely asserted, or supposed (with, of course, unintentional falsehood), that my efforts have been due, not to zeal for science, in the full sense of that sacred word, but to theological prejudice. I am, of course, proud to affirm that I have striven (I venture to hope not altogether without success) to defend churchmen from unjust aspersions, as I have not less defended men of science from unjust aspersions, but I have never taken up a position "on false pretenses." To my surprise and disgust, I have recently learned, through private conversation with my friend, that most eminent biologist, Prof. Ray Lankester, F.R.S., that my biological views and arguments have been attributed, by some prominent naturalists, to a desire on my part to champion views with which biology has no connection. I therefore desire permission here distinctly to deny such an imputation. I repudiate it with all the

¹ See vol. xxiii, No. 89, January, 1898, p. 28.

energy of which I am capable, and seize this opportunity to express my true meaning. When I urge, as I do now, and have so frequently urged before, that such facts as those advanced in my paper, before referred to, are fatal to a mechanical, utilitarian explanation of the origin of specific characters (because *falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*) I also unhesitatingly and unequivocally affirm that they are none the less (as a matter of course) due to natural, biological causes. I know no causes *in nature* but natural causes; nevertheless not all natural causes are mechanical ones.

The objection to a mechanical, utilitarian (and therefore the Darwinian), philosophy of nature, is due to the intellectual limitations which, as it seems to me, must attend its acceptance. My rejection of it is, of course, largely due to my conviction of the inadequacy of the causes assigned and the existence of so many conspicuous facts for which it fails to account. But my objection is based even more on its inherent intellectual vulgarity than on its inadequacy. After nearly forty years' meditation and examination of the subject, I remain convinced that the cause of specific characters still remains an unsolved enigma. I am not without hope that its solution may one day be achieved, but I am profoundly convinced that it never will be achieved till the facts and laws of psychology, as they exist in man and lower organisms, have become much more widely understood, and till the light thus gained has been reflected on questions of ordinary physiology. My hope and aim in the present paper is to contribute one mite towards so desirable a consummation. I would also wish to insert a corollary drawn from the contemplation of the living world of irrational creatures, which seems to me well calculated to afford comfort and consolation to human beings with respect to a matter which concerns the tenderest feelings of which mankind is capable and their more pathetic aspirations.

But before proceeding to consider any of the facts presented to our contemplation by animated nature, let us, as it were, lay a foundation for our work by means of some indisputable facts with respect to the world which is devoid of life. And in the first place let us consider the proportion borne by the latter to the former. Surely, if one department of nature is out of all proportion quantitatively in excess of others, the laws which we find inherent in the far larger part may *à priori* be expected to persist, however they may be supplemented, in the relatively fragmentary portion of the universe.

But what is the universe? Of what does it consist so far as

we can know? Of course there may be many modes and kinds of existence and being which our faculties have no power to perceive. What our five senses and their various diverse combinations are able to give us cognizance of, may be the merest fragment of the entire physical cosmos. Nevertheless, since *de non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio*, we may leave all these probabilities out of account and content ourselves with what our faculties are able to appreciate.

Have other worlds, as the earth has, living inhabitants? To this question we can give no positive answer, though analogy would surely suspect that some, if not many, of the heavenly bodies are inhabited. But whether they are so or not, the physical conditions of great spaces in the heavens would seem to indicate that the worlds destitute of life must be numerous, if they do not, as they probably do, greatly predominate in numbers. Even in our little corner of the universe, though Mars and Venus may be peopled with living creatures, it is very improbable that such is the case with Mercury, while those vast orbs, Jupiter and Saturn, seem most likely to be destitute of organic life.

And when from considerations of space we meditate on the abyss of past time, and think over the past physical history of our own globe, who can doubt that the time it has existed as a theatre of organic life is nothing compared with that vast period during which it revolved a mere mass of mineral matter, lifeless, however physically active. And even now inorganic matter forms so enormously preponderant a part of its total composition that if all the organisms which now live, both vegetable and animal, were evenly spread out over its surface it would thereby be invested with but a very thin film of organic matter.

In our consideration of the universe, therefore, and in our consideration likewise of the physical conditions and energies of our own globe as a whole, *inorganic* matter may well be taken as the type and form when we would study the laws which govern material existence considered as one whole.

We should do so the more certainly, and it is the more evidently our business so to proceed, when we reflect that it has now become a matter of certain knowledge that inorganic substances which exist in our own earth also exist and exist with the same properties and subject to the same laws in the remotest regions of the vast cosmos open to human ken, as also that they have there existed for long years, as is plain from the time required to enable the light of the remotest stellar bodies visible to reach the eyes of the keenest of our astronomers.

And what does the mineral and inorganic world declare to us as to the laws of its being and the reign of law ?

Surely, as that eminent Professor of Crystallography, Professor H. A. Miers, has said :¹ " Nowhere is the evidence of the permanent order that prevails in Nature written in more lustrous and indelible characters than in the mineral kingdom." He spoke truly, indeed, since every crystalline species has its own absolute internal constitution and laws by which it continues, from age to age, what it is and no other—the visible expression of a definitely constituted nature, through which ceaseless order reigns.

It is from the mineral that a more important argument may be brought forward in support of our contention that the varied, often beautiful, often curious characters which serve to define any species of mineral or plant are not due to utility or any merely mechanical cause. For does not the whole inorganic world teem with wonders ? What is more wonderful than the beauty of marble and serpentine, of malachite and lapis lazuli, of the sapphire, the emerald and the opal ? Yet these wonderful spars and gems, with their endless varieties of form and color, their intricate groupings of silky fibres and pearly flakes, have been for ages hidden in the dark recesses of the earth in a long, uniform, unchanging existence. They have their minute laws of form and their various definite properties ; they have their specific anatomy and most definite physiology, but these, most certainly are not due to any form of " selection " which has resulted in the triumph of utility. An, as yet unknown, energy, no physical force shows itself even here, as it does evidently and eminently in the domain of life.

And how does experience lead us to regard the energies which exist in living nature ? Long ago, in our work " On Truth " we have urged that one single dominant energy or " principle of individuation " is that which *par excellence* causes each individual animal and flint to be that which it is—determines its individual, specific and generic characters. The necessity of such a dominant individuating principle is especially manifest in the process of growth—especially that form of growth which constitutes reproduction. For the development of the ovum a fit environment is, of course, necessary ; just as the existence of the requisite *external* physical agencies are required for the development of a grain of corn. Still it is the nature and *internal* condition of the living corn-grain which is, emphatically, the cause of its growth, and such is also the case as regards the living ovum.

¹ In his inaugural lecture as Waynflete Professor at Oxford.

² See pp. 420-440.

Many modern naturalists (such as Bourne, Whitman, Vägeli, Weismann and others) have attempted to explain the development of entire organisms and their germs by imagining the existence in each of a multitude of most minute particles, to which hypothetical bodies curious traces have been supplied,¹ and to which a variety of vital functions are attributed. But each and all of these imaginary particles, when carefully considered, will be found no less to need explanation than do the phenomena they are called on to explain. By making use of such conceptions the difficulty as regards vital phenomena is simply pushed a step backwards. Such efforts at explanation are all necessarily vain because they attempt what is simply improbable. However much we may minimise or subdivide such supposed material elements, the same difficulty will ever recur. In the same way as that in which, when we seek to explain the physiology of an organism by the functions of its cells, each cell, so considered, becomes but an organism itself, "but small." So each of the imagined particles above referred to may be said to be practically enlarged into a "cell," the functions of a cell being so largely attributed to it. This attribution is a necessary one on the hypothesis of the above-named writers, since the mere juxtaposition of particles devoid of vital properties could never, it is evident, account for vital phenomena, such as growth and reproduction, to say nothing of sensation and reflex-consciousness.

However we may play with such images by the aid of a subtle and fertile imagination, the same inevitable and insoluble difficulty will ever recur. Indeed the most fertile producer of imaginary biological hypotheses of our own day (Professor Weismann) has in effect distinctly admitted this in declaring that so long as we know practically nothing about *forces* which act among the particles he terms "biophors," they cannot afford us what he regards as an explanation of vital phenomena. If we choose we may, of course, decline to seek for such explanation of those phenomena; but, if we yield to that impulse of our nature which impels us in search of causes, then we shall be compelled to have recourse to some radically different conception, and a conception which many persons find it difficult to conceive of. In the various activities commonly called "vital," we can perceive various parts of an organism under successively different conditions. But the activities themselves, whatever may be their nature, are not also mate-

¹ Such, *e.g.*, as biophors, gemmules, plastrules, micelli, inotagmata, idiosoms, plasms, etc., etc.

rial substances, and are utterly and forever imperceptible to our senses. If they are not material substances then their nature must be "immaterial," and by that fact they are entities which are absolutely unimaginable. For we can never imagine anything save what as a whole, or in its constituent parts, has been for us an object of sensuous experience.

Weismann's "biophors," and the particles supposed to exist by other biologists, are terms for mental images of material particles which differ only from bodies perceptible to the senses, because they are supposed to be of such exceedingly minute size. They are, therefore, necessarily incapable of serving us as means to present any immaterial energy to us, and the use of them to explain any vital phenomena is equivalent to an attempt to make imaginary representations of things "perceptible to the senses" serve as representations of things "imperceptible to the senses," which is manifestly an absurd attempt.

But the essential irrationality of this process passes, often unnoticed, because reiterated attempts to imagine an immense multiplication and complication of minute parts and their motions tends so to fatigue the mind as to make some persons think that by having their imagination thus overruled by a complication of images they had really attained to a satisfactory explanation.

What then is this radically different conception which is for us the only satisfactory one?

Each living creature is a unity which is yet duplex—a unity of visible material and a unity of invisible energy. In one way it might be said to possess a *body* and a *psyche* or "soul," but that, so to speak, would seem to imperil its absolute living unity. But it is a unity which is composite in so far as it has arisen from two factors; just as water is a unity which has arisen by the *union* (not the addition) of two factors—oxygen and hydrogen. These factors no longer exist side by side within it. Neither exists the water alone—possessing however the potentiality of resolution (not division) into the two elements whence it arose. But as no two plant substances can be identical in nature and energy, and as elements with different natures and energies must act with different effects, so we must conclude that in their union to produce water each element must have had some different effect upon the result.

Also, since their energies must have been different in force and activity, one of the two must have been more vigorous and active than the other. It thus becomes conceivable (though not imaginable) how in the coming of a new creature into being, from the uni-

fication of a certain mass of matter into a certain definite kind of energy, there may be, in its complete subsequent unity, some characteristics resulting from one of its sources of unity, and the other from the other, and also it may well be that one of its sources of unity may be active, dominant and equalative, as to its effects, rather than the other relatively passive. According to the old comparison of Aristotle, a piece of wax stamped with a definite impress is an individual thing. Yet the figure it bears is ideally distinguishable from the material substance which bears that impress. Judging by observations of animals, and by analogy (as we shall see later) of these cases, it is the immaterial factor of the animal unity which is the immanent principle of individuation and the active agent in its development, nourishment, growth, reproduction and sensitivity. Thus understood, it is the soul which makes the living organism what it is, though it have no actual existence apart from the material body it conforms and vivifies. As the German philosopher Wundt has said: "The psychical life is not the product of the bodily organism, but the bodily organism is rather a psychical creation." We have no shadow of evidence to lead us to suppose that in any organism more than one immaterial principle of individuation has coexisted. Therefore to it has been due every vital action of an organism, even the lower organic processes which not only pass unnoticed but are quite incapable of being felt. Thus if when we contemplate any living animal—such as a dog—we regard its material organism as composing it exclusively, we fall into the greatest of mistakes. We cannot say that the dog's soulless body or its soul constitutes the dog; for, as long as it *lives*, not only is there no body absolutely, but no soul absolutely. Nevertheless, if we are forced to use an inadequate expression, it would be much less incorrect to say that the soul has made, maintains, and is the dog, rather than that its mere body has been and is thus influential. Of course, immediately after death there is a mere body and there is no soul. What has resulted—as regards the soul—when the bifold unity has come to an end, we have no evidence to show, nor any clear analogy to guide us. Although no certain reply can, so far as I know, be given to this question, help towards its solution would be obtained could we be certain as to the true objective relation in which the intelligence of the higher animals stands to that of humanity. That they have a ready apprehension of much of the world surrounding them is unquestionable, but "do these animals perceive relations?" This is, in my opinion, the crucial question of comparative psychology. I am profoundly convinced that all the or-

dinary activities of animals can be explained without attributing to them any such power, and Professor Lloyd Morgan, who has paid so much attention to this problem, has arrived at the same conclusion in his "Introduction to Comparative Psychology." He relates many interesting experiments which he performed in order to convince himself on this subject. For three days he tried to make a fox-terrier bring a stick through a railing wherein one rail was wanting, leaving an aperture of about a foot. At the end of his many trials on the first day, the dog only succeeded (after repeated trials and coaxings) in pushing his way through, after many abortive attempts, by holding his head on one side. The second day ended in complete failure. On the third day he had not in the least improved in bringing the stick through, but had learnt to shirk the difficulty by running around the railings. After some weeks the experiment was repeated with no better results. On a subsequent occasion his master prepared a short stick with a crook at one end. This caught in the rail, and, after many attempts, the dog dropped it. He was then induced to take it by one end and drag it after him, so that it might catch by the crook at the other end; he then tugged at it with energy as ridiculous as fruitless. The experimenter tried to show the dog how the difficulty could be overcome. But each time the crook caught he pulled it with all his strength. At length he seized the crook itself, and with a wrench broke it off. A chance passer-by thereupon made the sapient remark: "Clever dog that, Sir; he knows where the hitch do lie!"

The result of this and many similar experiments was to convince Mr. Lloyd Morgan that the dog's method consisted simply of sensuous experience, and not of any perception of relations.

As to the question, "Can animals reason?" the answer must depend upon what is meant by reason, and the difficulty in estimating the reasoning powers of animals, is in most cases due to the ignorance of observers with respect to their own. As the author referred to shrewdly remarks: "The psychologist is apt sometimes to smile when after the recital, probably in the correspondence columns of a newspaper, of some anecdote of animal intelligence, the writer exclaims, 'If this is not reason, I do not know what reason is.' As, however, in such cases the writer has himself suggested the alternative, there is, perhaps, no discourtesy on the part of the psychologist in accepting it."

I have so fully laid down in my work "On Truth," and also in the pages of this REVIEW, the distinction which exists between our higher and our lower faculties, that I need not take up space here by a description of the characteristics of the human rational faculty.

But does the absence in animals of reasoning properly so called, of a perception of relations as such, and of articulate, intelligent speech constitute a necessary and absolute breach of continuity in the process of evolution? And here we may usefully revert to a brief consideration of the inorganic world in words presented to us by Mr. L. Morgan:¹ "If," he says, "we make a heavily saturated solution of chloride of lead in hot water, and set the solution on one side to cool, we shall see, after a while, that myriads of minute acidular crystals of chloride of lead make their appearance and sink to the bottom of the vessel in which the solution is contained. Here is a simple case of development or evolution. Let us take note of some of the features it discloses. In the first place, the crystals have a definite geometrical form, exhibit differential expansion under the influence of heat, and possess peculiar optical and electrical properties. In a word, the crystals are the result of a selective synthesis, special in its nature and determinate in its products. Secondly, this selective synthesis can only manifest itself under appropriate environing conditions. . . . Thirdly, if we trace backward the evolution of one of these crystals, we reach a point—that at which the crystal began to form as such—where there is apparent break of continuity; by which I mean, not a gap or hiatus in the ascending line of development, but a point of new departure."

This brings us to the great point, which concerns us here, Are these true and absolute breaches of continuity in psychical evolution? As to this our author declares, "that the step from consciousness,² or sense-experience, to reflection and thought, involves such a new departure. The curve of the development of sense-experience and intelligence pursues a smooth upward course, but when the perception of relations is introduced there is a new departure. The curve takes a wholly new direction and sweeps up to the highest products of rational thought."

He also gives in his paper a diagram representing the curve of sense-experience, from which another curve diverges, at a sharp angle and in an opposite direction, thus representing the first introduction of the process of reflection. He intends these diverging lines to denote graphically the difference between the lower animals and man, and plainly declares, "we may say that there is a breach of continuity of development at this stage of evolution analogous to the breach of continuity between the inorganic and organic phases of development. This is the view to which I myself incline.

¹ P. 234.

² As to this term, see my *On Truth*, pp. 189, 219 and 354.

It is, indeed, refreshing after the large amount of absurdity which has been published during the past generation on this subject, to meet with a competent naturalist so coinciding in judgment with the unprejudiced mind of Aristotle. According to this modern author man is the only animal capable of turning the mind back to examine its present experience, and its anterior experiences, of apprehending relations as relations, and gifted with self-consciousness and the power of ratiocination. Surely it is difficult to exaggerate the difference which must exist between a being capable of all this and one not so capable! Yet this difference is by no means all the difference between animals and man. Coinciding with this exceptional power of perceiving relations is that of appreciating "goodness" as such. Moreover, at the root of all these higher faculties lies the power of abstraction, through which the human intellect is able to apprehend absolute, necessary and universal truths, such as those expressed by the law of causation and those primary truths which constitute the foundation of all science and which need no proof, being clearly evident in and by themselves. A nature possessing such powers must surely be different *in kind* from one which does not possess them, and the former, as we have so often contended, could never have been evolved from the latter.

Nevertheless it is especially desirable that we should not be led into exaggeration, and declare that to be necessary and evident which is neither the one nor the other. Now it is certain that every man and woman, however high may be the intellectual eminence to which he or she may have attained, had at one time no perceptible intellect at all. Not only is such the case with every human embryo before birth, but for some time after birth it can hardly be said to have even distinct sense-perceptions, while it takes years for any real development of the intellect. Yet that intellect was latent from the first. The nature of the infant both before and after birth is such that normally it has become manifestly intellectual when all the suitable conditions of favoring environment have lasted long enough. It may therefore be asked, and it has been often asked: "If intellect though imperceptible is yet latent and apt for evolution in the human embryo and infant, why may it not also be latent and apt for evolution in the higher animals—the dog and the ape?" "May not the only reason why such animals do not manifest intellect be because their lives come to an end without their having attained the requisite internal and external conditions needful for its manifestation; as would be the case with every human infant that did not live for more than a year?"

Now, certainly, we cannot affirm it to be evident that the pres-

ence of such a latent intellectual nature in animals is impossible, and if it is not only possible but also actual, then there is no reason we can see why the human intellect should not, like the human body, have been evolved from the lower animals.

Certainly, the absence of latent, true intelligence in the nature of animals is not a necessary truth absolutely evident; but to us it appears in the highest degree improbable that a countless multitude of creatures should have come into being, all destined inevitably to perish without attaining to the exercise of the full powers of their nature, just as infants and idiots may, by exception, similarly perish. We cannot, then, affirm the universality of this difference of kind to be absolutely evident, though there is a mass of evidence which renders the latent and potential intellectuality of animals to be in the highest degree improbable.

But, however lofty and aloof from mere animal psychosis power of the human intellect may be, there is one point wherein men and animals are at one. They are at one in that each of them possesses but a single and individual immaterial energy operating in all their vital functions from mere nutrition to the sublimest speculation. There is no evidence whatever that a living man consists of "body and soul"—as Descartes taught. We have no experience of any "soul" possessed by us or any activity not that of the body, any more than we have any experience of any "body" possessed by us which is separate from the vital activity which animates it. Thus every man and woman, like every animal and plant, is a material unity with (so to speak) two agents formed of the absolute union of matter with an immaterial energy of a separate kind which gives to that individual mass of matter its generic, its specific and its individual characteristics and constitutes the most absolutely essential portion of its being. And as we have before urged, the immaterial energy is constitutive of even inorganic bodies.

By the admission that their active immaterial energies (the "forms" of Aristotle) of diverse ranks and orders, which, by absolute coalescence with different portions and qualities of matter, constitute all the substances known to us, from hydrogen or carbon to the philosopher who experiments with them, the phenomena of the universe may be, at least, intelligently apprehended. Thus the breaches of continuity which show themselves between the non-living and the living, between the merely living and the sentient, and between the merely sentient and the intellectual, can be, to a certain extent, understood. So also can the defects and limitations of our faculties, even the highest kinds of

which need for their efficient support and activity the merely animal powers of the lower part of our nature, such as sensation, imagination, sense-perception, and, together with those, sensuous reminiscence and inference. So also are the imperfections of the psychical powers of animals explicable as due to the want, in them, of that higher kind of principle, or "form," which enables us to look back and consciously recognize relations as relation, our own existence, and abstract truths, both necessary and universal, and to become possessed of ethical perceptions. No distinct object in the world, whether mineral, vegetable, animal or rational, is other than a unity in itself; yet no such object is material only, but owes its innate capacities, and its active powers, to the principle which forms and constitutes it what it is. This conception, though so long familiar to the most acute intellects this world has known, it is impossible adequately to express, because, speak as we may, our words will always suggest to the imagination that "matters" and "forms" are the separate, extended, entities existing side by side in each creature, instead of two unextended entities which together constitute that creature a unity in itself. The conception may be made easier, strange to say, by some fashionable "monistic" theories of the day. Thus, according to them, as well as according to the philosophy of Aristotle, every chemical transformation, every product of decay, death and dissolution, all the changes of embryonic developments, and all the various originations of new species, are one and all regarded as simultaneous changes in successively evolved unities, each with its aspects of "matter" and "form" respectively. Neither of these ever exists separately, according to either of these systems, the corruption of one substance and the formation of others being absolutely synchronous, though we are utterly unable to imagine such simultaneity.

As to the question of what becomes of animals when they have ceased to live, that must depend on the essential nature of that individuating and dominating energy which makes each creature that which in fact it is, whether it is essentially similar to that of man, though ever hindered by its environment from making its intellectuality manifest, or whether it is different in kind and of an altogether inferior nature.

Let us, then, briefly glance at the most remarkable characteristics of the highest energy which man possesses—the energy which enables him to attain to science. "Science" is the highest and most certain knowledge attainable, and that knowledge is divisible into three categories :

A. The most certain of all knowledge is that which is seen to be absolutely, universally, and necessarily true—as, *e.g.*, the “principle of contradiction,” “nothing can come into being without a cause,” etc.

B. Most certain also is that which is seen necessarily to follow as a consequence from premisses the truth of which is certain. If we cannot absolutely depend on such deductions, we can infer nothing, and so all reasoning, and therefore all science, is impossible.

C. The most certain fact perceived by us is the fact of our personal existence, the continuance of which is made known to us by consciousness aided by memory—the latter enabling us to be as certain with respect to certain events of our past as we are of our actual present experience.

And reflection furnishes us with a knowledge of many most important and significant truths as to the nature of the human soul, by pondering over its most remarkable activities.

The force energizing in a man's own consciousness he knows to be a continuously subsisting principle, conscious of successive objects and events, and capable of holding them before it in one conception as members of a series every part of which it transcends. Such a principle, aware of the trends and directions of its own intellectual activities, consciously present to them and capable of reviewing its own status and external objects and events in various orders, cannot itself be multitudinous, but must be as much a unity as possible—that is a simple unity. Moreover, this principle, as one which apprehends not only absolute, necessary and universal truth, but also hypothetical and possible truths, must be something altogether different from what we apprehend as matter and merely physical force. If, then, we know (as we certainly do know) material bodies and physical forces at all, it is *absolutely certain* that this intellectual persistent principle is neither one nor the other, but stands out in the strongest contrast with both. Therefore (to return once more to a matter already stated, but which can hardly be too much written on) if we know—as, of course, we do—that we have material bodies, we see for certain that our own being is a bifold unity.

It is a unity, for we perceive it is as much the “I” who feels, moves, grows or decays, as it is the “I” who thinks. We are certain, indeed, as to the existence of our body, but it is *absolutely impossible* for us to really doubt the existence of our self-conscious, thinking principle, or that we are one being—one body and one immaterial principle forming an absolute unity possessing two

sets of faculties. It is thus material and physical in one aspect, immaterial and intelligent in the other aspect. No certainty which we can attain to above any external object can be nearly so certain as this certainty we have concerning our own being—first, and above all, as to the immaterial, dynamic aspect of our being; and secondly, as to its material and physical aspect. This is the primary and highest truth of physical science.

What, then, when death reduces our active energizing being to a mere heap of relatively inert matter so far as our senses can perceive? Is there, apart from all we learn through revelation, any substantial energy surviving? Is there any still existing soul?

Surely, as we have before urged,¹ when once we are convinced of the truth of Theism, confidence in a future life naturally follows. Moreover, though we cannot affirm, apart from this, that our immortality is a belief which is plainly and evidently certain, it is none the less reasonable and congruous, and most assuredly there is no evident truth which contradicts it. It is remarkable and congruous when we remember what is the nature of that intellectual principle within us, the power and faculties of which we have just considered. That intellectual principle, if it survives dissolution, no longer possesses apart from the body any means (so far as we can tell) whereby it can make its continued existence known to the senses of those who still live, and who therefore have no means of knowing anything more by the help and activity of their organs of sense.

There is thus abundant ground for our confidence in a future life as regards man. As regards animals, if they, or some or any of them possess an immaterial principle of individuation essentially similar in nature to the human soul, then surely the souls of such animals would also survive the death of the body. But as to how this may be we know nothing, and revelation is silent. Whether in their case we may conceive of any process of metempsychosis, and possibly in some cases of a process of development in the formation of fresh living organisms, and so of new kinds and species, we can gain no real knowledge, and must remain contented with mere speculation and with hypotheses incapable of verification.

But this Aristotelian conception of matter and form as applied to the intellectual being of man carries with it some convictions which we think are not only very important but very consoling.

¹ See *On Truth*, pp. 487-491.

If the dog we love is the visible expression of an invisible intangible energy which is the dominant side of the living animal unity, the organization, actions and emotions of which are the creature's expression and manifestation, the same may be said of the living energy or soul of man, as in forming and constituting that at once material and immaterial entity of which it may be said to be the very essence.

That the soul of our fellow-creatures, of the men and women we like or dislike, should be imperceptible to us in and by itself is no wonder, since during the whole of life it has no existence in and by itself. Nevertheless, being as it is the dominating energy of its own compound unity, it becomes known to us through the animated body it informs. That body by its varied movements reveals it to us. In the glance of the eye, whether that glance denotes love or hatred, in the smile of affection, the sneer of contempt, the scowl of abhorrence ; in the gesture of hand which it knows or repels ; in the carriage of the neck and head, and whether the latter be proudly held aloof or caressingly approximated, it is immaterial energy, or soul, which thus reveals itself, and when we think we admire or abominate the material body we can see and touch, it is the soul thus revealed which in reality attracts or repels us. That marvellous energy, which to our senses is necessarily imperceptible, reveals itself, though we may have no suspicion that such is the case, to the human being who thus feels himself attracted or repelled. It does so because the human being who is thus influenced possesses a nature essentially similar in its constitution, so that the sympathy or repulsion so often mysteriously arising between soul and soul becomes thus less difficult to understand.

Such being the relations which may arise between living men and women here and now, what may we say with regard to the soul as it exists separated from the body ?

It is common enough for persons to think they know a great deal about the soul after death. In fact, however, reason tells us hardly anything, while with respect to the *anima separata*, revelation tells us little indeed, all important as that little may be.

We cannot in the least imagine what the separated soul may be, nor what its conditions or the means and methods of its activity. The only "soul" of which we have experience—our own soul and those of other men and women—is incapable of thought without mental images—sensuous imaginations—and it cannot enjoy them without a sufficiently nourished and active brain, and it would never have formed them save by the use of the various organs of

special sense, the eye, the ear, etc. How, therefore, the soul can act intelligently without a brain and without sensuous imaginations, we cannot think.

That it can learn material things without sense-organs is incomprehensible; the thought that it should have a power of apprehending immaterial entities like itself—its own and other souls—seems less difficult for us to conceive of.

But we are apt not to notice how great is our ignorance with respect to matters of daily experience and ordinary knowledge, the, at least relative, validity of which, and its enormous importance, no one for a moment questions.

It is most true that we cannot understand *how* the soul can reason and imagine *without* a brain and organs of sense, but who understands how the soul can imagine and reason *with* them?

What is more mysterious than our perception of objects about us and their relations to us and to each other; that with some such we must become acquainted or cease to live? Surely then, however ignorant we may be as to the energies, and their modes, of the *anima separata*, we may at least feel quite certain that there is no impossibility, so far as we can see, in the soul, and by itself, being able to apprehend and appreciate other souls in a similar condition to itself.

If this reasoning is valid (and no friend we have consulted has been able to find a flaw in it), a very important and consolatory reflection follows.

It has been urged that even if a future life was a certainty, it would never give us that happiness for which all affectionate natures crave—the happiness of seeing and loving once more, beyond the grave, those beloved ones we have cherished on earth; to meet whom again in a future and happier existence is one of the prospects held out to us in heaven.

The future existence of the just who for thousands of years have done their best here below can never, it is urged, afford such a happiness, owing to the following considerations. The representations drawn out as objections have been such as the following:¹

(1) A mother is in an agony of grief at the loss of her little girl. All her infantile winning ways, her smiles and tears, the incipient prattle of her talk, rise vividly to the mother's memory, and she tenderly dwells on the hope assured to her that in another and a better world her beloved little one will be restored to her; but it is her "little one" on which her fancy dwells so fondly that

¹ Urged, I think, in a novel, entitled *An African Farm*.

she desires to see again—not an altogether different being—whether it be a mere intangible, invisible spiritual being, such as she is utterly incapable to imagine the existence of, or even a full-grown woman in the place of the child she has lost. If it can be but one or other of these, then the future happiness her heart desires is forever denied her.

Again, let us imagine an affectionate son by the bedside of his aged and dying mother. During the twenty years he can remember her she has always been to him an old woman. As he has seen her gradual decay as senility has crept upon her, the tenderness of his affection for her has steadily increased. He loves her white hair and wrinkled face, her thin and withered hands, and the sound of a voice the tones of which speak of the many years which have crowned her honored age. As he mourns for his old mother when the end has come, a pious hope that they may meet once more naturally arises within him. But that hope and the wish to which it gives rise are that he may see his mother in very truth as he has known and loved her. His desire is to see her and not another. If that cannot be, his wish is vain, and if he is a man interested in such inquiries and speculations, he will recognize the futility of his vain hope and feel corresponding distress and discouragement.

Finally, if in the heyday of ripe youth just acquired the lover's anticipations are blighted by the sudden death of the betrothed maiden of his choice, it may be that he finds some comfort in his sore distress in the hope of a future union after his death with her whom he loved so tenderly. As he allows this aspiration to fill his mind and occupy his thoughts, it is inevitable that his imagination should call up before his mind's eye a mental picture of the loved one in the days of their brief but happy past. He sees the graceful outline of her form, her slender neck, her well-turned arm. He seems to clasp her hand again, and as she turns to him her face with its bright living eyes, he notes its sweet smile and how her head is clothed with its abundant tresses of his favorite hue. As he has known her so, and not otherwise, does he desire to behold her once more. No immaterial intelligence, no body made mature and other than this he so well knew can possibly seem capable of adequately responding to his aspirations. It may not unlikely seem to him that the holding out a hope of future reunion, but not with her he had known and as he knew her, was little else than an empty promise, if not a bitter mockery.

Such considerations as these may well, until they have been deeply pondered over, seem to deprive the conception of a future of all value, if not of all reasonable probability.

And yet these reflections which were earlier brought forward in this paper, may well, it seems to me, from the point of view of pure and simple reason only, both justify our hope of future union with those we love and also give to that hope a fully satisfying character.

For, bearing in mind the inconceivability for us of how the compound unity of soul and body enables us to perceive our fellow-creatures, of like compound nature, now, and the non-existence of any evidence that the soul in its simplicity (when it has become separated from its bodily union) cannot hereafter apprehend other souls like itself, a more important and consolatory consequence follows. For we have recognized the fact that in the complex unity of creatures (men and animals) during bodily life it is the immaterial principle which is determining, dominant, active and is indeed the living creature (man or animal) *par excellence* as compared with that in it which our senses can perceive—as compared with the body. We recognize that it is at once the source and the explanation of those powerful and often sudden attractions felt by one human being for another. If then, the soul in its disembodied condition can perceive and apprehend other souls similarly conditioned, it must be able to perceive the very essence of the soul thus made known. If it can thus recognize a loved one once lost, it must perceive that which constituted that being its very self; that which penetrating as it were through the corporeal being recognized by the senses had given to that corporeal being its special charm and those several characters upon which not our senses, but our intellect and our higher emotions, through the means or agency of our senses, had dwelt with friendship, it may have been with love, it may have been with rapture. Is it credible that a being thus able to apprehend directly that which gave the loved material form its very charm should grieve for, or desire to perceive again, those mere material envelopes, that imperfectly developed, or faded, or soon fading, fleshy constituent of the being whose soul it is which has been really prized and loved, although it may have been quite unknowingly.

It is, indeed, constantly apprehended unknowingly or altogether ignored, the many not recognizing that in the material conditions—the bodily organism—appreciable by sight and touch, there is revealed to the intellect that which is altogether beyond sense, though it is only by the medium of sense-impression that it can ever come to be known to living human beings.

How far-reaching, then, are the results, if we have judged them rightly, of the sagacious speculations of the Macedonian sage

(who lived in the fourth century before Christ) with respect to matter and form and the essential natures of living creatures. Little could he have suspected the utility to tender, pious human sentiment with regard to a future life, of views emitted by him solely in his efforts how best to understand and explain the facts and phenomena of animated nature.

I have purposely refrained, in the present paper, from putting forward any consideration, or urging any arguments which need for their support anything more than the light of reason un-supplemented by revelation. And this light carries us far, and the truths revealed by it to the tutor of Alexander the Great appear all that, in the main, will be attained by vision in the ages yet to come, since nothing essentially valuable has been discovered by any of those thinkers who deserted the peripatetic philosophy at the epoch of the renaissance. True indeed, I believe, were the words addressed to me, when but a lad, by that most eminent anatomist, the late Sir Richard Owen. He said, "I do not think that in philosophy the human mind will ever get much beyond Aristotle." And an augmented appreciation of, and a more or less marked return to, the peripatetic philosophy are amongst the most noticeable phenomena of our day. My valued friend, Mgr. Mercier, Director of the Superior Institute of Philosophy at the University of Louvain,¹ has quite recently expressed his confidence in the growth of this revival and shows how admirably it responds to the needs of modern science, especially that of physiological psychology, with respect to which he quotes² the following very remarkable words of the founder of the Leipzig laboratory: "Les résultats de mes travaux, dit Wundt, ne cadrent ni avec l'hypothèse matérialiste, ni avec le dualisme, platonicien ou cartésien; seul l'animisme aristotélien, qui rattache la psychologie à la biologie, se dégage, comme conclusion métaphysique plausible, de la psychologie expérimentale."

Difficult, nay impossible, it is indeed to imagine the union of matter and form in each living organism, to conceive how they can come together and the transition from anterior unions to the one which we may be considering. But how full is nature of mysteries! What a startling revelation of the hidden nature of bodies, and of the imperfection of common notions concerning them, has been the discovery of the Röntgen rays! Let them teach us to distrust first impressions and never to reject concep-

¹ See his *Origines de la Psychologie Contemporaine*, J. Alcan, Paris.

² P. 455.

tions recommended to us by the highest philosophy yet attained, on account of difficulties we may experience in trying to bring them home to an imagination which, like our own, is bound down by the phenomena of sense.

ST. GEORGE MIVART.

SAVONAROLA.

IN the study of a Dominican Father in Vienna there hung, not so many years ago, three Florentine pictures—the execution of Girolamo Savonarola on the Piazza Signoria, the Crucifixion scene, copied from Fra Angelico's in the chapter-room of the Convent of San Marco, and an engraving of the Last Judgment painted by the same artist for the Camaldolese Church of the Angels. One day a friend entered the apartment, and standing before this group of pictures remarked: "What a curious combination you have here! And yet, one not without its significance. The first, the execution of Savonarola, is the judgment of man on man; the second, the Crucifixion of Christ, expresses the judgment of man on God; the third, the Last Judgment, follows well upon the other two, for it represents the judgment of God on man—on man's judgment. By it everything will be set aright and will be shown in the clear certain light of its fixed and proper value."

And so it will be with Savonarola. Not until then, we dare say, with Pius VII., will his remarkable stature be shown in its true proportions. Meanwhile men contend among themselves, and such is the magic of his name that at its mere mention opposing armies are conjured up, as it were, to throw themselves headlong into the lists of champion or antagonist. Perhaps no other character in the world's history has been the occasion of so much conflict of opinion as this poor friar who, clad in the coarse gown of serge, walked amid the splendor and effeminacy of luxurious Florence, fearless, terrible, and in morals far, far above reproach. Even to-day, though four hundred years have passed since his death, feeling runs just as high for and against him. Germany, led by the perhaps hypercritical Pastor, brands him a fanatic, a sort of monstrosity begotten by an unbridled zeal and an over-

weening pride. Italy, following the lines of Capecelatro, Luotto and Ferretti, places the martyr's palm in his hand and breathes his name with all the awe and reverence that the mention of St. Francis, St. Philip Neri, or St. Catherine of Sienna engenders. Protestants like to hold with the exquisite and world-wise Dean Farrar that the Prior of San Marco was in word and deed a harbinger of the Reformation. Catholics laugh this idea to scorn, remembering how humbly and gratefully he received the plenary indulgence "in articulo mortis" conferred on him by the papal commissary, even on his way to the scaffold.

And so this diversity will run on even to the end. But between these two extremes there is a middle ground that offers a secure foothold from which the great figure may be viewed with all its lights and shadows full upon it. Faults there were in Savonarola's make-up. It were the sheerest folly to dispute this. He was a man and not an angel. But no one who brings to the study of his character an open mind free from all prejudice can fail to receive the conviction that he was a man more sinned against than sinning. He was born into troublous times. It was an age marked by all the characteristics of unrest, looseness and confusion that distinguish periods of transition. The world was passing out of the severer cycles of the middle age into the free, highly-colored epoch of the Renaissance. There were inventions and discoveries that were far-reaching in their influence. The conservative mind of the past became unchecked. The future opened out in limitless possibilities. The present was stirred to its depths by a new spirit that walked abroad and took on itself the posture and mien of classic antiquity. It was not indeed a new spirit. It was the old one which had vanished into thin air, as the sweet and wholesome breath of Christianity had begun to play upon the art and literature of Greece and Rome. For many years it had ceased to be or at least it lay numb, impotent, death-like. But now, somehow it had shaken off its torpor and, quickened again into life, began to exert its magic influence. It brought much, very much, that was good, but, alas! much also that was bad. While the movement remained subject, or at least was guided by the benign and wise direction of the Church, it was productive of results which even in this our day are an inspiration and a stimulus to the artistic soul. This was the Christian, the true, re-birth of art and letters which received its first impulse from such mighty men as Dante and Petrarch. But it had its checks and balances, as indeed all well-regulated movements must have. Under these safeguards artists and men of letters soon

began to chafe, and it was not long before all restraint was brushed aside in order, as they claimed, to allow their genius the luxury of an unfettered flight. This flight it took, but in the mad frenzy of its soaring it broke its pinions and fell, and lay like a huge carrion upon the fair land of Italy. Florence most of all seemed infected with its noxiousness. The unclean writings of Valla, Poggio, and Beccadelli were read everywhere.

So foul and shameless were they that the moral sensibilities of an average American of this century, though he be without the least religion, would be inexpressibly shocked by their perusal. Yet in Florence, at that time, they were learned and conned by rote, declaimed on the streets into the very ears of young girls, lisped by children and applauded by those who should have been the guardians of virtue and the chastisers of vice.

Of the Republican character of Florence there was little left. The Medici, gifted with remarkable shrewdness, with an insatiable ambition and with boundless wealth, had succeeded in bringing into their hands all the reins of government. They had studied the philosophy of history well, and, knowing that a debauched people is one easy to control, they took the upper hand in spreading the poison of immorality, gave to their subjects absolute freedom in the indulgence of their passions, and even encouraged a sort of emulation among them as to who could be the most shameless of the shameless. Nay, they walked before them in this way of licentiousness and excess, and wrote carnival songs couched in words that ought to bring a blush of shame to the cheek of the lewdest. But they forgot that, while it is true that a debauched people is one easy to control, such a people is always hurrying on to its utter ruin, and when it falls it drags its princes with it into the abyss.

In the midst of this state of affairs Savonarola came to Florence. He was just thirty years of age. Seven of these years had he spent in the austerities of Dominican life—in praying, in fasting, in study. The sense of the hollowness of all earthly things, which he had at first felt in all its fulness, when, as a youth of twenty-two summers, he heard the penitential sermon of the Augustinian monk at Faenza, had not abated under this régime. On the contrary, it had grown stronger and stronger, as, buried in the silence of the cloister, he gave himself up to the contemplation of heavenly things and the study of his beloved St. Thomas. As his detachment from earthly things grew stronger and stronger his horror of sin became the more intense. Into the peace and quietness of his cell, at St. Mark's, the ribald songs and the ob-

scene jests and the drunken clamors of Florentines obtruded themselves and jarred harshly on the calm of the cloistral atmosphere, an atmosphere still sanctified by the memory of St. Antoninus. From the walls of all the cells of the convent the heavenly figures of Fra Angelico's saints preached in voiceless but irresistible eloquence of the beauty and happiness of the world to come, and of the vanity and danger of that life with which the Florentines were dulling the edge of their better sensibilities. His perfect observance of the rule, his austerities, his gentle manners, his studious habits, all won for him the love and esteem of his fellow-religious. But now the apostolic faith of Dominican life began to attract him. His great soul burned within him as he reflected upon the depths of immorality into which Florence had sunk. He felt within him the stirrings of a mighty power; and he went forth, and from the pulpit of San Lorenzo preached his first sermon against the unbridled worship of Pagan ideals in literature and art, against the indecency and shamelessness so rampant that it befouled the very air of the city. Everywhere were godlessness, sin and corruption, and against this dark and forbidding background Savonarola's striking figure was thrown into bold relief.

He preached earnestly, untiringly, almost fiercely, but success attended not his efforts. The very fire of his delivery told against him. It seemed overdrawn, and, of course, his sharp invective, his hasty and graceless gestures and his Lombard accent were not after the manner which alone was pleasing to the polished Florentines. But he was not disheartened. With renewed energy he devoted himself to the study of Scripture, especially to the Prophets in the Old Testament and to the Apocalypse in the New. From these he hoped to borrow figures that would appal or encourage, and modes of speech that would rivet the attention of his hearers.

Meanwhile he preached in other places, but it was not until the year 1490 that he was again heard in Florence. On the first of August of that year he delivered from the pulpit of St. Mark's an exposition of the Apocalypse which was overwhelmingly successful. He had caught the popular favor, and at last the hour of his strength and influence had struck. On every tongue was his name, and so vast were the crowds that thronged to hear him that the church of St. Mark's was found too small to hold them, and the great cathedral had to be secured. Even this spacious edifice proved inadequate, and many tribunals had to be erected to accommodate the multitude that assembled to hear him. Savonarola

was in an ecstasy of delight. Not indeed on account of the consciousness that he had become the hero of the hour, the fashion of the fastidious, but because he felt that the opportunity for which he had long been praying, and for which he had been preparing himself by study and meditation and fasting, was now at hand. Now that he had secured a hearing, he could show his townsmen the evil of the ways they were treading, the wanton recklessness with which they were endangering the salvation of their immortal souls, and the awful chastisement which a just God must ere long send down upon their offending heads.

During the Lent of the following year, 1491, he preached at the Cathedral a series of sermons that held his hearers spellbound. Disdaining all the embellishments of rhetoric, he poured out his soul in simple, forceful words, denouncing the sin and the shame in which their lives were spent, and foreshadowing with the mien of a prophet, if not with the mission of one, their impending destruction. Fear seized upon his hearers, and often his preaching was interrupted by the wailing and sobbing of those in whose breasts he had enkindled the cleansing flames of penitence. He was no respecter of persons. All who deserved it felt the lash of his bitter words. Neither Prince nor Pope was spared. And so he continued in his great apostolate of reform, leading sinners from the paths of vice, turning their faces to God and filling their hearts with a desire for things eternal. Gradually they became weaned from their old corrupt tastes, and, as an earnest of their eagerness to lead clean, holy lives, they brought to the Piazza San Marco impure pictures, gorgeous apparel, perfumes, musical instruments, obscene books and all the other vanities that had held them enthralled, and making one vast pile of them set it afire, and as the flames ascended to heaven they sent forth their prayers for strength thereafter to lead lives of holiness and purity, such lives as would accord with the teaching of the zealous friar of St. Mark's. Such was the change that Savonarola wrought in the hearts of the Florentines.

Nor was he less assiduous in bringing about a better state of things in religious houses. Scarcely had he been elected prior of St. Mark's when he set about instituting a thorough reform, and with such success were his efforts crowned that before many months he saw about him in full vigor the beautiful fervor of the Order's earlier years. The charm exercised by the holy friars of St. Mark's was so great that their example was followed by the neighboring convents of Fiesole, Pisa, Prato and Siena, and thus was formed the famous congregation of St. Mark's. Under the

priordship of Savonarola the community of the convent of St. Mark's increased so rapidly that it soon numbered 230 members. Sons of the best families of Florence, men of age and station, scholars, artists, all begged for admission into the Order, and even the Camaldolese of the monastery of the Angels asked for the Dominican habit that they might have the happiness of living under Savonarola's direction. Indeed he had become a power, and his influence was wielded only for the good of his fellow-townsmen. To uplift the morals of the laity and to awaken in the breasts of the clergy a full appreciation of the high estate to which they had been called was the sole purpose of his striving. Commensurately with his influence and power grew the number of his enemies. As they saw their numbers increasing they became emboldened in their determination to silence this sharp-tongued preacher. They were not without good leverage, for in his sermons, as we have seen, he had spared neither Prince nor Pope, and in his vehemence of speech had made utterances which could be used strongly against him. Besides he had become almost hopelessly entangled in the mesh of political confusion. Lorenzo had closed his eyes forever on the gay scene through which he had walked with such magnificence. His son Piero was like his father in love of pomp and power, but had not his gifts of mind nor his diplomatic shrewdness. He was hot-headed, self-willed and sadly lacking in courage. The reign of the Medici was doomed.

In his threats of chastisement, Savonarola had often proclaimed the advent of another Cyrus, who would cross the Alps with his avenging army, and brandishing the sword of God's wrath would bring the Italians to a realization of their godless state, depose the Pope and open a new era of purity and plenty for all the land. As if in verification of his prophecy, Charles VIII., King of the French, came with an army of many thousands across the Alps down into Italy. Naples was his objective-point, and the adjustment of some complications in regard to its throne his aim, but he slighted not other Italian cities that lay by the way. That Savonarola felt himself gifted with a spirit of prophecy no one can deny. His deep study of the prophets of the Old Testament seemed to confirm this opinion of himself, as it certainly gave him a prophetic manner and mode of speech. Now that the Cyrus whose advent he had so often foretold was at the very frontiers of Italy, he seemed to have the corroboration of heaven as to his extraordinary mission. It was not well for him that this coincidence came. It robbed him of his better judgment, and he committed the fatal blunder of making overtures to Charles, and per-

haps even inviting his descent upon Florence. The great end of his life was the amelioration of the political condition of Florence and the purification of its morals. In the invasion of the French army he saw a means to this end, and he hailed it with all the intensity of his intense nature. It was a woful mistake, but not an act of treachery as it has sometimes been stigmatized, for all through the period of reconstruction subsequent to the expulsion of Piero de Medici, it was evident that Savonarola was not laboring for self-advancement, but solely for his countrymen, whom he loved passionately, tenderly. From the mixture of Theocracy and Democracy of which the Florentine government was now composed he had hoped for much for the good of the people. But he was now being brought in direct contact with the Holy See, and that series of acts was inaugurated for which perhaps more than for anything else he has been blamed by posterity. Many enemies he had at Rome, and they were not idle there. The Arrabiati of Florence were in communication with these, and on the 25th of July, 1495, as the first fruits of their united efforts, there came to Savonarola a brief from his holiness, Alexander VI., summoning him to Rome. It was written in a strain of gentleness, almost of paternal solicitude. To this Savonarola replied in a most deferential communication dated July the 31st, in which he admits the authority of the Pontiff, but begs to be excused from making the journey, setting forth as reasons his broken health, the length of the way, the inclemency of the weather and the number of his enemies. Not many weeks after this there came another brief from the Pope addressed to the Franciscan friars of Santa Croce. By this document Savonarola received a command not to preach until he had justified himself in Rome; furthermore, the union of the Tuscan and the Lombard Dominicans was ordered, though the separation of these two provinces had been made by the express command of Alexander himself. Despite Savonarola's entreaties, the Pope persisted in his command forbidding him to preach, but withdrew his order for a union of the two provinces. Savonarola disobeyed this command when, in the following February, he again mounted the pulpit and began a course of Lenten sermons. True, this was done by the positive order of the Signoria, who demanded of him with threats of punishment that he again preach to the people. It was, nevertheless, a flagrant act of disobedience, and cannot be justified. By way of extenuation one might plead the intelligence received from the cardinals of Naples and Perugia to the effect that the Pope had confessed that his command of silence was due to the influence of wicked

men. It is said that when Alexander heard that Savonarola had preached only after having been commanded to do so under penalty by the Signoria, he offered him, in a spirit of conciliation, the cardinal's hat, which, however, was promptly declined.

Affairs went on from bad to worse, with party feeling running high and recrimination following upon recrimination, until on the 12th of May, 1497, Alexander VI. signed the brief of excommunication, which was published on the 18th of June of that year. Promptly did Savonarola declare the excommunication null and void, but he refrained from the exercise of all spiritual function until the following Christmas, when he read three masses and gave Holy Communion to some of his own brethren and to many of the laity. In the following Lent he again preached to the public, and in his sermons strove to justify his conduct by declaring that the excommunication was not of binding force. Exactly upon what ground Savonarola stood in his stout maintenance that the excommunication was invalid has not come down to us. True, we know that he claimed that both the order not to preach and the one commanding the congregation of St. Mark's to unite with the Roman province were against charity and therefore null and void. But it is not unlikely that with his great knowledge of Canon Law he stood upon some more technical ground; such, perhaps, has been recently held by Giovanni Lottini, an Italian Dominican, and which we append for the consideration of our readers.

The last brief of Alexander VI., it will be observed, was merely a declarative one. No sentence of excommunication was fulminated in it, but rather the excommunication of Savonarola was assumed. It was not addressed to him but to a number of religious, directing them to declare to the public that he was in a state of excommunication on account of the transgression of a precept to which a sentence of excommunication (*latæ sententiæ*) was annexed.

Surely he was not excommunicated on the ground of preaching heretical doctrine, for Alexander VI. himself declared to Bonsi, the Florentine orator, that he did not condemn the doctrine of Savonarola.¹ As to his command to come at once to Rome, the reasons given for his failure to do so seemed quite satisfactory to the Pope.² Besides there is nothing said of excommunication or suspension in connection with this. It was given merely in virtue of holy obedience. Note the words of the precept, dated July 25, 1495: "In virtue of holy obedience, we exhort and

¹ Gherardi, p. 209.

² Luotto, ii., *Vere Savonarola*, p. 440.

command you to come to Rome as soon as possible, in order that we may greet you with paternal love and charity."¹ Nor was the injunction to suspend his preaching given under pain of censure.² It appears, therefore, that the supposition that he had incurred excommunication was based on some other transgression. One other remains, and that is his expressed disagreement with the wish of the Pontiff concerning the formation of the Tusco-Roman Congregation ordered in the papal brief, dated November 7, 1496. And it is safe to state that even this charge cannot be brought against him. The words of the brief are as follows: "In virtue of holy obedience, we unconditionally command under pain of excommunication (*latæ sententiæ*), that no person of whatsoever condition, dignity or grade, in no manner, either by himself or by others, directly or indirectly under any pretext whatsoever, shall dare to contradict or place obstacles to these letters."

It is difficult, if not impossible, to show satisfactorily that Savonarola placed obstacles in the way of those letters. That he did not approve of the object is clear, for he stated the fact openly, and his reasons were good. By the command of the Pope had the separation of St. Mark's from the Lombard province been made. Beginning with himself, Savonarola at once inaugurated a reform which soon restored the early fervor of the Order. We have seen how this fervor spread even to other houses and how, under its heavenly influence, the congregation of St. Mark's grew apace in numbers, in holiness and influence. Now that all this had been accomplished he could not desire or even accede to a union with another province the members of which showed no disposition to conform to the observant lives of the members of St. Mark's. The truth stared him in the face that laxity is vastly more infectious than rigor and austerity are enticing. Still he made no decided opposition to the wish of the holy father. He left the matter to the members of the congregation, and when they had unanimously expressed their disinclination to the union, he sent the word to the Pope with a comment that he could not blame them for holding this view of the matter, and that he fully agreed with them. Surely this was not placing an obstacle to the union. If it was, then not only he but all the brethren placed obstacles. And we ask, if all placed obstacles why were not all (*ipso facto*) excommunicated? Why should the incurring of the sentence be confined to Savonarola, when he had offended only as the others had? And surely no one ever yet supposed that any but he in-

¹ Villari, vol. i., p. 104.

² Luotto, p. 606; Gherardi, p. 390.

curred the excommunication. Besides, had he been disposed to place obstacles in the way or to delay or impede the fulfillment of the Pope's desire, a destruction of the brief could have been easily affected. It came to him personally. No one knew that it had been received until he laid its contents before the community. He might have withheld it, and though another would doubtless have been sent, still it would have occasioned a lapse of many weeks, and God only knows what turn events might have taken in those weeks of stirring times. To summarize then, Lottin's holding is this, that the last brief was merely declarative, that it imposed no sentence of excommunication, but presupposed one that had been incurred by the violation of a precept to which excommunication was annexed; that no such precept had been violated by Savonarola, and that consequently he had never been excommunicated.¹

One more charge remains, one which is often brought against Savonarola especially in this our own day. Protestants love to call him a harbinger of the Reformation, and in order to proclaim this to the world in ineffaceable characters, they have placed his figure with Wyckliffe and Huss at the base of the Luther monument at Worms. So thoroughly has this charge been refuted by Father Proctor, the Provincial of the English Dominicans, in his reply to Dean Farrar entitled "Savonarola and the Reformation," and within such easy reach of all does this pamphlet lie, that we shall not now tax the patience of our readers by doing indifferently what has already been done so well.

On the 23d of May of this year of our Lord 1898, it was just 400 years since Savonarola with his two companions was strangled on the Piazza Signoria, his body burned, and his ashes thrown into the Arno. They who did this deed hoped thus to bury his memory in oblivion, but to-day there is not a stranger in Florence to whom the murmuring stream does not tell of the treasure that it holds, nor is there a footfall on the Piazza Signoria that does not linger at the spot where hungry flames once devoured the chaste temple of a mighty soul. From the beginning unto the end his was a life given to God, and when his burning zeal o'erleaped itself, and he fell amid the jeers of those whose best interests he would serve, it surely was not held against him by One who searches all hearts and who knows the inner springs of every act and thought and word.

ALBERT REINHART, O. P.

¹ Il Rosario; Domenica III. di Maggio, 1898.

THE IRISH PATRIOT PRIESTS OF 1798.

THE rigors of persecution for conscience' sake had been relaxed. It was no longer the Ireland of the penal days. The priest-hunter's occupation was gone; the hedge-school philomath was allowed to guide in peace his pupils across the *pons asinorum*.

The Catholics, whom, only forty years previously, when priests were indicted for saying Mass, "the law did not presume to exist in Ireland," were tolerated, even encouraged. For about twenty years (since 1778) their sincere and indefatigable champion in Parliament, Luke Gardiner, Privy Councillor and Colonel of the Dublin Militia, occasionally reinforced by Sir Hercules Langrishe, Henry Grattan, and others, had been pounding the barricades of bigotry in their behalf. For nigh thirty years (since 1770) they had formed committees, headed by their chief prelates, to go up to each viceroy on his arrival, assure him of their devoted loyalty to the British Crown, and entreat certain concessions, which concessions were subsequently fought over by opposite factions in Parliament, who usually wound up by giving them nothing. But now they might go to Mass and send their children to school unmolested; they might vote for members of Parliament and municipal officers, though themselves debarred from sitting in either capacity; and as lawyers they were admitted to the "outer bar." To provide against the danger of foreign ideas and affiliations the British Government built in 1795, at an expense of \$160,000, the Royal College of Maynooth, and endowed it with an annual grant of \$40,000, so that Irish candidates for the Catholic priesthood might be educated at home, on condition of their taking an ironclad oath of allegiance to the Crown of Great Britain.

The wires which caused the explosion of '98 were laid years before it occurred.

A military banditti was launched upon the country, making every town and hamlet an inferno. "Even children were sometimes scourged, sometimes immersed to the lips in water, to extort information from them against their parents, and concealment was punished with death." It was an awful reign of torture and terror.

The first Catholic priest to champion the cause of the persecuted people was the Rev. James Quigley (by some called O'Coigly).

He was the son of a farmer in the county Armagh, and was for some time a student in what is now the Irish College, Paris, which he left, however, on account of some differences with the heads of the establishment. He witnessed the opening scenes of the French Revolution, narrowly escaped being hanged from *la lanterne* as a supposed Royalist French priest, and returned in 1797, an impulsive and patriotic Ulsterman of 35, to Ireland, where it appears he took up his residence at Dundalk. His sympathies were immediately aroused on behalf of the persecuted Catholic peasantry of his native Armagh. Seven thousand of these were expelled from their homes by the rabid Orangemen, instigated by Dublin Castle agents, in 1795, and ordered to go "to hell or Connaught." The callous Luttrell, Lord Carhampton, was sent with a military force to "restore peace" in the district, which he did by seizing what Catholics he could and sending them to serve in the British fleet. Numbers of those who were left were arrested and prosecuted by the government on the charge of "defenderism," *i. e.*, defending their homes against the Orange burners and marauders. To the aid of these poor people went, in May, 1797, Father Quigley, as prominent member of a committee of defence to oppose the wiles of the Crown Counsel, Marcus Beresford. "They interfered only in the defence of prosecutions on the part of the Crown," says a secret government dispatch relative to this committee. "Constantly in court under the counsel employed by the prisoners, assisted them in challenges, and seemed to give general directions about the trial." Associated with Quigley in this worthy undertaking were Patrick Byrne, Alexander Lowrie and Samuel Turner. The latter, a barrister of Newry, was reputed as "ruined" in his business on account of his nationalist ideas, and also as being a close friend of the patriot Lord Edward Fitzgerald, with whom he was frequently seen in Dublin. He afterwards proved a mercenary traitor. Another resident of Newry, who it appears got into the confidence of Father Quigley and afterwards enacted a Judas *rôle* in regard to him, was an Englishman named Frederick Dutton, a recipient of English secret service money.

Some months after his efforts on behalf of the poor Northerners Father Quigley went to France. Probably he was the first Catholic priest to take the oath of the United Irishmen. In Paris he administered it, it is said, to the brave young Roche, afterwards General Humbert's *etat-major*, hanged in Dublin after the failure of the French invasion. Some differences arose among the little Paris colony of Irish exiles; Wolfe Tone charged Quigley and Napper Tandy with "caballing" against him. Ere the petty misunder-

standing reached a head Father Quigley went to London. Thence, after some time, he started to return to France in company with Arthur O'Connor, M.P., United Irishman and nephew of the Tory Lord Longueville, his servant Leary, and Benjamin P. Binns and Allen, members of an English radical or revolutionary society. The priest, with powdered hair, and otherwise disguised, called himself at first Captain Jones and afterwards Colonel Morris; the others passed as his servants. The war between England and France made passage from one country into another extremely difficult, almost impossible. The vigilance of the custom-house officers headed them off at Whitstable. Hiring a cart and loading their trunks thereon they crossed the country on foot twenty-five miles to Margate, where they hoped to get shipping; but here, in the "King's Head" inn, they were all arrested by a posse headed by the Bow Street runners, Fugin and Rivet, who had followed them from London. Thither they were escorted back, and, after being examined two or three successive days before the English Privy Council, they were committed to the Tower. In May, 1798, they were taken to Maidstone and put on trial before a special commission headed by Judge Buller. A singular document was produced, purporting to be an address from the revolutionary executive directory of England to that of France, inviting the invasion of England and referring to Father Quigley as "the worthy citizen whom they had lately seen." It was charged that the document had been found in the pocket of a greatcoat belonging to some member of the party, that the said greatcoat had some powder marks on the collar, that Father Quigley wore powder in his hair, *ergo*, that the document was his. And then came the already mentioned Fred Dutton, brought over from Newry, to swear that the handwriting in the incriminating document was that of Father Quigley. The plot of the English government or its agents against the life of the dangerous Irish clergyman was complete. He was offered life and liberty on condition that he made disclosures; those offers he spurned with contempt.

In vain the amazed priest protested his ignorance of the document; in vain he said, in reference to the statement that it was found in his pocket, "I declare most solemnly, in the face of my country and my God, that it is false, unless one of them, or some person unknown to me, placed it there." Father Quigley's four companions were acquitted, but from the doom so cunningly woven around him there was no escaping. He was sentenced to be hanged.

From Maidstone jail, about 11 o'clock on June 7, 1798, set out the death procession. Three horses drew slowly along a "hurdle" consisting of a large deal chest, with two boards for seats placed across it. On the front seat was the hangman; on the rear one Father Quigley. The victim's arms were bound, and an iron chain, fastened around his waist, secured him to the plank on which he was sitting. His shirt collar was open; a rope was thrown around his shoulders. Behind came the deputy-sheriff and an English Catholic clergyman named Griffiths, and the escort consisted of 200 of the Maidstone Volunteers. A halt was made under a gallows which had been erected on Pennenden heath, and there, in the presence of a pitiless mob, while summer smiled on the vaunted pleasant vales of Kent, the first of the sacrificed Irish soggarths of 1798 met his death with manly bearing and noble fortitude. After Father Quigley's body was cut down a surgeon completed the sentence of the law by cutting off the head. The mutilated remains were interred on the spot, and the grave is now unnoted, unknown, undiscoverable.

There is little doubt that the execution of Quigley was a typical judicial murder of the kind usually practised by England on Irish Nationalists.

Arthur O'Connor declared that the paper upon which conviction was based was placed in the victim's pocket by the police. Dutton, the informer, continued to act for and receive his blood-money; his name appears on the secret service money lists for various sums aggregating to £700, or about \$3500.

Many years after Father Quigley's death Commissioner Adam Low, of the Jury Court of Scotland, who had been one of the Crown counsel at the trial, declared that the prisoner had not been properly defended. The Scotch lawyer and political turncoat, Sir James Mackintosh, having spoken disparagingly of Quigley as "the rebel Irish priest," was thus scathingly rebuked in public by the celebrated Dr. Parr: "The man might have been worse, Jemmy, than you have described him. He was an Irishman—he might have been a Scotchman; he was a priest—he might have been a lawyer; he was a rebel—but he might have been a renegade."

The insurrection burst forth in Ireland on the fatal 23d of May, 1798. The agony of the unhappy people had become unendurable. They were tired of being robbed and flogged and picketed and pitchcapped. They were mad at the shrieks of outraged virtue, at the cries of children under the lash, at the sight of burning homesteads, at the general fearful atrocities that were making

hell all around them. They stopped and burned the stage-coaches—this was the signal of uprising—then, with their rude pikes and pitchforks, they rushed upon the well-armed soldiery, and numbers of them found in death prompt relief from the prevailing horrors. And when the news of the outbreak, of the successful progress of his plans, reached Minister Pitt in London, he is said to have gloatingly exclaimed: "The Union is mine!"

But Pitt's butchers had not all their own way. From Kildare, where the uprising was initiated, the news of it, "running as it were with the wind," reached the county of Wexford. This county was but imperfectly organized under the United Irish system; in fact, a writer of the period states that the United Irishmen were "comparatively fewer in this than in any other county of Ireland." But many of the people, with a vague idea of protection against the savage yeomanry, had secretly provided themselves with arms, chiefly pikes; and these arms, on a threatening proclamation of the magistrates and by the advice of their priests — which advice some of the priests afterwards heartily regretted— they now proceeded to surrender. If a man had no pike or other weapon he would buy, beg or steal one in order to give it up and so prove his loyalty, and save himself from the lash, prison or rope. On Saturday, May 26th, the peasantry of Boolavogue, going to Ferns to surrender their arms, were treacherously set upon by double their number of the "black mob," as they called the Orange yeoman. Retreating homeward in tolerable order, they met, at Milltown, late that afternoon, a sturdy little horseman in clerical garb, who had ridden up on hearing of the affray. This was their pastor, the Rev. John Murphy, acting coadjutor of the parish of Monageer, Doctor of Divinity of the College of Seville, strong of mind and body, having alike proved himself a scholar of very high attainments and the best handball-player in the parish. He heard their tale of wrong and outrage; he saw the flames of twenty homesteads, fired by the yeomen, flaring in various directions; he saw the circle of stalwart men, of weeping women and children; and then and there he made up his mind, and the priest became an Irish insurgent leader. He designed and acted promptly. The surrounding country was being daily scoured and ravaged by the Camolin yeoman cavalry, who nightly returned to Camolin Park, the residence of their colonel, Lord Mountnorris. But this night many of them failed to return; instead there were more unwelcome visitors; for Father Murphy's band, armed with pitchforks, scythes and fowling-pieces, ambushed and attacked them as they were returning from "the Harrow," a

village two miles northwest of Boolavogue, defeated them with slaughter, slaying among others their leader, Lieutenant Bookey, and two hours later took Camolin Park, capturing therein a quantity of arms which had been given up by the country people, and, better still, a number of new carbines which Mountnorris had provided for his corps. Father John Redmond, a loyalist Catholic curate, interfered to protect the mansion of Mountnorris from plunder or injury, for which service he afterwards received from the "noble lord" the poorest possible reward.

Whit-Sunday morning broke, but there was no Mass in Father Murphy's little chapel, for the yeoman came and gave it to the flames, as also the house where he lodged—for he had none of his own. As for the priest, he took post on Oulart Hill, seven miles due east of Enniscorthy and eleven miles north of Wexford town, at the head of three or four thousand of his parishioners, among whom were many women and children and aged and infirm. He had only about three hundred fighting men, few of them equipped with firearms. In the early afternoon a red-coated column was seen advancing from the south, across the summit of Boloobwee hill. It was the ferocious North Cork militia—about 110 of the pick of them—under Lieutenant-Colonel Foote and Major Lombard, and the Shelmalier cavalry, probably that many more sabres. The cavalry shot out to encircle the hill so as to cut off the retreat of the insurgents, who were posted behind a ditch on the summit. The infantry charged up the slope, just halting to deliver a volley at what seemed a row of men's heads looking over the hedge, but which were merely fire-decoying hats raised on pikes. Several soldiers fell. Major Lombard lay dead with a ball through his heart. Then, leaping the ditch, came an avalanche of about two hundred pikemen, who spared not the steel nor the pursuit till of the whole North Cork detachment there were left alive but the lieutenant-colonel, a serjeant, a drummer and two privates, who saved their lives by good, hard running, the last of the fugitives being piked more than a mile from where the red-coated column was first sighted. As for the cavalry, they waited only till one of their number was tumbled from his saddle by a bullet from a long-barreled strand gun; they then turned tail and fled at top speed. It was pike against musket, and pike had won; and the priest-general, smiling with victory, stood amidst his cheering army. Of the enemy over a hundred lay dead, including six officers. The insurgent loss was three killed and six wounded. The victory of Oulart Hill was practically the beginning of the Irish insurrection of 1798.

Promptly following up his victory, Father John, at the head of a largely increased force, next day attacked the enemy in Enniscorthy, and captured the place after employing the expedient of having his pikemen drive before them a herd of cattle, which broke the enemy's line and threw it into confusion. Soon afterwards the insurgent camp was formed on Vinegar Hill, a rocky eminence overlooking the town. Thenceforth by his inspiring presence and splendid example he was the life and soul of the patriot army. With his valor he combined cool and discreet generalship. He advised against the attack on Arklow; his advice was disregarded and the result was disaster. When, after the battle of Vinegar Hill, all seemed lost for the insurgents, he still kept the green flag flying and advised his brother priest, Father Roche, against the fatal folly of surrendering to the merciless redcoats. "Even if I stood alone," he declared, "I would never willingly surrender to them." Unable to dissuade his friend he broke up his bivouac on the Three Rocks, near Wexford town, and marched with his force through Scollagh-gap into the county of Carlow, routing a party of the enemy that disputed the way. In the street of Killedmond a strong body of cavalry and infantry gave battle, but these the brave Wexfordmen, although fatigued from a long day's march, quickly overthrew and chased through the blazing village. Next day they encountered a British force which sought, at Goresbridge, to defend the passage of the Barrow; but the furious charge of the Fourth Dragoon Guards was promptly stayed and repulsed by Father John's pikemen, twenty-eight of the Wexford militia were made prisoners, and the rest of the redcoats fled. They rested that night on a high mountain land known as the Ridge of Leinster, and early next morning, June 24th, advanced towards Castlecomer, which they captured, a strong British force which advanced towards the place retiring precipitately without daring to give serious battle.

Kilkenny was apathetic in the national cause; so was Queen's County; seeing which Father John's brave army turned back in disappointment. As they rested in the Kilkenny coal district, the colliers—an emaciated, consumptive, degraded crew—came and pretended to fraternize with them; but at night, while the brave fellows slept, the soulless wretches stole a large quantity of their arms and ammunition and disappeared like moles into their burrows. In consequence of this treacherous act and of a fog which concealed the approach of the enemy the Wexfordmen were defeated, on the morning of the 26th, at Kilcomney Hill. Retreating, however, in good order, they carried Scollagh-gap, which was held by the

enemy, by a pike charge, and marched back through it into their native county, where, at length despairing of success, they finally dispersed to their homes.

Father John fell into the hands of his mortal foes. His martyrdom for the religious and political faith that was in him took place in the town of Tullow, county Carlow. It seems that his captors were unaware of the important nature of their prize, but the discovery of a pyx and stole in his pocket showed that the "croppy" was a priest, and this was sufficient. He was tried by court-martial. A ruffianly major named Hall proposed an insulting question; a prompt blow of the sturdy soggarth's fist sent him sprawling. The patriot priest was stripped and tied up, and received five hundred lashes, the tearing cat-o'-nine-tails passing from one tired hand to another. Then, this horrible laceration failing to kill him, or even to elicit a groan of pain, they cut off his head. His body they burned in a pitch barrel—as "a holy fricassee," they said—at the door of a respectable Catholic townsman named Callaghan, and they afterwards buried the calcined bones in the same spot. The head they placed on a fourteen-foot pole at the chapel gate, and the attention of every Catholic who passed was directed to it, with the facetious request that he "ask his priest for the forgiveness of his sins." So died the heroic John Murphy, whom victory would have made the Washington of Ireland.

Early on the memorable Whit-Sunday morning of the outbreak, the Rev. Michael Murphy, who strongly disapproved of armed resistance, considering it hopeless, set forth from the town of Gorey, where he lodged, to say Mass for his flock. But in Ballycannow, as in Boulavogue, there was no Mass said that morning. The musket-butts of Orange yeoman were crashing on altar and window, and the pastor met an alarmed party of his people, who begged him to accompany them to the hill of Kilmacthomas, nine miles west of Gorey, whither a multitude, largely composed of women and children, had fled for refuge, even as sheep instinctively seek the high ground to avoid the wolves. He went to the hill, which was soon approached by three hundred yeomen from Carnew (where two days before they had shot twenty-eight men in cold blood without any form of trial). Volley after volley was poured into the helpless crowd, which fled in terror, leaving three hundred corpses on the sward, after which the yeos proceeded on their way, burning two Catholic chapels and one hundred cabins in a march of seven miles. Father Murphy rallied and organized the fugitives, and with them joined Father John

Murphy's victorious force at Balliorrell, with which they subsequently participated in the capture of Enniscorthy.

Among the insurgents were Father Murphy's brother Nicholas and his nephew James, whom he himself induced to join. When he came to take the latter to the camp, the young man's mother protested. "Sister, it is true he is very young," replied the patriot priest, "but not too young to fight, and, if needs be, to die for his country."

After ten days' fighting, Father Michael proposed an attack on Arklow, probably for the purpose of opening up the way to Dublin and striking at tyranny in its chief stronghold. The attack, a brilliant and successful one, was made on the 7th of June. But it cost the life of the gallant leader. As the pikemen wavered under a shower of grapeshot, one of them exclaimed: "Boys, we have no one to lead us," whereupon Father Murphy dropped his riding-whip and seized a flag. "Come on, boys, I'll lead you—come on!" he cried encouragingly. Bravely leading the charge against the British right wing, he was slain, "while waving a standard in his hand," by a ball from a four-pounder. Confused by the fall of their leader, the insurgents made no use of their victory, but turned about and marched back to Gorey Hill.

Father Murphy's body lay where he had fallen, green flag in hand, until the return of the enemy, when it was perceived by a party of military under Lord Mountnorris. This doubtful scion of nobility, whose name was Arthur Anglesey, was son of Richard, Earl of Annesley, by one Juliana Donovan. He had been rejected as illegitimate by the English House of Peers, but was confirmed by the Irish Parliament in 1793 as Earl of Mountnorris. Before the outbreak he was familiar with Father Michael Murphy, who had assisted him in getting signatures of loyalty from the Catholics, of whom he was supposed to be a friend. To rid himself of the latter odious imputation, with the spirit of a pariah he directed that the head of the insurgent leader should be lopped off and the body cast into a burning house, exclaiming: "Let his body go where his soul is." It appears his order was not carried out, but more inhuman atrocities ensued. Captain Holmes, of the Durham regiment, broke open the breast with an axe, and some soldiers of a Welsh regiment, called the Ancient Britons, took out their dead enemy's heart, roasted his body, and oiled their boots with the grease that dripped from it. They also roasted his heart and devoured it! Tradition says that these cannibal savages died raving mad.

Father Murphy's sister and some friends recovered his fiend-

ishly-maltreated remains, and interred them in Castle Ellis graveyard. In the same grave were subsequently laid the remains of his young nephew James, who fell June 25th in an attack on Hacketstown.

Nicholas Murphy, a relative of Father Michael's, escaped to Canada, where he settled and prospered, one of his sons (who visited Ireland ten years ago) becoming mayor of Montreal.

At the end of May, when the insurgents lay encamped at the Three Rocks, near Wexford, they were joined by the Rev. Philip Roche, of Poulpalsey, and the Rev. Moses Kearns, both clergymen of gigantic frame and great physical strength and bravery. A force under Bagenal Harvey, a Protestant insurgent leader, with Father Roche as second in command, marched to attack the redcoats in New Ross. From the hill of Carrickbyrne this force marched, on the evening of June 4th, to Corbet Hill, within a mile of Ross, which was held by two thousand British troops, including the Dublin militia, under Lord Mountjoy, formerly Luke Gardiner, M.P., and foremost champion of the Catholic cause in the Irish Parliament. Next morning General Harvey sent forward his aide-de-camp, Furlong, with a white flag and a letter demanding the surrender of the town; but the envoy, on approaching the British outposts, was immediately shot. The assault was soon after ordered, and the Irish, under a terrific fire from the enemy, stormed the Three-Bullet Gate (Ross being then a walled town) and surged into the streets. A British officer advanced to parley with them, and, remembering the fate of Furlong, they promptly shot him. Thus, by the irony of fate, fell the staunch parliamentary champion of the Irish Catholics, for the slain officer was Lord Mountjoy. The late Dr. R. D. Joyce, who wrote "The Boys of Wexford," and the Irish Parnellites, who adopted it as their campaign song, were probably unaware of the liberal and upright character of the individual referred to in the lines:

"A young man in our Irish ranks
A cannon he let go;
He slapped it into Lord Mountjoy,
A tyrant he laid low."

In no recorded manner was poor Mountjoy a tyrant; he was a good friend of the Catholics when friends were greatly needed, and so quite unfitted for his fate.

After some hours of desperate and bloody fighting, during which the town was captured and recaptured, the losses on either side being about even, the British were left in possession of New

Ross, and the insurgents, unmolested, returned to their camp at Carrickbyrne. Three days afterwards they moved thence to Slieve Kielter, an eminence overlooking the river Barrow, where Father Roche was enthusiastically elected commander-in-chief *vice* General Harvey, resigned. Under their new commander—the clerical Ney of the insurrection—they marched to the hill of Lacken, between Ross and Enniscorthy, where, says a hostile account, “they formed their encampment with much more regularity than usual, and erected a number of tents for the accommodation of the officers.” The hearty, rugged, generous disposition of Father Roche won him the love and confidence of his men, whom he inspired with his own lion-like courage and contempt of the enemy. Throughout the war his influence was ever wielded for mercy and humanity. A Protestant historian, the Rev. Mr. Gordon, says: “Two Protestants in a respectable situation of life, brothers, named Robinson, of the parish of Killeghny, were seized and carried to Vinegar Hill. Some of their Roman Catholic tenants, solicitous for their safety, rode to Lacken Hill camp, where Rev. Mr. Roche held the chief command, to solicit his interference. An express was immediately forwarded to Vinegar Hill, ordering the Robinsons to be sent under escort to Lacken Hill camp. The two Robinsons got their freedom immediately, and a protection, and were permitted to return home. This being understood by some officers in the army that they had been pardoned, and by a rebel priest, was construed into disloyalty, and was nearly becoming the instrument of their own condemnation and death.”

On June 19th the camp on Lacken Hill was surprised by a large force of the enemy from New Ross, and the insurgents, few in number at the time and with little or no ammunition, were in danger of annihilation. But the good generalship of their leader saved them. Roused from bed by the general alarm, he immediately issued orders for battle, but, seeing the superiority of the approaching force, he ordered his infantry to retreat as quickly as possible. Then, distributing his few horsemen at different distances across the hill, he caused them to wave banners as if in defiance, giving the British the idea of a large force ready for battle. The advancing column halted in some confusion, and began to form line of battle. Then, the insurgent foot having got to a safe distance, the horsemen galloped after them, Father Roche himself being the last man to leave the hill. Thus he brought off his entire command to the Three Rocks without the loss of a man.

Next day he fought probably the most extraordinary action of

the war. Hearing that a British force had encamped at Longraig, a village midway between Ross and Wexford, he marched with an insurgent army to give battle. The enemy consisted of one thousand two hundred well-equipped and disciplined troops, under the able and chivalrous Sir John Moore. The Bayard of the British army and the Ney of the Irish were face to face. Father Philip's artillery consisted of six small ship guns tied with ropes on common carts. His pikemen, from the manoeuvres of the opposing soldiery, were unable to come into action, which was entirely sustained by the gunsmen, who numbered only five hundred and sixty. These, when the insurgents arrived at Goff's Bridge, within sight of the enemy, whose scarlet array was drawn up at Fooke's Mill, formed in line four deep, advanced, and opened fire. And for four hours those half-thousand brave fellows maintained a spirited and scientific bout with more than double their number of regular troops, ably led and thoroughly disciplined. The British troops fought better than they had done in any engagement in the insurrection except Arklow; nevertheless, they are said to have lost more men in this action than the insurgents. The latter, their stock of ammunition at length exhausted, retired leisurely towards Wexford. The old car on which one of their guns was tied was broken by falling into a ditch, and they left it and the piece there. But the other five cannon they brought back with them.

But the end was near. Three strong British armies were closing in on Wexford. On June 21st the main insurgent force marched from the Three Rocks to the village of Sledagh. Here a council of war was held, and here Father Roche, despite the advice of Father John Murphy, announced his intention of proceeding to Wexford with the view of obtaining terms from General Lake for himself and comrades. Lord Kingsborough (grandfather of the late Colonel King-Harman), who had been practically a prisoner in Wexford during the insurrection, had held out promises of protection of life and property when the town would have repassed under British rule. Relying on these assurances, the British troops having reoccupied the town, Father Roche, unarmed, rode in in the early morning. He had advanced within the lines before he was recognized, immediately upon which he was dragged from his horse by the savage yeomen, brought in the most ignominious manner to the British camp on Windmill Hill, brutally kicked and buffeted, pulled by the hair, and at length hauled down to the jail, so covered with bruises and blood as to be unrecognizable. Thus was the chivalrous soggarth required

for the mercy and humanity he had always bestowed upon his enemies!

A few days afterwards he was tried by court-martial—the first to be condemned to death by that tribunal in Wexford. He was taken to the bridge of Wexford and hanged from an ornamental lamp-arch, springing from two wooden piers. His heavy frame caused the first rope to break, but another was procured, and his life was ended with double torture. With him was executed another insurgent leader, Captain Keough, whose head was cut off and raised on a pike over the court-house. The lifeless bodies of both were stripped, treated with barbarous indecency and thrown into the river.

A fighting *soggarth* of the type of Father Roche—like him a man of gigantic frame, powerful physique and lion-like courage—was Father Moses Kearns. A man of action and enterprise, too, he proposed, immediately on casting his lot with the insurgents, that an attack be made on the British forces in Newtownbarry for the purpose of opening up communication with the insurgents of Wicklow and Carlow. The proposal was adopted, and Father Kearns was appointed general of the force, about two thousand strong, armed chiefly with pikes, which moved upon the village. The rev. general, however, displayed some imprudence in his initial essay in warfare; he paid no heed to the sage suggestion of one of his men, that before commencing the attack he should send a force to the opposite side of the town in order to guard against surprise. After invoking aloud the Divine aid he gave the signal for assault, and in a short time the *élan* of the Wexford pikemen sent Colonel L'Estrange's five hundred regulars flying for their lives. The triumphant insurgents dispersed through the captured village, but here, through lack of ordinary precautions, they were soon after surprised by their late opponents, reinforced by the King's County militia, and suffered a repulse. They retired fighting bravely and inflicting considerable loss on the enemy; and a large party of them, under Father Kearns, proceeded to the insurgent camp on Vinegar Hill.

When twenty thousand British troops under the notorious "butcher general," Sir Gerard Lake, encompassed and attacked the insurgent position there on the fatal 21st of June, Father Kearns proved himself a hero. The division under himself and Thomas Barker, who had learned the art of war in the French service, took post with a small cannon mounted on a car in front of the Duffrey Gate of Enniscorthy, and successfully resisted the attempts of the English under General Johnson to enter the town

from that side. When Barker lost his arm by a ball, Father Kearns took his place and continued to animate his men until he, too, was severely wounded and had to be carried from the field.

Escaping from the sanguinary battue which ensued, Father Kearns and a large number of insurgents found a protecting fastness in the wood of Killaughrim, whence they emerged, early in July, and joined the main camp at Ballyfad. On the morning of July 5th, in a dense fog, they were surrounded by the army of the ferocious Sir James Duff; but they burst easily through the toils, slaying about eighty of his cavalry, and marched towards Carnew, halting at Cranford or Ballygullen, to fight the last battle of the insurrection in Wexford. For an hour and a half the brave men under the green flag displayed the greatest valor, repulsing Duff's cavalry and driving his artillerymen three times from their guns, all performed by the gunsmen alone. When at length the redoubtable pikemen were brought into action, General Duff, already severely worsted, withdrew his reduced force towards Gorey, and the last fight on Wexford ground lay to the credit of the gallant "croppies."

But Wexford county was now swarming with British troops that had been poured in from all parts of the three kingdoms. The madness of further resistance was evident. Numbers of the insurgents dispersed to their homes. A small body, with whom was Father Kearns and a brave Protestant patriot, Anthony Perry, of Inch, proceeded into Kildare, where they formed a junction with some local insurgents. They set out for the County Meath, where they lost many of their reduced number in an attack on the fortified house of Captain Tyrrell, at Clonard. On the following day, their ammunition exhausted, they were repulsed by the Limerick militia under Colonel Gough (father of "the Bayard of India"). Somehow separated from their men, Father Kearns and Colonel Perry fell into the hands of their enemies, and the Catholic priest and the Protestant gentleman were hanged side by side, dying cheerfully for the cause they loved. The story of their doom is thus related by O'Kelly: "Their brave leader, Colonel Perry, and the Rev. Mr. Kearns, were both met with at Clonbollogue by Captains Ridgeway and Robinson, long famed for their prejudices to papists, and the chief leaders of Orange principles in Edenderry; after being conducted to the guard-house a summary trial under the specious name of court-martial was commenced by these worthies and fomentors of persecution; the gallows was ordered to be the doom of Perry and Rev. Mr. Kearns. An apparent feeling for Perry was evinced by the Orange party,

because a Protestant ; but an exulting sneer broke forth for Rev. Mr. Kearns as being a rebel priest."

When the shells were bursting on Vinegar Hill and the British cavalry charging the insurgents, a priest named Clinch, of Enniscorthy, fought bravely in the thick of the fray. Mounted and sword in hand he singled out Lord Roden, the high-priest of Orangeism in Ireland, attacked him vigorously and wounded him, and might have slain him had not one of Roden's troopers ridden up and rescued his leader by shooting his brave clerical opponent dead.

Only these five priests—the two Fathers Murphy, Fathers Roche, Kearns and Clinch—are recorded as having taken an actual part in the fighting in Wexford. Some adverse comment has been excited by the course pursued by them. Even some of the insurgents, their contemporaries, looked rather in disapproval than otherwise on the strange spectacle of priests in arms ; it seemed so *outré*, so much at variance with their sacred calling. But the urgent necessity that forced them into the position, and the good they accomplished, and the evil they prevented while in it, must be considered. On this subject Thomas Cloney, an insurgent leader who fought with them shoulder to shoulder, says : " I always thought and still think that ministers of religion should be ministers of peace, and not voluntary witnesses to the spilling of human blood. It is but justice, however, to those lamented clergymen to say that they prevented much bloodshed. They were all brave, just and humane." Edward Hay, although imbued with sickly loyal prejudice against the " fighting priests," admits that " they were conspicuous for courage and humanity."

But the Irish warrior-priests of 1798 need no apologist. The shafts of Pecksniffian innuendo glance harmless from their noble characters. Their devotion to that noble cause all of them sealed with their blood. Their names deserve to be set in letters of gold on any monument with which Irishmen may commemorate glorious " Ninety-eight."

There were other clergymen, non-combatants, and even non-sympathizers, so far as the insurgent cause was concerned, who nevertheless experienced the rigors of persecution. Father John Redmond, coadjutor of the parish of Clough, was eminently loyal to the British Government—so much so that it is said he refused to hear the confessions of United Irishmen, regarding them as outside the pale of the Church. Before the insurrection he was on friendly terms with the illegitimate reprobate Lord Mountnorris, whose property at Camolin Park he took an active part in saving on the Saturday night of the outbreak—an act which proved

fatal to the unfortunate clergyman, for the wretch whose house and goods he preserved at the risk of his life argued from it that Father Redmond was a man of influence among the "rebels" and therefore worthy of death. Mountnorris sent for him to come to Gorey. On his appearing there he was brutally knocked down by some yeomen, dragged before a court-martial, and sentenced to death on the evidence of Mountnorris. He was hanged in company with an insurgent named Patrick Carroll, and both their bodies were interred in the same grave, a square weed-grown mound still pointed out on the side of Gorey Hill, facing Kilnahue lane.

Father Redmond had studied in France, where he had had the distinction of saving the life of Napoleon Bonaparte. One night he and Napoleon occupied the same chamber in a house in Bas Poitou. Next day, Napoleon, who was experimenting in machinery, tried one of his inventions in a water-course, and in doing so tumbled into the stream. Redmond extended his fowling-piece, which Napoleon seized and was drawn to *terra firma*, else Europe might never have known her great conqueror.

One of the first priests arrested in Wexford was Father Dixon. He was taken by the Orange Captain Boyd on the perjured testimony of an informer, a gardener named Francis Murphy, who swore that on a market-day, in Wexford, the clergyman met him in a public house and tried to induce him to become a United man. Three respectable witnesses contradicted this testimony, but nevertheless Father Dixon was marched off a prisoner to Duncannon Fort, under sentence of transportation. He had a relative in Wexford, a rude sea-captain named Thomas Dixon, who terribly avenged the outrage when that town passed into the hands of the insurgents. The unhappy informer having been made prisoner by the people, Captain Dixon, on the second Sunday of the rising, while the Catholic inhabitants were at Mass, brought Murphy out of the jail and led him to the Bull-ring, where he compelled three revenue officers to shoot him and afterwards to throw his corpse into the river.

Nor did the vengeance of Dixon stop here. A man of fierce and sanguinary disposition and inflamed by the butcheries committed by the yeomanry on the families of the peasantry, he determined to put to death every Orangeman in his power. On June 20th, when Father Roche's division was absent opposing Sir John Moore's force at Fooke's Mill, Dixon and a crowd of pikemen went to the jail and brought forth several of the loyalist prisoners, whom he sentenced to death on the evidence of two of their num-

ber, Orangemen. The unfortunate men were conducted to the bridge, and there such of them as were not saved by the intercession of spectators who bore testimony to their good deeds or innocence were ruthlessly piked to death and their bodies thrown into the river. A few were mercifully shot. The bodies were not rifled. Thirty-five victims were slaughtered in this appalling manner, and the dripping pikes were raised to be plunged into the body of the thirty-sixth, when this one, a Mr. Kellet, happily bethought him of summoning as witness in his favor the parish priest of Wexford, the Rev John Currin. Thus learning for the first time of the horrid work going on, Father Currin came running to the bridge. Appalled at the scene of blood, the minister of peace flung himself on his knees beside the intended victim and entreated those present to join him in prayer. Several knelt down, and the good priest in solemn and moving words supplicated the Almighty to show the same mercy to the people that they would show to the prisoners. This produced a subduing effect on the populace, and, on the intervention of some of the insurgent leaders, the slaughter ceased. Father Currin, who thus won the victory of mercy over the wild passion of revenge, was a pious Franciscan. In the grounds of the Franciscan convent of Wexford a group of trees marks the site of one, a great chestnut, which was planted by him, and which was known as Father Currin's tree. The sanguinary Captain Dixon escaped to America, where he lived many years. His relative, Father Dixon, partly the unconscious cause of his act of vengeance, was, in defiance of all justice, transported to Botany Bay.

To the penal settlement of Botany Bay were also sent other Irish priests, transported as felons on the mere suspicion that they sympathized with the unhappy oppressed against the brutal oppressor. Prominent among them was the Rev. James Harold, O.P., pastor of the parish of Saggart, County Dublin. Although to the last he had preached patience and resignation to the persecuted people he was marked out for vengeance, seized one Sunday morning at the very altar and led away to jail, whence, several months later, he was transferred to the "Minerva" convict-ship, off the coast of Cork, and taken to Australia. Another convict on the same ship was General Joseph Holt, the Wicklow insurgent leader, who describes the vessel as "a floating dungeon of disgusting filth" under a "cruel and unfeeling monster, in the shape of a man, who commanded it," adding that "many of the poor wretches on board had been eight months on the water without a change of clothes, in a state of inexpressible torment, and covered with vermin."

To those patriot Irish priests, exiled as felons, belongs the glory of founding the Catholic Church in Australia. January 15, 1800, Father Harold landed at Sydney. He soon commenced missionary work among his poor countrymen, endeavoring to console them under the persecutions to which they were subjected by the degraded and inhuman brutes who held irresponsible control of the convict settlement. Frightful were the scenes he was compelled to witness, and even to participate in. Holt describes one of them: "The unfortunate man (Fitzgerald) had his arms extended around a tree, his two wrists tied with cords, and his breast pressed slowly against the tree, so that flinching from the blows was out of the question, as it was impossible for him to stir. Father Harold was ordered to put his hands against the tree by the hands of the prisoner, and two men were appointed to flog, one being the hangman from Sydney. They stood on each side of Fitzgerald, and I never saw two threshers in a barn move their flails with more regularity than these two man-killers, unmoved by pity, and rather enjoying their horrible employment than otherwise. The first blow made the blood spurt out of Fitzgerald's shoulders. I have witnessed many horrible scenes, but this was the most appalling sight I had ever seen."

After living and laboring for many weary years amidst such sights Father Harold obtained his liberty and returned to Ireland, where he lived to a good old age, beloved and respected.

A gentle, non-belligerent priest who was arrested and subjected to the torture of the lash was Father Peter O'Neill, of Ballymacoda, County Cork. Without a shred of evidence against him he was seized at the instance of fanatic suspicion and hatred and bound to the triangle, where two stalwart soldiers laid on the strokes alternately, "cross-cutting" and taking his flesh away in lozenges. While the terrible punishment was in progress an order came for Father O'Neill's release, but the ruffianly officer who superintended ordered the laceration to continue, being satisfied only when the victim "shook the triangle" in his agony. Father O'Neill's memory is revered by the people of the district as that of a saint. His dust reposes beneath a tall, time-stained monument in Ballymacoda chapel yard, and near at hand a high Celtic cross marks the resting-place of his nephew, the patriotic Peter O'Neill Crowley, who was shot in an encounter with English troops in 1867.

P. G. SMYTH.

HAS THE CHURCH A SHARE IN DETERMINING
THE SACRAMENTAL RITE?

IN the October number of "Les Études" of last year there appeared an article from the pen of the Reverend Father Stephen Harent, S.J., professor of dogmatic theology in the Lyons province of the Society of Jesus, entitled, "The Part of the Church in the Determining of the Sacramental Rite." The subject is one of the greatest interest for the theological student, and not without its attraction, one would fancy, for the general Catholic reader. It may come as a surprise to some of the latter class to hear that there can be any question of the Church having a share in determining the rite of any sacrament—understanding, of course, the essential and not the merely ceremonial and accidental rite; for in the definition of a sacrament as given by the catechism in use throughout England and Wales—a definition substantially the same as that given in other Catholic catechisms—we read: "A sacrament is an outward sign of inward grace, *instituted by Christ*, by which grace is given to our souls." The words "instituted by Christ" might seem to one, at first sight, to preclude the possibility of the Church having any part in determining the essential rite of any sacrament. This difficulty, one of the principal difficulties raised against the opinion advocated by Father Harent, will be duly considered in its proper place. For the moment, let it suffice to say that everything depends upon the precise meaning of the words "instituted by Christ." How far is it necessary to ascribe the determining of the sacramental rite to Our Lord Himself, in order that they may be truly said to have been instituted by Him? If theologians differ as to the precise nature and extent of this institution, there are some points, nevertheless, upon which they are quite unanimous. The sacraments were all instituted by Christ, and they were instituted by Him immediately. St. Thomas, in the third part of his Summa, question sixty-four, art. 4, asks himself whether Christ could have communicated to His ministers (*i. e.*, Apostles; *cf.* I Cor., iii.) the power that He had over the sacraments, so that they could of their own choice institute what sacraments they deemed necessary or suitable for the Church, and he answers the question in the affirmative, distinguishing between the power which Christ had as God and the power which He had as man. What St. Thomas considered as a mere speculative pos-

sibility St. Bonaventure and some of the older schoolmen held to have actually taken place in the case of some of the sacraments. In his treatise on Confirmation¹ the Seraphic Doctor teaches that the Sacrament of Confirmation was instituted after the ascension of Christ into heaven by the apostles themselves acting under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Whether or not it be true that St. Bonaventure changed his views on this matter at a later period of his life, it is now universally held by theologians that this opinion is no longer tenable since the definition of the Council of Trent, Session 7, Can. 1. "If any one say that the sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Christ Jesus Our Lord . . . Let him be anathema."

Although this canon does not explicitly condemn a mediate institution of the sacraments by Christ, and consequently does not make the doctrine of an immediate institution *de fide definita*, yet in the mind of the Council the words *instituted by Christ* were intended to convey the meaning of immediate institution, and consequently the doctrine of mediate institution is no longer a lawful one. But while giving us this solid foundation of truth to rest upon in our study of the sacraments, the canon of the Council of Trent still leaves much uncertainty as to the precise manner of this immediate institution, and on this point the opinions of theologians are very much at variance.

The different views in the matter may be reduced to three classes :

I. Those who teach that Our Divine Saviour instituted each and every sacrament not only "in genere," that is in a general kind of way, by indicating to His apostles what sort of matter and form He desired for each sacrament, leaving the further and more precise determination to the choice of the apostles themselves, but that He instituted each one "in specie;" that is, He decided once and for all the exact precise matter and form of each sacrament.

II. Those who agree with the first class to this extent that they hold Our Lord to have instituted certain sacraments in this specific way, as, for example, Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, but who disagree with them with regard to the other sacraments. It is their opinion that Jesus Christ in the case of some sacraments—as, for example, Confirmation and Holy Orders—left the matter and form officially undetermined, and decided that whatever rite were used by the proper minister, provided it suited the general purpose of that particular sign desired by Him, should be

¹ Lit. iv. Lev. dis. 7, qu. 1, art. 1.

valid. Thus, to take, for example, the sacrament of Confirmation, Our Lord would have said, "I institute a sacrament by which those who receive it will be, by the reception of the Holy Spirit, confirmed and strengthened in the faith. Any formula conveying this idea and used by a proper minister will be valid." In this case the share of the Church in deciding the sacramental rite would, as far as validity is concerned, be *nil*. She would, however, always retain the power in such an hypothesis of deciding what rite would be necessary for the liceity of the sacrament.

III. Those who, whilst agreeing with the first and second class, that Our Lord did actually determine "in specie" the rite of certain sacraments, hold, nevertheless, that in the case of other sacraments, notably of Confirmation and Holy Orders, Christ, whilst laying down in general the nature of the sacrament, the particular grace it was to confer, and the general character of the sign which should be used in order to signify and convey the grace conferred, did, notwithstanding, leave to His Church the power and authority to decide this sign more in particular, according to the necessities of the faithful. This sign, rite, or formula, when thus decided by the ecclesiastical authority, was to be the only valid formula for the conferring of that particular sacrament; any other formula, though possibly better calculated to signify the grace to be conferred, would be certainly invalid and useless as far as sacramental grace was concerned.

It is this latter opinion which Father Harent advocates in his article in "Les Études." I say *opinion*, for although, in exposing the different systems, I have made use of the words "hold," "teach," etc., yet each system, as far as the controverted sacraments are concerned, does not claim for itself more than the greater probability. Some of the merits of the view held by this third class of theologians are that it becomes easier for one who holds it to explain certain very great difficulties in connection with the sacraments of Holy Orders and Confirmation, and it gives one more weapon to Catholic theologians in their endeavors to prove to Anglicans the invalidity of Anglican orders. The great difficulty urged against this view is the one which we touched on briefly in the beginning, namely, the words of the first canon of the seventh session of the Council of Trent—words given also in the definition of a sacrament as found in Catholic catechisms. "How," it is said, "can this view be reconciled with the teaching of the Council that all the sacraments were instituted by Christ Jesus Our Lord?"

Father Harent answers this difficulty by giving a number of

parallel instances in which expressions similar to that used by the Council in this instance do not prevent a similar variety of opinions. Without quoting his exact words, I shall give in substance several of the examples which he brings forward. If they do not raise this third opinion to the dignity of certitude, they establish its solid probability until the Church shall authoritatively pronounce one of the other views to be the only true one.

1. It is of faith that God is the author of the Bible, and if we consider this authorship to consist of inspiration it is of defined faith, and those who wilfully deny it are guilty of formal heresy. Yet though this much is certain, every student of Scripture is well aware how much is left undecided and uncertain with regard to the exact nature and extent of this inspiration. For example, did God dictate all the words (verbal inspiration), or did he simply inspire the substance of the thought, leaving the choice of expression to the sacred writer (material inspiration); and if so, to what extent did he leave him free to choose? These questions are left unanswered by the definition of the Church that "God has inspired the Holy Scriptures."

2. God himself instituted the Papacy. Leo XIII. holds his present position as supreme spiritual head of the Christian world by virtue of Divine authority. This, since the Vatican Council, is a dogma of defined faith. And yet Jesus Christ, whilst instituting the office of supreme pastor, left the mode of his election, nevertheless, to the decision of His Church. The laws which govern the holding of a conclave and its method of arriving at a decision are not of Divine but of ecclesiastical origin, and yet the person elected according to those laws is by right Divine the successor to St. Peter and supreme head of the Church.

3. Another example. Let us suppose that some prince wishes to found an order of knighthood. He alone will determine what is to be the nature, scope and privileges of this new order, whilst he may leave to a Minister of State the task of arranging what ceremonial shall be employed as essential to the conferring of it. He contents himself with merely giving his Minister some general instructions as to the kind of ceremonial to be employed. And yet there is no one who would deny that under these circumstances the prince is the real and only author of this new degree of rank, ceremonial included.

4. Yet one more example taken from a very practical matter of ecclesiastical procedure: A bishop gives the necessary faculties

¹ Vat. Council. i. Can.

for confessional purposes to one of a religious community of priests, leaving to the Superior the choice of the priest who is to receive these faculties. In other words, whomsoever the Superior shall choose, on that person alone are the faculties conferred; and yet the Superior cannot be said to give the faculties, since such a thing is beyond his power. The bishop alone gives the approbation, for there is question of hearing the confessions of his subjects. After considering these parallel instances we may with justice ask, to quote the words of Father Harent, "Why, then, should Jesus Christ lose the title of institutor of all the sacraments because He had said to his Apostles, to his Church :

"Amongst the sacraments which I am instituting in such number, and for such determined ends, here are some of which I leave you to fix the rite in a more precise manner. I only require that there should be, on the whole, some analogy with the end that I have chosen; and, what is more, I enact that it should contain two parts—something for the eyes, something for the ears (matter and form, as the theologians of the middle ages will afterwards call them). To this rite thus roughly sketched by Me, and more precisely determined by you, I attach this or that supernatural effect." To descend to detail. Let us take the sacrament of Confirmation. We can well imagine Our Blessed Lord saying to His Apostles (we again quote from Father Harent), "I wish to give, to those who have recently become members of the faithful, a grace of strength. I wish to make soldiers of them, to convert them into athletes of the faith; select some rite having, in the first place, an aptitude for conveying this idea. Because of this aptitude which I insist upon, but yet more because of the subsequent choice of this rite by legitimate authority (there is the rite very clearly determined beforehand), I raise it, thus determined, to the rank of a conventional sign of the grace which I promise, and not only to the rank of a sign, but to the rank of an instrument productive of that grace under the action of My Spirit. I alone can attach to such a weak element a like efficacy; I alone can join to it the special presence of My sanctifying Spirit; I alone can put into the sacramental rite that which gives it its value. I alone, in consequence, institute it."

But here we can well imagine an opponent saying, "Your reasoning is very plausible; still you cannot so easily dispose of the Council of Trent. Yet once more it bars the way by a short sentence in the second chapter of its twenty-first session, where it treats of the Church's power over the sacraments. The Church, it says, can change, dispense, etc., in the matter of the sacraments,

'always leaving their essential portion intact' (*salva illorum substantia*). But the matter and form are certainly essential portions of a sacrament. Therefore, according to the Holy Council the Church has absolutely no authority over the matter and form of a sacrament, and your explanation, in consequence, is an impossible one."

In this case, as in the case of the previous difficulty taken from the words of the Council of Trent, there is room for a distinction. Just as we have explained the words "instituted by Christ," so we must explain the words "essential portions" (*substantia*) in the present instance. How are the matter and form essential portions of a sacrament? Only by virtue of a very definite symbolism already determined, and by virtue of a supernatural force, which are only adjoined to the matter and form upon the fulfilment of certain general conditions, which vary according to the nature of the sacrament. Thus, in Confirmation, our Lord would have decided that the material sign should be symbolic of force conferred, of spiritual renewal and strengthening, and that the form of words should correspond to this idea; in Holy Orders the sign should be capable of indicating that spiritual powers, dignity, etc., were conferred, and the form of words likewise should convey the same meaning. It is by the fulfilment of these general conditions, laid down by Christ, that this double rite (matter and form), determined "in specie" by the Church, becomes truly an essential portion of the sacrament, and in so far as these conditions determined by Christ are observed by the Church, so far does the substance of the sacrament remain unchanged.

So much for the general principles. Now let us apply them to a particular sacrament. Holy Orders and Confirmation are the chief sacraments about which there can be question of Christ having determined the rite only "in genere." Let us take the sacrament of Holy Orders and the order of the priesthood, as it is about this order that the controversy principally turns. For the sake of greater clearness it may be well, at the outset, to briefly summarize the main points of the rites used for conferring this order in the Latin and Greek Churches.

The Latin Rite.

1. The bishop, saying nothing, places both his hands on the head of the one to be ordained. The surrounding priests do the same.

2. Immediately afterwards the bishop and the priests hold their hands extended over the one that is to be ordained, whilst the bishop says the following prayer: "Let us, dearest brethren,

beseech God, the Father Almighty, to multiply His heavenly gifts on these His servants, whom He has chosen for the office of the priesthood, and may what they receive through His mercy be ratified by His grace. Through Christ our Lord. Amen."

3. He, the bishop, places a stole and chasuble on the one to be ordained, and anoints his hands with the oil of catechumens.

4. He presents him a chalice with wine and water therein, and a paten placed over it with bread, all of which objects the one to be ordained touches. Whilst presenting him with the chalice the bishop says: "Receive power to offer sacrifice and to celebrate masses for the living and the dead. Amen."

5. Then mass is continued, and the newly-ordained, together with the bishop, pronounces the words of consecration.

6. After the communion the bishop places both his hands on the head of the newly ordained, saying: "Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained."

Greek Rite.

1. The bishop three times signs the head of the one to be ordained with the sign of the cross.

2. Holding his right hand on the head of the one to be ordained, he says: "May the Divine grace, which always has a care of that which is infirm and supplies that which is deficient, promote (N. N.), a venerable deacon, to be a priest. Let us pray for him that the grace of the Holy Ghost may come upon him."

3. He signs him thrice, praying over him.

4. He clothes him in a chasuble.

5. At the time of the Consecration he presents to him a host which has been consecrated, according to some, or a host to be consecrated, according to others.

Between these two rites there is a very substantial difference. In the Greek rite it is beyond question that the ordination is conferred by the first imposition of hands and the accompanying prayer. There is no tradition of instruments, properly so called. In the Latin rite the tradition of instruments plays a very important, and, it would seem, an essential part. And yet the Church recognizes both rites as perfectly valid, with this proviso, that the Greek rite be limited to the Greek Church. The question now to be decided is, what place does the tradition of instruments hold in the Latin rite with regard to the essential part of the sacrament? Is it necessary for the valid conferring of the priesthood in the Latin Church, or is it merely a ceremonial development, which the Church, in the exercise of her powers, has introduced to add

beauty and impressiveness to the ritual and to edify and instruct the faithful? Various answers are given to this question by Catholic theologians. There are some who hold that the first imposition of hands with the accompanying, *i. e.* morally accompanying, form, is the only essential rite, as far as the valid conferring of the sacrament is concerned. Others take an exactly opposite view, and consider the imposition of hands as a mere embellishment of the ritual necessary now for the lawful conferring of the sacrament, but in no way essential. They hold that the only essential rite in the Latin Church is the tradition of instruments and the accompanying forms. Finally (for we shall not consider more than three theological opinions on the point, the three most important ones, and the most generally adopted), there remains a large number of theologians, perhaps the greater number, who teach that, in the Latin Church, both the tradition of instruments and the imposition of hands, at least the first imposition, and the accompanying forms, are necessary not only for the lawful, but also for the valid conferring of the priesthood. If this last doctrine be the true one, and it would seem to be so, then this conclusion follows by a simple process of reasoning that the Church has *de facto* taken a part in determining the essential matter and form of at least one of the sacraments. But is it true that the tradition of instruments is necessary for the valid conferring of the Sacrament of Orders, we always speak of the Latin Church? The arguments usually adduced to prove that it is true, although they do not put the matter absolutely beyond question or dispute, are yet sufficiently strong to make it more than probable, in the opinion of very many theologians, that the tradition of instruments is now an essential portion of the sacramental rite of the priesthood (we have restricted the examination to that particular order). To briefly mention these arguments: we have, in the first place, an authoritative statement of Pope Eugenius IV. in the instructions which he wrote for the Armenians at the time of the Council of Florence.¹ "The sixth sacrament is that of orders, of which the matter is that by the tradition of which the order is conferred: as the order of the priesthood is conferred by the tradition of a chalice with wine and of a paten with bread. . . . The form of the priesthood is thus: Receive the power of offering sacrifice in the church as well for the living as for the dead in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Now, although this document has not the force of an *ex cathedra*

¹ Denzinger, N. 596.

pronouncement, there can be no doubt about two things. Pope Eugenius IV. evidently considered the tradition of instruments and the accompanying forms an essential portion of the rite, as he expressly says "the order of the priesthood is *conferred*," etc. It is also equally certain that the bull "Exultate Deo," in which this instruction to the Armenians comes, is a document of very great theological importance—so great that some theologians have held it to be a definition of Catholic faith. This is not so, as the words of the bull itself show, since it distinguishes between the several parts, using the word "definition" where there is question of stating matters of faith, and when there is merely question of giving an authoritative instruction using such words as "doctrine," "tradition," "statute," etc. Yet, making full allowance for this, the instruction to the Armenians must be considered at least as an authoritative description of the practice of the Latin Church in the days of the Council of Florence, and that practice, as we see from the words of the Pope, was to treat the tradition of instruments as an essential part of the sacramental rites of the priesthood. It may seem a little extraordinary that Pope Eugenius should make no mention whatever of the imposition of hands. Some have gone so far as to conclude therefrom that the imposition of hands was not an essential part of the rite. But the truth seems to be that the Pope wished principally to draw attention to those points of ritual in which the Latin and Greek Churches differed from each other. Although he makes no explicit mention of the imposition of hands, he does not exclude that rite, and implicitly mentions it by referring the Armenians for whatever he has omitted to the Pontificale Romanum, where the imposition of hands is certainly treated as an essential portion of the sacrament.¹ Besides this argument, drawn from the bull "Exultate Deo," there are many others adduced by those who favor the view that the tradition of instruments is an essential part of the rite. To select a few: St. Thomas, in the supplement to the 3d part of Summa, quaest. 37, art. 5: "Because the principal action of the priest is to consecrate the body and blood of Christ, therefore in the very presenting (to him) of the chalice with the determined form of words, the *sacerdotal character is impressed* (upon him)." Again, Pope Clement VIII., in the instruction which he also wrote for the Greeks, ordains that in the sacrament of penance that form of words shall be used which was prescribed in the general council (of Florence). He thus seems to consider the instruction

¹ Cf. Denz. 596.

of Pope Eugenius as an authoritative decree of the General Council, which would considerably increase the force of the argument drawn from that instruction. Again, in the Pontificale Romanum before the tradition of instruments the deacon is called "ordinandus," that is, "the one to be ordained;" after the tradition of the instruments he is called "ordinatus," the one newly ordained. Finally, the practice of the Church, which enacts that the different instruments should be physically touched by the ordinandus, and if, in mistake, they have not been so touched, requires that that portion of the ceremony be repeated.

From all these instances it is more or less clear that the mind of the Church considers this rite of the tradition of instruments as an essential portion of the Sacrament of Orders. I say more or less clear, because, if the proofs alleged do not absolutely put the matter beyond question, they make it extremely probable that it is so. Taking, then, this fact as our major premise, "The tradition of the instruments is an essential portion of the rite in the Latin Church," and, as our minor premise, the tradition of the instruments is of purely ecclesiastical origin and did not exist in the first centuries of the Church's history,¹—then the only reasonable conclusion is that the Church has claimed the power of changing and determining the rite of a sacrament, and since she has claimed the power she must be considered to possess it. In the words of the celebrated Thomist, Billuart,² "Christ did not institute the matter of this sacrament by determining 'in specie' that this or that thing should be the matter of it, but by determining only 'in genere' that it should be conferred by some sensible sign, which should be indicative of the power bestowed; but the determination of this sign in particular, whether it should be this or that thing, whether the imposition of hands or the tradition of instruments or both together, that He left to his Church to decide, as I have already said with reference to the Sacrament of Confirmation. The Church, therefore, using this power given to it by Christ, determined, or at least consented, that the imposition of hands with the corresponding form should in the Greek Church, and perhaps also in former ages in the Latin Church, be the legitimate sign of both powers conferred, namely, of consecrating and of absolving. But afterwards she determined, for the Latin Church, that the tradition of instruments with these words 'Receive power,' etc., should be the legitimate sign of consecrating; the im-

¹ Cf. Gasparri, vol. ii., n. 986.

² Bill. de Ordine, dis. ii. art 1, obj. 1.

sition of hands with these words, 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' etc., should be the sign of the power of absolving; so that a Greek ordained by the Latin rite, or a Latin ordained by the Greek rite, unless provided with a dispensation from the Supreme Pontiff, would not be validly ordained. That this was the institution and will of Christ we have concluded, together with an almost countless number of theologians, *cum innumeris pene theologis.*" We shall see something more presently about the almost countless number of theologians; but before finally leaving the question of orders it will be well to consider one of the more important difficulties that are urged against the above-mentioned doctrine of Billuart. This consists of the words of Pope Benedict XIV.:¹ "Granted that the Church has the faculty of which we are speaking, namely, of changing the matter of the Sacrament of Order, it is altogether gratuitous and arbitrary to imagine that the Church has ever made use of that privilege. Let them say where and when, in what century, in what Council, by what Pontiff the change was made. For if the Church had taken away from the rite of ordination those things which were customary of old, then we should be compelled to affirm that the matter and form of ordination had been changed by the authority of the Church, and new forms substituted for the old. But when all that are contained in the ancient rituals still persevere unaltered, and are even now holily and exactly observed, no one will easily believe that those same things, which for so long a time were sufficient, now no longer suffice for the valid conferring of this Sacrament of Orders."

It is well to note that Pope Benedict is here only speaking of the Sacrament of Orders, and his words do not extend to the Sacraments of Confirmation and Matrimony, in which it is also held that the Church has exercised her right of determining the matter and form. Again, he does not explicitly deny that the Church has this power; he satisfies himself with merely trying to prove that she has never exercised it. And as for the reason he adduces, as Father Harent remarks, is it quite sure that we can place so much value on this negative kind of argument? Amongst the diriment impediments of matrimony, impediments which render the matrimonial contract null and void, and consequently affect the validity of the sacrament, are there not some for the origin of which it would be extremely difficult to assign any precise date, general council, or known pontifical document?

¹ Benedict XIV. de Synodo, viii., c. x. n. 10.

But in addition to the fact that Pope Benedict's book is by no means to be considered as a pontifical document, the Pope himself in the same work takes care to qualify his statements, thus: "We have wished to expose all this, not for the purpose of passing judgment in favor of this opinion, but only to show that whilst having *against it almost the entire army of the scholastics*, it is not afraid of their blows, and even finds missiles to hurl back at them." Besides, from several quotations which Pope Benedict XIV. makes in this work from the learned Oratorian, Morin, it would seem that he based his view upon a misapprehension of the real teaching of that writer, who in reality held that the Church had and exercised the power of changing the sacramental rite. What Morin endeavors to prove is that the tradition of instruments is of comparatively recent origin.¹ After explicitly stating "Why, then, in effect, shall the Church be unable in the Sacrament of Orders to do that which she has often done in the Sacrament of Matrimony, namely, to fix new conditions for the matter and form, so much so that he who fails to observe these conditions renders the sacrament invalid and null, since Jesus Christ himself did not determine 'in specie' the matter and form of these sacraments. The only thing which we defend is the relatively recent origin of the tradition of instruments, and still more of the last imposition of hands." Finally, before leaving this question of the teaching of Pope Benedict XIV. on the point under consideration, we can oppose to one Papal document another Papal document of equal weight and importance, and teaching a doctrine the contrary of that propounded by Pope Benedict XIV. Pope Innocent IV., in his commentary on the chapter "Presbyter," says: "As for the apostolic rite, we find in the Epistle to Timothy that they placed hands on those who were to be ordained, and that they said prayers over them: but we do not find that they used any other form. Whence we believe that unless forms had been afterwards invented, it would be sufficient for the ordaining prelate to say, 'Be a priest,' or some such equivalent expression; but in subsequent times the Church instituted the forms which are now observed. And these said forms are of so great necessity, that if in an ordination they should have been omitted, then it would be necessary to supply what had been left out."

And now, before we pass to the consideration of the argument of authority, it will serve to strengthen our position if we devote a few words to the opinion put forward by the second class of

¹ Morinus de sac. ordinationibus, p. 3, exerc. 7. c. 6, n 2.

theologians mentioned in the beginning of this article, namely, the opinion of those who teach that Our Lord left some sacraments officially undetermined, and decreed that any matter or form used by a proper minister should be sufficient for the valid conferring of the sacrament, provided only they preserved the general characteristics of the sign instituted by Christ.

Apart from the fact that this view is opposed to the unvarying practice of the Church, which has never left the matter or form to the individual choice of the minister, there is also this *à priori* consideration against it, that of all methods of sacramental institution it would seem to be the most impracticable. And why? Because the sacraments are for the benefit of mankind (*sacramenta propter homines*); and since Our Lord exacts, as an essential condition for their being validly conferred, that a certain matter and form should be used containing a very definite symbolism, it would seem, to say the least, very injudicious on the part of a Divine legislator to leave the essential parts of a sacrament to the caprice of an individual. Besides, the sacrament about which there is greatest question of a rite to be determined is the Sacrament of Orders, on which depend the sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist, the two most important sacraments after Baptism when there is question of salvation. If, then, there should be any essential defect in the Sacrament of Holy Orders, this defect would of necessity vitiate the other two sacraments, and might in the course of time vitiate the whole or a greater portion of the hierarchy, as far as the validity of their sacerdotal powers was concerned. It is, then, extremely improbable that in a matter of such supreme importance Our Blessed Lord should not have taken every precaution to insure the practical certainty of valid ordination. This He could not do under ordinary circumstances by leaving the rite officially undetermined, whilst exacting that it should be of a certain character and necessary for conferring the sacrament.

But, to return to the opinion advocated in this article, that Christ left the determination of the sacramental rite in the sacraments in question to the authoritative judgment of His Church. Before concluding let us see what is the exact theological value of this opinion. It is the fashion nowadays, in certain theological circles, to treat it as an opinion of little importance, a mere hypothesis that has scarcely any real probability in its favor. Some would go so far as to look upon it with something akin to a suspicion of unorthodoxy. It is well, then, before finally leaving the subject, to see how far the verdict of theological authority is on our side. We have already seen, in the extract from Billuart, that in his day it was the

teaching of a countless number of theologians (*cum innumeris pene theologis*); we have seen that Pope Benedict XIV. acknowledged it to be the view received by almost the entire army of scholastics. Gasparri, also of the opposite camp, describes those who hold it as not a few eminent theologians, and Father Harent, in his article in "Les Études," has taken the trouble to gather together the names of some of these eminent theologians. They are not restricted to one century or to one school of theological thought. Every school is represented—the early scholastics, the doctors of the Council of Trent, the Thomists, the Carmelites of Salamanca, the Theological Faculty of the Sorbonne, the Scotists, the Society of Jesus. Finally, this opinion is held by many celebrated canonists and moralists, and in our own day it does not lack distinguished adherents, amongst whom we beg leave to mention the Reverend Father Harent himself, and also the Reverend Father Louis Billot, S. J., Professor of Dogma at the Roman College. It is evident, then, that those who hold this opinion with such excellent company cannot in the slightest degree incur the note of temerity. On the contrary, when they remember the words of Billuart already quoted, they may without any very great stretch of imagination be tempted to apply to this doctrine the words of St. Augustine, "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum.*"

F. RANKIN, S. J.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION IN THE "DARK AGES."

(A.D. 476—A.D. 1100.)

THE fifth century closed in darkness, and as we look at the situation of affairs which immediately followed, not with the jaundiced eye of a prejudiced critic, but with the candid fair-mindedness of one in search of the truth, the wonder is, not that the times were dark but that there was any light at all.

Historians of the school of Hallam, and especially Robertson, whom the Protestant Maitland characterizes as "a very miserable, second-hand writer," find it to their interest somehow to besmirch the memory of the monks of old, while they heap mountains of calumny and gross misrepresentations upon a system of religious institutions of whose supernatural nature and purport they understood absolutely nothing. Their broad and unsubstantiated assertions, sad to say, are allowed by many to pass unchallenged. While the continent of Europe was swarming with barbarians and weltering in blood; while its towns and cities with their amassed treasures were given over to pillage and fire; when all seemed lost, the monasteries became the sole repositories of learning, and continued so for many a long, long day. This is the incontestable fact as it confronts us upon the page of history, and the most ingenious combinations of talent and bigotry have never been able to disprove it.

We have seen how from the very outset monasteries became educational centres. We may form some idea of the intellectual atmosphere which they developed if we bear in mind that, with few exceptions, the early fathers and doctors of the Church had been monks or were educated in monasteries—Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, Augustine, Fulgentius, Sulpicius Severus, Vincent of Lerins, Cassian, Salvian, and much later, Gregory the Great—not to speak of others, the bare mention of whose names is guarantee sufficient of the educational value of the ancient monastic training. It was the profound learning of these mighty ones of the elder time, as embalmed in their imperishable works, which for centuries presided over the development of Christian doctrine and formed the groundwork of Scholasticism in a subsequent age. The immortal "Summa" of the Angelical Doctor did but codify and systematize truths upon

which these primitive writers, pupils of the monasteries, had rung the magnificent changes ages before. At the end of the fifth century the West, like the East, had become fruitful in these nurseries of learning, and when the municipal schools disappeared with the fall of the Empire, children were driven to have recourse to them for whatever learning was saved from the universal wreck.

There was one flaw, however, in the monastic system as it then existed, and that was a lack of proper organization, in default of which satisfactory and permanent educational results were less readily attainable. This evil was remedied by the great patriarch of the West, Saint Benedict, who, A.D. 529, at Monte Cassino laid the foundations of an order destined to absorb or supplant all previous monastic institutions in the West and keep alive in its cloisters the torch of learning amid the worse than Cimmerian darkness deepening around. That it filled a pressing need is obvious from the rapidity with which it spread. Before the end of the century in which it was born Benedictines were in every country laboring and praying and teaching, and by the disinterested holiness of their lives pointing the way to an elevation of character and a need of civilization of which the barbarian had never heard or dreamt.

The time of the monks was devoted to the inculcation of a knowledge which to us seems scant enough, though it was considerable then. It was mainly ecclesiastical in character. The fact is quite intelligible when we remember that the principal object of education in an age so barbarous was not so much cultivation as civilization—finish as foundation. What youth needed most was to outgrow its savage environments, and to this secular education was far less conducive than familiarity with the truths of Holy Writ and the fruitful suggestiveness of the Church's liturgy. Besides, the primary object of the monastic schools was to train aspirants to the religious or priestly state, and it was only as a matter of necessity that they were thrown open for the patronage of students intended for mere secular avocations. Many were put in the monasteries when very young; some even in their infancy.¹ This was rendered more or less urgent by the prevailing

¹ "The custom," says Doctor Lingard, "of offering children to be devoted for life to the monastic or clerical profession, was early adopted in the Christian Church, in imitation of the oblation of the prophet Samuel in the temple of Jerusalem. The idea that the determination of his parents was no less binding on the child than the voluntary profession of adults was first embraced in the sixth century, and followed until the pontificate of Celestine III., who, according to the more ancient discipline, permitted the child at a certain age to decide for himself."—*Hist. and Antiq. of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 231, note 6.

"The fierce northern warriors," says Cardinal Newman, "who had won for them-

disorders, and found abundant sanction, secular and ecclesiastical, in the admitted customs of the times. Thus, for instance, Saint Boniface, the great apostle of Germany, became a monk when only five years old.¹ Venerable Bede, as he tells us himself, en-

selves the lands of Christendom with their red hands, rejoiced to commit their innocent offspring to the custody of religion and of peace. Nay, sometimes with the despotic will of which I have just now spoken, they dedicated them, from or before their birth, to the service of Heaven. They determined that some at least of their lawless race should be rescued from the contamination of blood and license, and should be set apart in sacred places to pray for their kindred. The little beings, of three or four or five years old, were brought in the arms of those who gave them life to accept at their bidding the course in which that life was to run. They were brought into the sanctuary, spoke by the mouth of their parents, as at the font, put out their tiny hand for the sacred corporal to be wrapped round it, received the cowl and took their place as monks in the monastic community. In the first ages of the Benedictine Order, these children were placed on a level with their oldest brethren. They took precedence according to the date of their admission, and the grey head gave way to them in choir and refectory, if junior to them in monastic standing. They even voted in the election of Abbot, being considered to speak by divine instinct, as the child who cried out 'Ambrose is Bishop.' If they showed waywardness in community meetings, inattention at choir, ill-behavior at table, which certainly was not an impossible occurrence, they were corrected by the nods, the words, or the blows of the grave brother who happened to be next them; it was not till an after time that they had a prefect of their own, except in school hours. That harm came from this remarkable discipline is only the suggestion of our modern habits and ideas; that it was not expedient for all times, follows from the fact that at a certain date it ceased to be permitted. However, that in those centuries in which it was in force, its result was good, is seen in the history of the heroic men whom it nurtured, and might have been anticipated from the principle which it embodied."—*Historical Sketches*, vol. ii., art. "The Benedictine Schools."

¹ Which rather conflicts with Mr. Emerton's amusing statement that Boniface, for a time, carried on his mission in Germany on his own account, but finding that it would help his enterprise immensely, eventually allied himself with the Church of Rome. He says: "The famous Englishman Boniface, the Apostle to the Germans, had come over from England and entered upon the work of a missionary among the Frisians along the shores of the North Sea. From there he had gone over into the valleys of the Main and Danube, and had had remarkable success in founding churches and monasteries, which were to be so many centres of light in these still barbarous regions. For a time he had carried on this work on his own account, but soon he saw that if he could make himself the agent of Rome he would strengthen his cause very greatly. The papacy was the more ready to adopt him as its own, because there were already missionaries at work in these same parts who had taught a form of Christianity different in many ways from that of Rome. These missionaries had come from that Keltic church which we saw established in the west of England and in parts of Scotland and Ireland at the time when Augustine had carried the Roman form to the Anglo-Saxons, and the conflict between them and Boniface was the same which went on there between Augustine and the ancient British church. The question in both cases was the same: Should Rome become the one centre of church life in the West, or should the life of the church, like that of the state, gather about several centres? Should there be national churches, or but one all-embracing Church Catholic of which Rome should be the single and supreme head? In great parts of Germany, as in Great Britain, it had seemed as if a local, national church might grow up quite independent of Rome; but after the work of Boniface it was clear that the hold of Rome upon Germany was fixed forever."—(*An Introduction to the Study of the Middle Ages (375-814)*, by Ephraim Emerton, Ph.D., Professor of History in Harvard University. Boston: Ginn & Company, 1888, p. 131.)

tered the monastery of Wearmouth at seven ; while Saint Bruno, as late as the tenth century, was committed to the monks at Utrecht at the advanced age of four years. About the age of seven, children began the work of education proper by learning the Psalter. It was of obligation for all monks and ecclesiastics to know it, and accordingly it was the first thing taken up. When they had mastered it they entered upon their course of profane study, which consisted, presupposing the acquisition of reading and writing, of the three fundamentals : grammar, rhetoric and logic, which constituted what was called the *Trivium* ; and the four mathematical and more advanced sciences of arithmetic, music, geometry and astronomy, which were known as the *Quadrivium*. The two together embraced what was called "The Seven Liberal Arts." By "grammar" was understood something more than etymology, syntax and prosody. It included rhetoric and, in a measure, the study of literature. "Rhetoric" in turn was rather declamation and public speaking. By "music" was understood the science as far as acquaintance with it then extended, which, we may suppose, was considerable in some cases when we bear in mind that Gregorian chant takes its name from a monk of the sixth century, Pope Gregory the Great, whose famous school of chant was for a long time prominent and became the model of many others subsequently founded in Germany and France by Saint Boniface and Charlemagne.¹ The language spoken in the class-room was Latin, and children were required to master it even before the vernacular. The literature studied was mainly Roman. In fact, the whole monastic educational system bore a striking resemblance to that of the ancient municipal schools of the Empire, already described. "The curriculum," says Cardinal Newman, "derived from the earlier ages of heathen philosophy, was transferred to the use of the Church on the authority of Saint Augustine, who in his *De Ordine* considers it to be the fitting and sufficient preparation for theological learning. It is hardly necessary to refer to the history of its formation ; we are told how Pythagoras prescribed the study of arithmetic, music

¹ "After the manner of a wise Solomon," says an ancient writer speaking of Gregory, "being touched by the sweetness of music he carefully compiled his *Centon*, or Antiphony of chants, and established a school of those chants which had hitherto been sung in the Roman Church, and built for this purpose two houses, one attached to the church of Saint Peter the Apostle, and the other near the Lateran Patriarchium, where, up to this day, are preserved with becoming veneration the couch whereon he was accustomed to rest when singing ; and the rod wherewith he was accustomed to threaten the boys, together with the authentic copy of his Antiphony."—*Christian Schools and Scholars*, Drane, p. 60.

and geometry ; how Plato and Aristotle insisted on grammar and music, which, with gymnastics, were the substance of Greek education ; how Seneca speaks, though not as approving, of grammar, music, geometry and astronomy as the matter of education in his own day ; and how Philo, in addition to these, has named logic and rhetoric. Saint Augustine in his enumeration of them begins with arithmetic and grammar, including under the latter history ; then he speaks of logic and rhetoric ; then of music, under which comes poetry as equally addressing the ear ; lastly of geometry and astronomy, as addressing the eye. The Alexandrians, whom he followed, arranged them differently, viz., grammar, rhetoric and logic or philosophy, which branched off into the four mathematical sciences of arithmetic, music, geometry and astronomy.

Greek was studied very little and an acquaintance with its literature was individual and exceptional. Hence it does not figure extensively in the class-room until quite late. It was indeed a rare accomplishment, and with the vast majority served no higher purpose than an elegant affectation. Bede, Alcuin, Paschasius and others, we are told, were familiar with it, and it is no more than likely that they taught it to some of their pupils, without, however, giving it in the school-room the prominence enjoyed by Latin. In a few of the monasteries, notably that of Saint Gall, it was studied and taught, and from a very early date. With time it came into more general use and played a conspicuous part in later monastic curricula. This impulse given to its pursuit was due to Charlemagne, who set the seal of his royal approbation, so to speak, upon it and made its cultivation the fashion by having it taught in the college of Osnaberg, established by him, and which attained some renown, but whose history is lost in the darkness and confusion which envelop the period. It is noteworthy that some of the most proficient Greek scholars of mediæval times were women. In fact, having the same and in many cases better facilities for mental improvement than the men, and having more time on their hands and nothing but serious books within reach, it is not surprising that the ladies of those days, whether nuns in convents or dames at court, did much to foster the thorough cultivation of the classics—Hebrew, Latin and Greek. Very many of them wrote Latin and a few Greek verse with finish and ease. Saint Radegundes, a nun of the sixth century, found leisure for the study of the Latin and Greek patristic commentaries. Among the friends of Saint Boniface was a community of English nuns remarkable for their classical attainments,

many of whom at his request followed him into Germany and there opened schools for girls. Foremost among them was Saint Lioba, who, it is narrated, was thoroughly versed in the Scriptures, the writings of the Greek and Latin fathers, and the canons of the Church. The nuns in the convent of the famous but unfortunate Heloise studied Greek as well as Latin, Hebrew and Arabic; while of another we are told that she familiarized herself not only with the Greek and Latin classics, but also with the philosophical works of Aristotle.

Physical science, as might be expected, was far less developed in the monastic schools than the study of language. Many of the monks lectured and wrote upon such subjects, some of them voluminously, but their views in most cases, if not groundless surmises, were at least broader than their premises, and in the light of subsequent investigation and discovery have proven the merest puerilities. But for all that it is to their credit that despite the odds against them they fostered a spirit of scientific inquiry at all; and while, on the one hand, it does not add much to our stock of information to be told, for instance, as Rabanus Maurus, one of the mediæval lights, tells us, that the mouse and house-fly came originally from Greece, and that birds are divided into big birds and little birds, in which latter class he puts the wasp and the locust, yet, on the other, it is a subject of wonder to see what acquaintance Bede, and centuries later Albertus Magnus, had with matters whose discovery we are accustomed to look upon as of comparatively recent date. We can afford to marvel when the great naturalist Von Humboldt could not refrain from expressing his surprise. "Albertus Magnus," he says, "was equally active and influential in promoting the study of natural science and of the Aristotelian philosophy. . . . His works contain some exceedingly acute remarks on the organic structure and physiology of plants. One of his works, bearing the title of 'Liber Cosmographicus de Natura Locorum,' is a species of physical geography. I have found in it considerations on the dependence of temperature concurrently on latitude and elevation, and on the effect of different angles of incidence of the sun's rays in heating the ground, which have excited my surprise."¹

As text-books were rare, a great deal of dictation was necessary. The weariness which it begot soon led to the invention of shorthand methods of reporting discourse. Some monasteries became famous for their shorthand classes, and their professors

¹ *Cosmos*, vol. ii., p. 243 *in fine*. Translation by E. C. Otté.

celebrated not only for their own but for their scholars' proficiency. Of the text-books in use, the most renowned were the "Grammatical Institutions" of Priscian, in eighteen books, of which, so the story goes, Theodosius the younger was so enamored that he copied them with his own hand; the "Distichia Moralia," a popular class-book whose composition was attributed to Cato, but is more commonly believed to have been the work of a monk of the second century;¹ the grammar of Donatus, the teacher of Saint Jerome, which continued a favorite throughout the middle ages; various works of Boëtius, a writer of the fifth century and one of the last and brightest scholars of the decline. He wrote original Latin productions for class use, and it was to his translations from the Greek that medieval students owed much of their acquaintance, which was none too extensive, with the writers of Hellas. To these let us add "On the Teaching of Sacred Letters" and "The Seven Liberal Arts," written by Cassiodorus for the school which he founded at Viviers, and which were also works in long and favorable repute. The best known and no doubt the most generally used was the "Satyricon" of Martianus Capella, written about the year 470. It was an encyclopædia in nine books, covering in its treatment the matter embraced in the *Trivium* and *Quadrivium*. It contained whatever knowledge was then extant upon the so-called "Seven Liberal Arts," and such was its widespread popularity that it continued in favor as the text-book by excellence for upwards of a thousand years and was translated into various languages and adopted everywhere. Possibly the one who did most in the composition of text-books, and that at a time which Mr. Hallam stigmatizes as the nadir of European civilization, was Saint Isidore, Archbishop of Seville, and one of the founders of the celebrated seminary to which allusion has already been made in a previous paper. He died in the year 630. Isidore was certainly a learned man, and was looked upon as an intellectual prodigy by his contemporaries. The work which won him his great reputation is entitled "Origines; seu Etymologiarum Libri." It is in twenty books, and not only embraces the *Trivium* and the *Quadrivium*, but also the subjects God, man, the world, Scripture, medicine, law, language, geography, agriculture, zoology, and a number of other miscellaneous topics. Of these productions, and similar ones of lesser note, Hallam remarks that their very meagreness is proof sufficient of an almost total literary decay. True. No one attempts to deny

¹ On this work, cf. *Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars*, Healy, p. 117.

their superficiality of treatment. On the other hand, they are not to be tried by the canons of nineteenth century criticism, which it would be well for Hallam, Milman, Robertson, Brucker, and our own Mr. Emerson always to bear in mind.

The claustral and cathedral schools, in default of many of our modern improvements, were conducted under difficulties not hard to conceive. The monastic school for externs was in a building apart from the cloister. There was a head master and an assistant. In the larger monastic institutions the corps of professors, as we would now phrase it, was quite numerous. The system was paternal, though the rod figured conspicuously in the moral training of the mediæval "small boy," but hardly to the absurd extent asserted by Laurie, who says that "in many monasteries all the boys were periodically flogged as a kind of general atonement for sins past and possible;" this, too, on the ridiculous assumption that the devil was in the heart of every boy, and could only be gotten out by trouncing. The students, especially the younger ones, were carefully looked after by the monks appointed to act as prefects, and whose duty it was to remain with their charges night and day—exercising the closest supervision over their conduct. Education was absolutely free, and in many instances, as at Yar-row in the time of Venerable Bede, indigent pupils were even provided with food and clothing at the expense of the cloister. The boys continued at school until fourteen years of age, when they departed to enter their respective fields of labor. If they desired to be monks, they remained in the monastery undergoing the discipline suited to that kind of life. Facilities for the pursuit of higher studies were not to be had until the time of Charlemagne, A.D. 768, who, in imitation of the imperial system of old Rome, whose educational as well as governmental polity he sought in many respects to reproduce, founded advanced schools in various parts of his extensive dominion. The most celebrated were at Paris, Tours, Pavia, Rheims, Lyons, Fulda and Bologna. Some see in them the germs of the mediæval universities, whose origin scholars find it difficult to trace with accuracy. Such were the teachers. Such was the learning afforded by the early mediæval monastic schools. It may be taken as a fair estimate of the educational advantages offered by the monasteries in general. We say "in general," for some were, of course, more advanced than others. But our concern is not with the exception, but with the rule. That education under these circumstances, and in spite of the obstacles in the way of its development, did not remain at a standstill, is sufficiently manifest by the progress made in certain

monasteries when the circumstances of the times, especially the royal patronage and the discontinuance of wars, were conducive to its rapid and healthy growth. Indeed it is impossible not to observe, though the transition be at times ever so gradual and well nigh invisible, as we thread our way through the twilight from the sixth to the twelfth century, a progressive movement towards the broader educational condition of things in which it finally culminated. Where the monks of the fifth and sixth centuries were occupied with saving the remnants of ancient literature, purging and adapting authors for class purposes, and imparting the merest elements to the as yet untutored barbarian, their successors in the eighth and ninth and eleventh had strung their instruments for songs in a higher key. The monk Gerbert, raised subsequently to the Papal chair under the title of Sylvester II., was holding forth upon the *Categories* and *Topics* of Aristotle. The professors in certain German monasteries were delivering lectures in Greek, Hebrew and Arabic. At Dijon the monks of Saint Benignus were discoursing on medicine, while the enterprising inmates of Saint Gall were teaching painting, engraving, and, in the opinion of some, sculpture.¹ This development would have been more systematic and pronounced from the start if the zeal of the monks, unhampered by endless political and social unrest, had been the only factor in the circulation. It was not, however, and those pious men who found so much time for the conduct of schools still felt that the bulk of their energies had to be devoted to the spiritual rather than the intellectual benefit of their neighbors. How well they succeeded in their missionary undertakings is shown by the fact that within the compass of six centuries they had reclaimed from Arianism the Goths and Vandals, and "instructed in the Gospel the idolatrous nations of Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Bulgaria, Hungary, Saxony, Poland and Russia."

Such was the monk at home : such his work. But if we would gauge him aright and allot him his due meed of praise we must follow him abroad and study his endeavors for the widespread diffusion of knowledge. The fifth century, as we have said,

¹ "Rabanus Maurus was about the first to comment on the *Introduction* of Porphyry, and on portions of the *Organon*. In the year 935, whilst Reinard of S. Burchard, in Wurtemberg, commented on Aristotle's *Categories*, Poppo was elucidating, at Fulda, the *Commentary* of Boethius. Notker Labeo, who died in 1022, translated into German the *Commentary* of Boethius, and the *Categories* and *Interpretation* of the Stagyrte. Abbo of Fleury (1004) wrote a clever and original work on the *Conclusions*, and Adalberon, Bishop of Laon (1030), disciple of Gerbert, wrote a dissertation *De Modo recte Argumentandi et Prædicandi Dialecticam*.—Saint Thomas of Aquin, Vaughn, p. 188.

closed in darkness. The schools of the Empire and the earliest attempts at Christian education were at first brought to naught by the deluge of barbarism which swept over the continent of Europe, though destined, after years of almost utter obliteration, to revive and become the foundation of modern civilization, reform and culture. In the meanwhile, that is to say in the sixth and seventh centuries, by a providential arrangement, peace reigned in what are now the British Isles. Thither learning fled. In England and Ireland, during the three centuries following the fall of the Roman empire, monasteries were multiplied, and education diligently fostered, and scholars nurtured who went forth when the storm abated and set about the process of reconstruction all through Europe. During the sixth and seventh centuries, says Doctor Döllinger, the schools in the Irish cloisters were "the most celebrated in all the west." Famous among them were those of Armagh, which at one time could boast of seven thousand pupils; Lismore; Cashel; Kildare; Aran "of the saints;" Clonard, where the great Columba studied; Clonmacnoise; Benchor, and Clonfert, founded by Saint Brendan.¹ The arrival of Saint Augustine in England with a colony of monks from Monte Cassino, A.D. 597, inaugurated for the seventh and eighth centuries a most prosperous educational era in that island. Canterbury, Lindisfarne, Malmsbury, Croyland, Yarrow, Wearmouth, York, Oxford and various other centres, are at once suggestive to the student of history of the active spirit which had taken possession of the country. To the schools of these isles, and that for upwards of three hundred years, students, regardless of the difficulties of the journey, flocked in thousands and from all quarters, even from Greece and Egypt. Of the great men who studied within their enclosure, and who afterwards became the pioneers of the revived learning and civilization throughout the western world, it will suffice to mention Saint Columba, the Apostle of Caledonia; Saint Columbanus, who evangelized France, Burgundy, Switzerland and Lombardy; Saint Columbkille; Saint Boniface, the Apostle of Ger-

¹ "During the sixth and seventh centuries the church of Ireland stood in the full beauty of its bloom. . . . The schools in the Irish cloisters were at that time the most celebrated in all the West; and in addition to those which have been already mentioned, there flourished the schools of Saint Finian of Clonard, founded in 530, and those of Saint Cataldus, founded in 640. Whilst almost the whole of Europe was desolated by war, peaceful Ireland, free from the invasions of external foes, opened to the lovers of learning and piety a welcome asylum. The strangers who visited Ireland not only from the neighboring shores of Britain, but also from the most remote nations of the continent, received from the Irish people the most hospitable reception, a gratuitous entertainment, free instruction, and even the books that were necessary for their studies."—*History of the Church*, Döllinger, Vol. II., p. 31.

many; Saint Gall, the Apostle of Switzerland; Saint Fridolin; Saint Sigisbert; Saint Killian; Saint Virgilius; Saint Cataldus; Saint Kentigern; Saint Willibrod; Saint Donatus; Saint Frigidian; Venerable Bede; Aldhelm; Alcuin, and an army of others. Under their influence the barbarian, grown weary of strife and realizing the desolation which he had wrought, was gradually moulded to better things. He became as eager to learn as they were to teach, and their work went on prosperously if slowly. "As the Irish missionaries," to quote Newman again, "travelled down through England, France and Switzerland to lower Italy and attempted Germany at the peril of their lives, founding churches, schools and monasteries as they went along, so, amid the deep pagan woods of Germany and round about, the English Benedictine plied his axe and drove his plough, planted his rude dwelling and raised his rustic altar upon the ruins of idolatry, and then, settling down as a colonist upon the soil, began to sing his chants and to copy his old volumes, and thus to lay the slow but sure foundation of the new civilization."¹

The first of the three most notable movements in the direction of educational progress occurred during the reign of Charles the Great, which extended from A.D. 768 to A.D. 814. This illustrious man—"the King of Europe" and "the Orthodox Emperor," as he was fondly styled on account of the vast extent of territory over which he ruled and his noble defense of religion, though himself a stranger to literary cultivation, could nevertheless appreciate the accomplishment in others. A journey through Italy about the year 780 brought him in contact with certain scholars of whose learning he was in admiration. The event determined him to do all in his power to raise the intellectual standard of his subjects by putting within their reach every facility for educational improvement. It was a sadly needed reform, the internecine wars of the Merovingians having done much to cripple learning and paralyze the popular zeal for its acquisition. It was the dream of Charlemagne's lifetime to lay the foundation of an empire destined to rival in splendor the glories of ancient Rome, and he felt that this were impossible without the revival of letters on a scale approaching, if not surpassing, the traditional renown of the Augustan Age. He had heard of the system of higher and secondary education as it had prevailed in the universities of old at Rome, Athens, Constantinople, Alexandria and elsewhere. He had seen it in active though imperfect operation in the Benedictine monasteries, in

¹ *Loc. cit.*

which a partial line of demarcation between the higher and lower studies was drawn. Accordingly, his first care was to send earnest instructions to the bishops and abbots and priests urging them to enter heartily into his scheme of educational reform by exerting themselves vigorously for the benefit of their cathedral and monastic as also of their parochial schools. All this in order to qualify youth the more effectively for entrance into the Palatine or Palace School established at the Court, or similar institutions soon to be modeled upon it in other parts of the kingdom. The text of this capitular or encyclical letter, "the first general charter of education for the middle ages," is quoted in full by Mr. Mullinger in his popular and well-known work upon the schools of Charlemagne as affording a marked evidence of the educational status of the times. "We exhort you, therefore," says the emperor, "not only not to neglect the study of letters, but to apply yourself thereto with perseverance and with that humility which is well pleasing to God. . . . Let there therefore be chosen for this work men who are both able and willing to learn and also desirous of instructing others; and let them apply themselves to the work with a zeal equalling the earnestness with which we recommend it to them."¹ The emperor's next care was to secure the best professors, and for these he looked to England and Ireland. The most celebrated of those whose services he engaged was Alcuin, an English monk of the monastery of York. He enjoyed widespread fame as a teacher and a scholar, and so impressed Charles, whom he met at Parma on the occasion of the visit already alluded to, that he prevailed upon him to resign his position as head master of the schools in his monastery and take up his residence in Frankland, there to become the corner-stone of the new order of things about to be inaugurated.² The learning which Alcuin brought with him was signalized and recommended by the tradition which had come down to him through a series of distinguished saints and scholars direct from the See of Peter.³ He continued with very little interruption for fourteen years, from A.D. 782 to A.D. 796, co-operating with his royal master for the furtherance of his educational plans. He then severed his connection with the

¹ *The Schools of Charles the Great*, J. Bass Mullinger, M.A., pp. 97-99; *Schools of Charlemagne*, Newman, *Edinburgh Review*, Vol. 151; *Hist. Sket.*, Vol. III.

² According to some writers. Laurie says they met at Padua; Newman, at Pavia.

³ We refer particularly to the celebrated Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, whose achievements have been rightly said to constitute an era in the history of the English Church. For an account of his zeal in behalf of schools and letters, *vide Conversion of the Teutonic Race*, Hope, c. xi.; Newman, *loc. cit.*, 451; *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, Lingard, c. 11.

Palace School, retired from court, and sought a quiet retreat in the monastery of Saint Martin, at Tours, the incursions of the Norsemen, which had begun in the meantime, rendering it impossible for him to return to his much-loved island home.

Among the distinguished successors to Alcuin in the Palace School should be mentioned Rabanus Maurus, also Dungal and Clement, two Irish scholars of rare ability, whose proffered services in the cause of education Charlemagne readily accepted and rewarded. At a later date, during the reign of Charles the Bald, and after the school had been transferred from Aix-la-Chapelle to Paris, we find at the head of it the famous Scotus Erigena, with whom theologians are sufficiently familiar. Scotus was an eminent Oriental linguist, had studied in Ireland and travelled much in the East, where, no doubt, the metaphysical speculations for which he became so celebrated had become tinged with the Platonism of the Alexandrian schools. His heretical views touching the Eucharist and free will soon led to no end of conflict and controversy, until his public condemnation by the Church became an imperative necessity. The Palace School and such as were more or less fashioned upon it were intended to furnish every facility for the prosecution of higher studies, and therefore designed to complete the work begun in the primary or parochial schools, and carried on through the minor cathedral and monastery schools. A youth graduating from one of these latter passed to one or other of the former or major schools which, by royal decree issued A. D. 789, had been erected in connection with certain of the larger monasteries, as, for instance, with those of Saint Gall, Fulda, Fleury, Fontanelles, and at least a dozen more referred to by Mabillon. In the primary or village parochial school reading, writing, arithmetic and singing were all that was taught. In the minor schools the work previously begun was continued and augmented by the addition of the *Trivium*. In the major schools the *Quadrivium* was added, and such special languages and sciences as individual institutions were able to supply, which, in some cases, was considerable. Over the primary or parochial school the parish priest presided. Over the monastery school, minor and major, whether conducted for interns or externs, the abbot. Over the cathedral school, the bishop, directly, or indirectly by means of the *Scholasticus*, or head master appointed by him. Instruction was gratuitous. The schools were strictly public; equally open to rich and poor. The whole system was capped by the Palace School. From it all others naturally took their cue, as it was generally, though not

always, controlled by the best teachers, and consequently was easily able to set the fashion and give the tone to the rest of the country in matters literary and scientific. It is worthy of observation that the Palace School was for girls as well as boys; women as well as men. It was to one of his female pupils that Alcuin dedicated his commentaries upon the Gospel of Saint John and his treatise on the nature of the human soul. It goes without saying that throughout the moral training of the pupils was most sedulously looked to. Catechism, Scripture, ecclesiastical chant and the Church's calendar and ceremonies were carefully taught. It certainly must have been a great stimulus to the diligence of scholars everywhere to note the zest with which the Emperor "went to school," taking his place upon the forms in the class-room and asking and answering questions like the youngest pupil, whilst the eloquence of Alcuin opened up to his untutored mind the profundities of grammar and arithmetic or of astronomy, of which he seems to have been particularly fond. We may thus conceive of the Palace School as a sort of university centre, though in no sense a university; nor, in the opinion of Cardinal Newman, even the nucleus of the subsequent mediæval universities, as Du Boulay, in his eagerness to trace the origin of that of Paris to Charlemagne, so stoutly contends. Some idea of the broad gauge upon which the Emperor proposed to operate his plan of educational reform may be gathered from the fact that even the Palace School was not intended exclusively for members of the court, but admitted also those of humble origin whose exceptional talent gave promise of future ability.

When in this connection we speak of "higher studies," we use the term relatively, of course. There was, for instance, in astronomy as taught by Alcuin much that was never dreamt of in Herschel's philosophy or seen through the Lick telescope. But all the same, what there was of endeavor merits praise instead of ridicule, as it pointed distinctly to a forward and not to a retrogressive movement. It may be said that the great Emperor brought the full force not only of his example but also of his authority to bear upon the promotion of education throughout his dominions. As he had commanded, and that in various capitulars, all bishops, abbots and priests to second his efforts to provide the necessary learning for his subjects, so in like manner he commanded the subjects in their turn to profit to the full by the opportunities afforded. Every inducement in the shape of rewards and preferments was offered, and when these failed compulsion was had recourse to. In a capitular issued A. D. 812 he

ordained that "every one should send his son to study letters, and that the child should remain at school with all diligence until he should become well instructed in learning." The result of so much activity on the part of Charlemagne and such prompt co-operation on the part of the monks was a general revival of learning within his dominions. Their influence was still more widespread. Wherever the fame of his literary achievements extended; wherever the pupils of the Frankish schools travelled, there the spirit of inquiry was awakened and an eager desire to imitate, if not to emulate them, was enkindled. That his scheme of reform, left to itself, would have produced permanent and happy results there is no questioning. His immediate successors, Louis le Debonnaire and Charles the Bald, did their utmost to bring it to maturity. But political dissensions, whose origin and course it were beyond our present purpose to trace, begot civil discord, and in the social upheavals of protracted war the educational work of Charlemagne was undone. The growth of feudalism and the dismemberment of the Carlovingian Empire, which was in progress for a century and a half—that is to say from the middle of the ninth to the end of the tenth century—played havoc with the schools. Yet it were false to say that the interest and industry put out by so many minds and through so long a time upon the advancement of learning were productive of no results. There is a conservation of moral as of physical energy in the world, and the prolific idea, once set in motion, never dies until it has brought forth to fullness, somewhere and somehow, the fruitage of which its pent-up vitality gave hopeful assurance. The efforts of Charlemagne, if not altogether successful, were certainly not entirely abortive. The cathedral and conventual schools had been actively revived.¹ A new impulse had been given to the study of the German language.² Pupils graduated

¹ The Episcopal or Cathedral schools which had almost, if not entirely, disappeared during the dreadful period of the barbaric invasions, had been gradually re-established whenever and wherever an altered condition of affairs allowed. Under the Merovingians, according to Ozanam, at least twenty could be enumerated in France alone. Charlemagne gave a new impulse to their revival and multiplication. It was in the assembly of Aix-la-Chapelle and in the year 789 that bishops received their first command to open, in connection with their cathedrals, schools that were both public and free. Alluding to their general character at this time, West says: "The Episcopal or Cathedral schools were neither so strict nor so flourishing as the monastic schools, whose exterior side they resembled, educating candidates for the priesthood and children of laymen generally. . . . Apart from the rigorous discipline of monastic life exacted from the *oblats*, there is, however, no essential distinction to be drawn between the instruction furnished in the monasteries and cathedrals."—*Alcuin and the Rise of the Christian Schools*, p. 57.

² Cf. *Saint Boniface and the Conversion of Germany*, Hope, c. 25.

from his schools had scattered themselves over Europe, disseminating elsewhere the seed which could no longer grow in soil now become uncongenial. While the entire life of the great man, in so far as he is connected with the history of education, has built up a tradition whose splendor still hangs, like a sunset glory, upon the distant and darkening horizon of those far-off times, and still works like a charm upon the minds of scholars. None the less, it is true that at this juncture, the beginning of the tenth century, the continent was lapsing into darkness. Education and learning once again fled to Britain, where peace was beginning to reign, and there sought to build themselves a habitation amid the ruined and deserted cloisters where the monks of other days had lived and prayed and studied and taught.

When Alfred the Great, A. D. 872, succeeded to the throne of Britain the aspect of affairs was dismal in the extreme. The ravages of the Danes had exiled studies from the kingdom and left but little trace of the educational labors of the early monks and missionaries. The churches and monasteries, the only homes of learning, had been pillaged. Their inmates, its only guardians, had been murdered. Lindisfarne, Coldingham, Tynemouth, Bardney, Croyland, Medeshamstede and Ely amongst the number, were in ashes. "At this period," says Doctor Lingard, speaking of the close of the Danish invasion, "the English church offered to the friends of religion a melancholy and alarming spectacle. The laity had resumed the ferocity of their heathen forefathers; the clergy were dissolute and illiterate; and the monastic order was in a manner annihilated.¹ Like Charlemagne, Alfred felt that his mission was to be one of reconstruction. Accordingly he set to work to rebuild monasteries, to gather together teachers, open schools, and urge his subjects, by example no less than by precept, to do all in their power for the furtherance of knowledge. Returning from Rome, a visit to the court of Charles the Bald had thrown him in contact with scholarly men and introduced him to the workings of the Palace School, which he made it his purpose to reproduce in his own dominions as soon as a lull in the storm of battle would permit.

During the fifteen years of peace which the country enjoyed immediately after the decisive encounter of Ethandune (A. D. 873), Alfred set vigorously to work. He gave himself to diligent study, securing as teacher and head of the Palace School, Asser, a monk

¹ *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, c. 11; *The Life of King Alfred the Great, Knight*; *Annales Rerum Gestarum Aelfredi Magni*, Asser.

of St. David's, or Menevia, in Wales, who subsequently became his biographer. Asser enjoyed a widespread reputation for learning and ability. It was only, however, after considerable delay and difficulty that the King prevailed upon him to spend six out of the twelve months each year in England, superintending the Palatine and such other schools as were placed under his direction. For it is surmised, and with good reason, that his pedagogical work was not confined to the inmates of the palace, but that, like Alcuin, he travelled from place to place with his royal master, opening schools where at all feasible at the same time that he communicated to those with whom he came in contact, some of the zeal and interest in educational progress which filled his own ardent and devoted soul. In reward for his services he was created abbot of several monasteries, and finally raised to the bishopric of Sherburne, where he died in the year 910. Under such competent guidance Alfred made great progress in his studies, and was enabled gradually to perfect the work of his education which had been begun years before. Though we are told that at the age of twelve he could neither read nor write, by dint of persevering endeavor he soon became remarkable for his attainments in certain departments of learning, and one of the most celebrated men of his times.

Each day he devoted eight hours out of the twenty-four to prayer, study and composition. He applied himself especially to philosophy, geometry, music and architecture. At the age of thirty-nine he took up Latin, which he mastered sufficiently to enable him to compose in it several works of no mean desert, as well as to translate others into the vernacular—amongst them being "*Liber Pastoralis Curæ*" by Gregory the Great; "*De Consolatione Philosophiæ*" by Boetius, and "*Historia Ecclesiastica*" by Venerable Bede, together with selections from the "*Soliloquies of Saint Augustine*." His proficiency in the Saxon tongue, in which he wrote numerous poems, was also remarkable. Add to which the practical turn of his genius, which enabled him to bring to bear upon the material and intellectual advancement of his kingdom whatever knowledge he acquired. "In a word," says Edmund Burke, summing up his excellent qualities, "he comprehended in the greatness of his mind the whole of government and its parts at once, and, what is most difficult to human frailty, was at the same time sublime and minute."¹ A character of such diversified worth was well suited to become the chief

¹ *Abridgement of English History*, Book II.

instrument of educational reform at an epoch and in conditions sufficiently dark and desperate. Like the humblest child he sat at the feet of Asser in the Palace School, and gave peremptory orders that all the officials of his kingdom should set the same example of diligence and love of self-improvement by applying themselves immediately and earnestly to the cultivation of learning. If loath to do so, they were to be dismissed from their offices forthwith. To facilitate the execution of his command, he enlisted the services of whatever learned men there were in Britain. These were none too numerous. He himself in a letter to Wulsige had deplored their lamentable scarcity.¹ Nothing daunted, however, by the obstacles in his way, he sent abroad to solicit aid from other nations—not merely petitioning for scholars to conduct his schools, but even for monks to people his cloisters, the rude Saxon not having developed as yet any particular relish for that species of life. Not only Wales, as we have seen, but Flanders, Germany and France were put under contribution to supply the deficiency. Perhaps the two most prominent whom he succeeded in obtaining were John, surnamed "the Old Saxon," who is thought to have received his education at the monastery of Corby in Westphalia, and Grimbald. Both were monks and priests. The former he put in charge of the monastic establishment at Ethelney. He is sometimes confounded by historians with John Scotus Erigena, already referred to, and who was not only not abbot of Ethelney, but most probably, as Dr. Lingard maintains, was never in England at all.² Grimbald, if certain accounts be credited, was given the direction of the educational institution at Oxford, whose origin would thus be traceable to the ninth, if not to an earlier, century, with the honor which it so much craves of having Alfred for its founder. The more likely opinion, however, based upon sounder historical criticism, seems to be that all record of Grimbald is lost, and his connection with Oxford is nothing more than a fiction woven of the fancies of certain romantic writers.³ But

¹ "Adeo funditus concidit," he writes, "apud gentem Anglicanam (learning) ut paucissimi fuerint cis Humbrum, qui vel preces suas communes in sermone Anglico intelligere potuerunt, vel scriptum aliquod a Latino in Anglicum transferre: tam sane pauci fuerunt, ut ne unum quidem recordari possim ex australi parte Thamesis, tum cum ego regnare coeperam." Pastoral of Gregory, *Introduction*.

² *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, c. II, Note 37. *Historica Ecclesiastica*, Nat. Alexander, vol. xii., c. 9, Art. III.

³ "The connection of the University of Paris with the Palatine Schools of Charles the Great," says Rashdall, "rests only upon a series of arbitrary assumptions. The theory which traces the origin of Oxford to Alfred the Great aspires to a foundation in contemporary evidence. The Oxford myth was long accepted on the authority of a passage in the Annals of Asser, Bishop of St. David's. The passage is found neither

how bright soever the halo with which a grateful posterity crowns Alfred's work as an educational reformer, it was comparatively scanty, and in all likelihood would have perished with him had not providence raised up in the person of Dunstan, a saintly monk of Glastonbury, where the light of learning still flickered, one who could and did, upon his recall from exile by Edgar, take up the work and bring it to a perfection far beyond Alfred's capabilities. His name, coupled with those of Ethelwald, Oswald, Aelfric and Abbo, will ever be associated with an educational development not altogether barren of results in the history of English civilization. Advancing upon the lines marked out by Alfred, he enlarged his scope and infused into the undertaking a divine power—the gift of saints—which until then it had not known. The work of restoration was pushed diligently forward. Peterborough, Ely, Malmesbury and Thorney rose from their ruins, and no less than forty abbeys were built or restored under his celebrated primacy. Thus the tenth century, from A.D. 924 to A.D. 992, saw the beginning of an upward movement in Britain which was to continue with very little interruption until the multiplied misfortunes of the sixteenth century would pour, like a deluge, over the land.

The experiment made by Alfred to revive learning in England, in imitation of Charlemagne in France, found zealous emulators in Germany in the persons of the Othos, who ruled that country from A.D. 936 to A.D. 1024. Their efforts were as successful as, if not more so than, those in Britain, and form, together with the other two, the only points of relief in the dark ages we are traversing. The pursuit of letters had been steadily on the decline for five hundred years, and, Hallam to the contrary notwithstanding, the general verdict of historians is that it reached its lowest ebb toward the close of the tenth century, which has been not inappropriately styled an age of iron—“*sæculum infelix et obscurum.*”²

in any extant MS. nor in the earliest printed editions, but made its first appearance in Camden's *Britannia* in 1600 A.D.; whence three years afterwards it was transferred to the edition of Asser. The spuriousness of the passage, which is indeed sufficiently betrayed by its affected classicality of style, was demonstrated as long ago as 1843 in a dissertation appended to the English translation of Huber's *English Universities*. The myth recently received its *coup de grace* at the hands of Mr. James Parker (*The Early History of Oxford*, Oxf. Hist. Soc., 1885). . . . When the supposed authority of Asser is put out of court, the Alfredian legend even in its simplest and least elaborate form, cannot be traced further back than the *Polychronicon* of Ralph Higden, who died in 1363. In fact the whole story with the vast cycle of legend of which it is the nucleus . . . may now be abandoned to students of comparative mythology and of the pathology of the human mind.”—*The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, by Hastings Rashdall, vol. ii., part ii., p. 322, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

¹ *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria*, Cave, p. 402.

² “En incipit,” says Baronius, “annus Redemptoris nongentesimus, tertia indictione

The reason for this lamentable and unparalleled decadence was the destruction of churches and monasteries at the hands of barbaric Normans, Danes and Saracens, whose depredations at this period vividly recalled the invasions of Goth and Visigoth in the fifth and sixth centuries as they swept over the face of Europe, leaving nothing but ruin and desolation in their track. Yet, dark and dismal as the period really was, if we scrutinize the situation closely we will not fail to see that it was not absolutely unproductive of schools and scholars. Both were to be met with at Utrecht, Einsiedeln, Treves, Hildesheim, and in other cities. The same spirit of interest in studies which we have seen at the court of Charlemagne was visible in the populous centres of Germany, and especially within the royal household, where a well-conducted palace school was flourishing. It was fashioned upon the same lines as those presided over by Alcuin and Asser, and aimed at systematizing whatever educational endeavors were possible in an age so unfamiliar with the arts of peace and the institutions of civilized life.¹ Saint Bruno, raised by popular acclaim to the archbishopric of Cologne, and Saint Adelbert to that of Magdeburg, stood out in bold relief as particularly zealous for the educational improvement of their country. Assisted by the unstinted patronage of the Othos and the generous co-operation of a people anxious to learn, the seed of their endeavors fell upon responsive soil and realized a creditable harvest. Injunctions were issued to the bishops ordering them to provide their dioceses with suitable schools. Scholars were brought, especially from Rome, to serve as teachers, and thither students were sent to acquire whatever learning was to be obtained at the heart of Christendom, with the result that not a few, despite the difficulties of the situation, won a fair celebrity for their intellectual attainments. It were needless to recite a mere catalogue of names. Suffice it to say that the two most celebrated scholars who flourished during this epoch

notatus, quo et novum inchoatur sæculum, quod sui asperitate ac boni sterilitate ferreum, malique exundantis deformitate plumbeum, atque inopia scriptorum appellari consuevit obscurum."—*Annales Ecclesiastici*, vol. x.

Bellarmino says of it, "nullum sæculo decimo inductus."—*De Controversiis, de R. Pontif.*, lib. iv., c. 12.

¹ Hence to avoid repetition we can afford to be brief in its description. Possibly nothing contributed more generally to the realization of educational results than the hearty co-operation of an episcopacy of which one historian writes: "In no age, perhaps, did Germany possess more learned and virtuous churchmen of the episcopal order than in the latter half of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century."—Introduction to the *Literature of Europe*, Hallam, vol. i., p. 28.

were doubtless Scotus Erigena and the monk Gerbert—solitary lights, so to speak, in a firmament grown almost pitchy dark.¹

But the darkest hour, so the saw has it, is the one before the dawn. Whether it be so or not ordinarily, in the present case it certainly was. The elements of a great change had been long at work. The change itself was now imminent. Social, political and religious influences long smouldering were about to declare themselves. Their manifestation was to transform Europe, breathe life into the dry bones of the past, and give birth to a civilization whose shibboleth was to be educational reform. It is no easy matter, even for the philosopher of history, to trace to its certain causes the general revival which unmistakably sets in with the eleventh century. The spirit of chivalry, the Crusades, the birth of commerce, the formation of European languages, the multiplication of religious orders, the secularization and specialization of learning, and the introduction into Europe from the East of a system of philosophy peculiarly adapted to stimulate mental exertion, are all advanced as having more or less influenced the turn in the tide so noticeable at this time. To speak of the principal. Chivalry, at once the effect and concomitant of feudalism, with its exalted regard for personal honor and womanly dignity, certainly did much to steady the jarring elements of the barbaric ages in which it flourished and lift men's thoughts and aspirations from the rude to the refined, from the actual to the possible, from the real to the ideal. The tales of scald and bard; the songs of troubadours and minnesingers, woven upon the romance of love and rehearsed far and near in wooded bower or castle hall, were in-

¹ As the eleventh century opened in the darkness of the tenth, so its close ushered in the dawn of an epoch ever memorable as a transition period in the history of Christian education. The forces which effected the tremendous change had been silently and imperceptibly at work for years, maybe for centuries, meanwhile held in abeyance by the deplorable social and moral condition of the times. With the advent of new and more favorable circumstances, however, they were free to declare themselves and did so with permanent and universal effect. Nowhere was their influence felt more lastingly than in the schools, both monastic and cathedral, which from this point on—from Anselm to Peter the Lombard—are scarcely recognizable as identical with their former selves. An altogether new spirit had taken possession of them. Their resources were being multiplied daily, while the whole trend of their steady development was in the direction of the universities into which they were to be eventually merged. Of their relation, *in transitu*, to the universities, and of the universities themselves—their organization and constitution—we hope to speak somewhat in detail later. For a summary account of the transition to which we allude, the reader is referred to *Saint Thomas of Aquin*, Vaughn, pp. 76-77; *Rise and Constitution of Universities*, Laurie, Lect. vi., pp. 96 *et seq.* For an elaborate treatment of the entire subject, vid. *History of the Universities of the Middle Ages Before 1400*, Denifle; *The Universities of the Middle Ages*, Rashdall; *Idea of a University and Rise and Progress of Universities*, Newman (*Historical Sketches*, vol. iii.).

deed a summons to something higher. They were an incentive to a social condition in which delicate fancy and noble sentiment, touchstones of mental refinement, were allowed full scope and activity. Allied to religion, the chivalric spirit did more. It purified and elevated while it supernaturalized the lives and hopes of men, affording them through the darkness from which they were emerging clearer glimpses of another order of life, moral in character, and founded upon the immutable principles of Christian beauty and truth. It was the dawn of a new civilization, broader and nobler than aught they had ever known, and the national as the individual heart throbbed in responsive unison with its invitation to higher and better things. The Crusades, too, whatever objections may be alleged against them on other grounds, contributed largely to the revival of which we are speaking. Until the voice of Peter the Hermit sounded the call to arms throughout Europe and rallied to a common cause so many nations differing in character and thoroughly antagonistic, men's lives were comparatively insulated. There was little travel and almost no interchange of ideas. What knowledge there was stood, as it were, in stagnant pools awaiting some mystic touch to quicken it into marvelous life. For want of motion and friction it lacked the vigor which alone could insure its rapid and steady growth. Ireland, England and Germany had indeed made the world their debtors by sending their scholars hither and thither; but the coming and going of a few only helped to emphasize the defect in the general situation. But with the uprising of multitudes the result was quite different. As army met army, as they moved in thousands from place to place, they awoke as from a dream, and what they heard and saw came to them with the force of a revelation. New ideas, new institutions, new scenes, new nations, new laws, new customs, new social and political systems, new libraries, new scholars, new educational facilities, the varied products of the arts and sciences and the fruits of every industry were all a most effectual mental stimulus. What they had seen and heard only made them the more eager upon returning home to see and hear more, while it formed the endless burden of romantic stories which excited others to set out in quest of similar information. The secularization of learning was also acting as a potent factor at this crisis. It is true, there had always existed what were known as "adventure" or private schools, whose professors eked out a livelihood shifting from place to place and teaching wherever the experiment seemed to pay. But they were conducted in a manner in harmony with the Christian ages in which they flourished. Now, however, a change was

coming over their condition. Their number was increasing. The store of learning which they carried was growing every day more considerable, while a spirit of mental unrest was fast developing in their midst. Practically divorced from religion, they wanted the safeguards which the monasteries had once supplied. A dangerous spirit of ambitious rivalry soon took possession of them which, while it had the advantage of opening up wider fields of research, was in not a few instances fraught with the still greater disadvantage of not knowing where to draw the line upon its investigations. In its wild chase after the elusive phantom of knowledge it too often overlooked its higher obligations and contributed not a little to foster the sceptical spirit of the heresies which began to crop up at this time, and which, in their deification of reason, repudiated the supreme and inalienable claims of divine faith. But among the various forces at work we must not omit to mention the introduction into the West of the philosophy of the East with its disposition to inquiry and its endless metaphysical refinings. Europe was ripe for it.

Heretofore education had moved in a beaten track. It had been traditional rather than discursive. It had contented itself with guarding and quoting the wisdom of antiquity without attempting to open up new vistas or cut new paths through the unexplored realms of the mind. Original research was almost unknown. Augustine and Gregory Thaumaturgus might be cited, but to venture a new treatise upon the nature and province of grace were a boldness akin to impiety. Such a state of affairs could not endure. Too many problems were pressing for solution and all that was needed to give it was a scientific method of investigation which, while it would throw the searchlight of the subtlest mental acumen into the darkest corners of the most abstruse subjects, could not fail to harmonize, in the rounded fullness of a universal accord, the natural with the supernatural, the human with the divine, the principles of revelation with the laws of perpetual progress. The birth of scholasticism, for such was the name which it assumed in Christian hands, marks a prominent point of departure in the intellectual history of Europe. The Aristotelian or Peripatetic philosophy had been imported from Greece and popularized by Arab commentators. Saracenic invasion introduced it into Europe by way of Spain, and it was not long ere it was caught up and assimilated into the life of the leading educational institutions of the West. Cleared of its pagan dross, it was easily moulded into an effective instrument in the hands of saints and scholars, and made to serve the higher and

holier purpose of an aid to the fuller illustration, by rational methods, of the truths of the gospel. It took speedy possession of the existing schools; infused new vitality into the studies of the *Trivium* and *Quadrivium*, imparting to them a life and a relish they had never known before. The quiet atmosphere of the classroom became alive with the fire of disputation. The fervor spread from institution to institution. Students thronged from everywhere to the various schools, until their number became so great as to necessitate an increase of lecturers and an organization sufficiently compact and effective to hold this eager and turbulent body in due control. The enthusiasm which had formerly marked the lectures of Gerbert and Scotus was now aroused by numerous professors who could drink of the same fountain of wisdom without crossing the threshold of their respective monasteries. Which of all these forces was the most operative it were impossible to say. While Paulsen emphasizes the Crusades and Professor Laurie the secularization of education, Cardinal Newman insists upon the Greek philosophy as the most effective and significant force then at work.

The age of the Universities had not yet come. Still who can fail to see in the features which distinguish this transitional epoch the dawns of that activity which in the twelfth century would be thrown into definite shape and in the fifteenth would strike the zenith of its development for the weal of some and the woe of others? Professors and departments in the various schools were multiplied. Studies were organized. Superior schools were started in great numbers as supplementary aids in the shadow of great educational centres. A system of interdependence, co-ordinate and subordinate, was forming amongst the various institutions. Learning, as well as the methods adopted for its inculcation, was assuming a universal character which was gradually lifting education from the contracted and hampering environments of the past to the world-wide field it was destined to range after a few years. Who was the master spirit of the hour can only be surmised. The names of Anselm, Lanfranc, William de Champeaux, Abelard and others, pass in celebrated train before us in answer to the question. Laurie finds even in the rebellion of Berengarius and the rationalism of Scotus sufficient explanation of the great awakening as he conceives it. This much, however, do know—that in the monastery of Le Bec, in Normandy, especially under the regencies of Lanfranc and Anselm, the new philosophy was chastened and wedded to theological truth in a way to establish its practical value when properly applied, and thus

was furnished with credentials which made it welcome wherever it went;¹ that it was in and about the School of Paris that the new life was manifesting itself most strikingly. Having passed through the various stages of a long development, that institution was now preparing more evidently and rapidly than ever, under the salutary influences of position and patronage, to assume at the end of the eleventh century the higher role of university, and thus merit for itself the distinction of having led off in the great transformation so near at hand. Incidentally, and while the scene is shifting, it is interesting to observe, as an unmistakable sign of her zeal for educational progress, how the Church, as she had done her utmost to save the relics of ancient learning in the dark days of barbaric invasion, in the present emergency contributes her vast and varied influence towards lifting it on to the higher plane for which it was certainly making.² She favored rational investigation—the application of philosophy to dogma—provided it were distinguished throughout by a humility and faith which could recognize and respect the claims of revelation as against the assumptions of a vain and unbridled reason. With her blessing and cooperation, with the favor of the State as well, with the combined energies of inspirited multitudes, the forces now set in motion were not to be stopped, but moved on powerfully to their appointed ends—to their far-reaching and lasting results. The night had passed. The day was slowly breaking.

REV. EUGENE MAGEVNEY, S. J.

SAINT IGNATIUS COLLEGE, Chicago, Ill.

¹ *The Life and Times of Saint Anselm.* Rule.

² For an enumeration of various councils convened by the Church in behalf of popular education, especially during the ninth century, cf. *The Bible in the Middle Ages.* Buckingham.

THE RECOLLETS AT DETROIT DURING NEARLY
ALL THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

THE Catholic Church, under whose auspices the Western World was discovered, whose ministers first brought the light of Christianity to the aboriginal nations possessing the soil of North and South America, and first explored the extensive regions lying between the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans, has, to use the words of the "silver-tongued orator" of the Catholic Congress of Baltimore in 1889, "set its broad seal on American soil."

On no part of the American domain was this seal more firmly set than on the fair region which we propose to designate as the North and the South littorals of the Detroit, where the Catholic Church was first established under the auspices of Catholic France.

Neither the political events during which the flag of a ruling power has been changed five times on the North littoral, nor the progressive expanse of a great city under American rule, has weakened the tenacity of the seal of the Catholic Church.

The closing years of the nineteenth century suggest the fact that the Eternal Sacrifice which was first offered in this locality by Catholic priests in July, 1701, on the high bluff of the strait, which has since become the commercial centre of the city of Detroit, with her 300,000 or more inhabitants, has been continuously offered by priests and prelates during the two centuries succeeding the erection of the first Catholic chapel on these shores.

But before religion had been established, the strait leading into Lake Erie had been recognized in New France as of strategic importance to the maintenance of French supremacy in the North-west regions.

To the English it was the gateway of water-communication between Lake Erie and New York and the fur-trading regions of lake and forest from Lake Huron to Lake Superior, exploited and held by the French, but ardently coveted by the English traders.

To the French the control of the strait would secure protection against hostile approach from the lower lakes, or from any attempt to enter Lake Huron by way of Lake Erie.¹ The French could reach Lake Huron from Canada by way of the Ottawa River,

¹ A study of the map of the waterways between Lakes Erie and Huron will show the strategic importance of the strait between Lake St. Clair and Lake Erie.

and by water and portage communications to the Georgian Bay; and this was the route usually taken by military and trading expeditions from Canada for nearly a century. It is claimed by Rameau and other historians that there was a frontier rendezvous on the strait where the city of Detroit now stands, during the seventeenth century, and that La Salle, who crossed Lake Erie in the "Griffon" in 1679, having on board his vessel Fathers Membre, Hennepin and Ribourd, and the Chevalier Henry de Tonty, when passing up the strait, tarried at this rendezvous. Father Hennepin and the Chevalier de Tonty in their respective narratives describe the natural beauty of the approach to the locality, the forest-lined shores, the green meadows, the beautiful birds and the abundance of game they saw, with much admiration. Charlevoix in his seventeenth letter, written at Detroit forty-two years later, corroborates the description of the scenery as given by the companions of La Salle.

In 1693 the French Government had under consideration the advisability of establishing a fort at the site of this rendezvous on the strait. Among the officers called upon to report upon the lake frontier was the Chevalier Antoine de la Mothe Cadillac, who had been commandant of Michilimacinae and its dependencies.¹ The memoir submitted by this young officer upon the status of the Western Lake Indian nations, and their political relations with the nations of the Iroquoian Confederacy of New York, attracted attention in the cabinet of Louis XIV., and especially of the Count de Pontchartrain, Minister of the Marine and Colonies, not only for its comprehensiveness, but more particularly for the reasons assigned for constructing permanent works of defence at this strategic locality.

He also advocated the planting of a colony of Frenchmen on the strait and the concentration in the vicinity of the proposed military post of all the Indian nations inhabiting the shores and islands of Lakes Huron and Michigan, for permanent settlement, whose warriors, allied with the French, would make a combined force which the English and their Iroquoian allies could not overcome. Definite action at the time on the part of the Government

¹ Antoine de la Mothe Cadillac, born at St. Nicholas de la Grave, Tarn and Garonne, France, 1658; officer of distinction in Canada, 1686; Chevalier of St. Louis; Seigneur of Mount Desert, 1689; Commandant at Michilimacinae, 1694; founder and Governor of Detroit, 1701-1710; Governor of Louisiana, 1710-1717; returns to France; Governor of Castelsarasin, Tarn and Garonne, 1722-1730; obit, October 15, 1730.—Farmer's *History of Detroit*, pp. 226-330.

of France was probably deferred by the adverse influence of the monopolists controlling the trade of New France.¹

In 1700 the Chevalier Cadillac went to France and explained his plans to Count de Pontchartrain. He asked for a grant of land for his proposed colony, for 100 soldiers, for as many more colonists, the necessary outfit for such an expedition, with money for its support during the initial years of its establishment. He received his commission as Governor, the grant of lands, and an order on the Governor-General of New France for the men, money and stores; and, returning to Canada in 1701, commenced the organization of his initial expedition.

But de Calières, the Governor-General, was unable to furnish more than fifty soldiers and the same number of artisans and farmers for colonists—in all, about half the number authorized by the French Government.

The expedition, which comprised twenty-five bark trading-canoes,² left Trois Rivières June 5, 1701, taking the route by the Ottawa River, and across, by rivers, lakes and portages, to the Georgian Bay, thence through Lake Huron down to Lake St. Clair, into the strait leading to Lake Erie,³ the Chevalier Cadillac in command; Alphonse de Tonty, captain; Dugué and Chacornacle, lieutenants; Father De Lhatte, Recollet, to be chaplain of the future post; and Father Vaillant, S. J., for missionary work among the Indians at their intended settlements.

After a journey of forty-four days the Chevalier Cadillac entered the strait, and arrived at the locality of the old rendezvous July 21, 1701, and assumed possession of his domain.

The bluffs on both sides of the strait at its narrowest point were high: a landing-place was selected about a mile below the old rendezvous, on the northwest side, at the mouth of a small river,⁴ where the shore was low and sandy. The expedition was disembarked, and a military camp established.⁵ The site of the

¹ *La Compagnie du Canada*, whose stockholders were mostly residents of Paris.

² The capacity of a trading bark canoe was four tons of freight. It could be carried on the shoulders of four men across the portages without its freight; the latter usually followed on hand-trains.

³ This route was taken in preference to the shorter one by way of Lake Erie, to escape the vigilance of the Senecas, hereditary guardians of the "Western Door" of the "Long House," as the "Country of the Lakes" of New York was called, between the Hudson River and Lake Erie, the home of the Nations of the Iroquoian Confederacy.

⁴ The Savoyard River, which has since disappeared.

⁵ "The successful termination of the first move in this bold enterprise," writes Rameau, in his *Notes Historiques*, "was highly creditable to its commander." Canada, at the time, had a population of about 21,000 souls. From her sparse settlements

future post was located at the narrowest part of the strait, on the bluff.

Four *arpents* were marked out for stockade inclosure, inside of which two hundred square feet were reserved for defensive works, the construction of which was immediately commenced. The fort was built of heavy square timber laid as in mason work, having four bastions. Its position was designed to command any approach by land or water, while affording protection to all Frenchmen. It was named, in honor of the patron of the colony, Fort Pontchartrain.¹

The chapel, built in the same inclosure as the fort, was named in honor of St. Anne, on whose festival, July 26, 1701, it was commenced. The dwellings for temporary use were all alike, and built of upright timber—simply extensive cabins roofed with bark and made habitable by the methods customary in frontier life.

“Here, then,” says General Cass, “commences the history of Detroit, and with it the history of Michigan. How numerous and diversified are the incidents compressed within the period of its existence!

“No place in the United States presents such a series of events interesting in themselves and permanently affecting, as they occurred, its progress and prosperity. Its flag has been changed five times, three different sovereignties have claimed its allegiance,

Cadillac selected his men; but his frontier experience enabled him to engage such adventurers as might be relied upon, whose intelligence and courage would be likely to stand the ordeal of the dangers of his expedition. “It is a proof of his great influence,” continues Rameau, “that he succeeded in inducing so many to leave their homes and friends, and follow him to a far-distant wilderness, in a journey of 600 miles, exposed to hostile Indian attack, with the possibility that after its termination the whole command might be massacred before assistance from the nearest friendly quarter in Canada could reach the scene.”

¹ Louis Philippeau, Count de Pontchartrain, Minister of the Marine and Colonies under Louis XIV., 1690–99, when he succeeded Boucherat as Chancellor, and retired in 1714. His son, Jerome Philippeau, Count de Pontchartrain, succeeded his father as Minister of the Marine and Colonies, 1699, and retained his portfolio until the death of the “Grand Monarch.” Count Jerome was the patron of the Colony of Detroit, and probably a friend of its founder. He insured its success in spite of the intrigues and the persistent opposition of its enemies, both in Canada and in France—the wealthy monopolists of the *Compagnie du Canada*, whose directors in Paris sought its destruction from the time of its inception. This tribute is due to his memory.

Cabinet council work under Louis XIV. was most thorough; this is evident, so far as the affairs of the colony founded by the Chevalier Cadillac is concerned, from the marginal notes on nearly all the documents in the archives of the Marine and Colonies relating thereto.

It is a curious historical fact that the anti-Jesuit ranting and the calumnies of the Chevalier Cadillac against the Jesuit missionaries contained in his dispatches to La Touche, Under-Secretary of State, were controverted in royal councils by the venerable Jesuit, Father La Chaise, confessor of the King.

and since it has been held by the United States its government has been thrice transferred ; twice it has been besieged by the Indians, once captured in war, and once burned to the ground."¹

In pursuance of his proposed plan to colonize the Indians in the vicinity of Fort Pontchartrain, the Chevalier Cadillac sent messengers to the nations inhabiting the littoral and islands of Lakes Huron and Michigan, inviting their tribes to leave their cantons, "to bring their families, and to come down and make new homes in the vicinity of the post, where the climate was mild, the soil fertile, game abundant, a storehouse for barter, and ample protection assured." His influence over the lake tribes was such that most of the Hurons and Ottawas abandoned their homes and came to the post.

The Huron tribes built their canton and fort about a mile below the post, while lower down on the shore of the strait were located the cantons of the Miami and Pottawotomi tribes.

The Chevalier Cadillac located the Ottawa tribes on the opposite side of the strait, on the high bluff about a mile southeast, where they built their cantons and strong defensive works.

After the fort and stockade had been completed, small tracts of land outside the post on the shore above were assigned the farmer colonists and married soldiers ; advances of seed-grain, implements, and other supplies were made to encourage the tillage of the soil from the allowance granted by the King ; while shelter within the stockade was assured to all Frenchmen.

But the difficulties confronting the tillers of the soil were great ; there were no horses, no cattle ; the clearance of timber and the preparation of the soil for planting had to be done with the axe and spade—in other words, by hand-labor.

Meanwhile the chase and the fisheries became valuable auxiliaries in the supply of good and wholesome food.

Had the Chevalier Cadillac received that support from the Colonial authorities of New France intended by the Government of France, the success of his enterprise in the founding of the colony of Detroit would never have been doubtful. But, as we have stated, the success of his enterprise on the plans proposed would seriously affect the interests of the monopoly controlling by royal charter nearly all the trade of French America. While the removal of the people of the Indian tribes from their homes on the littorals and islands of the upper lakes and colonizing these tribes in the vicinity of Fort Pontchartrain would demoralize the

¹ Cass : Discourse before the Historical Society of Michigan at Detroit, 1830.

richest field of the fur-trade of the *Compagnie du Canada*, these consequences had been foreseen, and their effect upon the profits of the rich monopoly had been estimated so adversely, that the destruction of any colony on the plan proposed and the crushing of its projector had been determined by the Paris directors, even before the initial expedition had started from Trois Rivieres.

These, it is true, were commercial considerations. More serious, however, were the results to be expected from this Indian hegira in a religious point of view.

Michilimacinac was the headquarters of the missionary system of the Western lake regions, which included the people of the tribes of the respective nations the Chevalier Cadillac proposed to colonize near Fort Pontchartrain.

The conversion to Christianity of most of these Indians had been effected during the seventeenth century by the labor, which in some instances had been attended by the martyrdom, of some of the saintliest fathers of the Society of Jesus.

The removal of these Christian Indians from the spiritual control of the missionary fathers, which control had been independent of the jurisdiction of the military commandants of Michilimacinac, and their concentration and settlement as proposed, would expose them to contact with the white race, while religious control would become subordinate to the dictates of the military commandants, which had not always been in harmony with the Christian rule of the missionary fathers. Experience had proved that such contact had resulted in the demoralization of the weaker race, and that Christian Indians who had been exposed to it were likely to lapse to debauchery, if not to Paganism, with deplorable consequences to the peace and welfare of their families.¹

It resulted, therefore, that the heroic enterprise of the Chevalier Cadillac, in founding the post and colony at Fort Pontchartrain, was destined to encounter the serious opposition of two of the most powerful elements in all New France; the one altogether commercial, which already virtually controlled the colonial officials; the other of a purely religious combination, with great influence in America and in Europe.

¹ The Chevalier Cadillac, while in command at the post of Michilimacinac, had championed the cause of the French traders when the missionaries sought to suppress the sale of *eau de vie* to their Indian neophytes, which caused misery in their families and endangered their souls. Their beneficent opposition to this evil resulted in a bitter controversy, maintained by the Chevalier.

But the missionaries sought the intervention of the French Government and their cause was sustained. The Chevalier, rankling under this signal defeat, never ceased to misrepresent and even to revile the Jesuit Fathers.

While the directors of the *Compagnie du Canada* opposed this enterprise with unscrupulous methods, the Father Superior of the Jesuits at Quebec, while not co-operating, refrained from opposing the founding of a colony sanctioned by the Government of France.

It is probable the situation was fully explained to the Provincial of the order in Paris at the time, and by the latter to Father La Chaise, the venerable confessor of Louis XIV.; we have, however, no knowledge of such epistolary record.

The first intimation the Chevalier Cadillac received of the non-concurrence of the Father Superior at Quebec was the prompt withdrawal of Father Vaillant de Guestis while the expedition was still encamped. The recall of this distinguished Iroquoian missionary and Indian diplomat¹ annoyed and angered the chevalier, for his dispatches and correspondence on file in the French archives are in evidence of the fact. It was an unexpected and a very serious disarrangement of his plans for the utilization of the several thousand Indians who were to be gathered by his influence to the vicinity of Fort Pontchartrain.

While the Chevalier Cadillac was laying the foundation of the post and colony of Detroit, its wealthy enemies in Paris were scheming for its destruction. In the fall of 1701 Governor de Calières was instructed that it was the King's command that the posts of Detroit and Frontenac were to be placed in charge of the *Compagnie du Canada*, who would reimburse the Government for the cost of their establishment and assume the expense of their future maintenance. The Governor was directed to convene a council of the notables of Canada and of the seven directors of the company, to arrange the conditions of these transfers. This council was held at the Chateau of St. Louis, in Quebec, October 31, 1701. It was an *ex parte* assembly of men in the interest of the company, who were opposed to the colony of Detroit. The chevalier could not be present, while his friends in Canada were excluded. Its proceedings were drawn up in a *procès verbal* as a "treaty" between the representatives of the Crown on one side and the directors of the *Compagnie du Canada* on the other, and certified by a royal notary.

By its terms the military tenure of the Crown remained vested

¹ Rev. Francis Vaillant de Gueslis, S.J., ordained at Quebec, 1675. Missionary at Fort Hunter, 1679. With the Mohawks, 1683, whence he retired at the breaking up of the missions in the Iroquoian cantons. Chaplain of Denonville's expedition against the Senecas, 1687. Envoy to Governor Dongan, at New York, 1688. At Detroit, 1701. Missionary in the Seneca cantons, 1703-7, whence he returned to Quebec. (See Charlevoix for later mention.)—New York Doc. 9, 762.

in the respective commandants, who were to have control over military affairs; but they were forbidden, under severe penalties, to take any part in their trade or commerce, which was placed under the exclusive control of the factors of the monopoly. It is doubtful if this was intended by Louis XIV., or if the so-called "treaty" ever received the royal sanction.¹ On July 18, 1702, the annual convoy from Quebec arrived at Fort Pontchartrain, bringing a dispatch from Governor de Calières citing the royal mandate, accompanied with an official copy of the "treaty," and instructions to turn over to the factors of the monopoly, who came with the convoy, the stores and property of the Crown at Fort Pontchartrain. The Chevalier Cadillac was further instructed to make such arrangement with the three factors as would conform to the conditions of the "treaty" in their future government of the post and colony.

The chevalier was too good a soldier to refuse obedience; he surrendered his civil functions, confident that in time the Government, in the interests of New France, would restore him to full control over the post and colony.

For five years the *Compagnie du Canada* ruled at Fort Pontchartrain, during which time its founder had been arrested and subjected to legal persecutions at Quebec, while, in the meantime, Governor de Calières, who was an honest ruler, had died and had been succeeded by the Marquis de Vaudréuil, who was a nephew of the Sieur Lotbinière, of Quebec, a leading director of the monopoly in New France. The Chevalier Cadillac, in an exhaustive document, addressed Count de Pontchartrain, in which the history of the colony during six years, the manner in which he had been persecuted, and the schemes of the company for breaking up the colony were minutely related. He asked that the company be withdrawn, and that the control of the post in the interest of the colony and of New France be restored to him with increased power, and demanded a grant of money to enable him to procure additional colonists and develop its growth.

This document, which is on file in the archives of the Marine and Colonies at Paris, shows, from its many marginal notes, that it was carefully considered in the cabinet councils held by Louis XIV. The Chevalier Cadillac was sustained. The *Compagnie du Canada* was withdrawn, while the Marquis de Vaudréuil was sharply reprimanded and narrowly escaped the disgrace of dis-

¹ This is also the opinion of Judge Campbell, author of *Outlines of the Political History of Michigan*.

missal.¹ The privileges of the monopoly were greatly restricted.² The people of New France were relieved from an incubus which had dwarfed commercial enterprise, which had corrupted public functionaries, and which had to some extent demoralized the youth and manhood of the agricultural classes.

Upon the return of the Chevalier Cadillac to Detroit after his prolonged detention at Quebec, he found Captain Bourgmont in temporary command and the establishment so badly demoralized that his worst enemies would have been satisfied with the situation. The garrison had been reduced, but the soldiers had received neither pay nor clothing from the company for three years. Some of the colonists had left the post and were engaged in fur-trading.

In the meantime the post had been attacked by hostile Indians, while the chaplain, Father Constantin, had been treacherously killed by an Indian's bullet. Bourgmont, however, was a good officer, and with the assistance of the friendly tribes in the vicinity the post was saved from capture and pillage.

But French prestige over the 3000 or more Indians domiciled near Detroit had been weakened; to restore this the Chevalier Cadillac had to use sharp measures. Every effort was now made by its founder to re-establish the colony on a sound basis. The garrison of the post was increased, additional colonists and artisans, horses, cattle, agricultural implements, and seed-grain were brought from Canada, while a grist-mill was erected.

The storehouse was well stocked, but the Chevalier Cadillac made stringent regulations for the sale of *eau de vie* to colonists and Indians alike. He was now commandant of the post and seigneur of the colony; as such he made grants of land to colonists and issued licenses to fur-traders.

Soon after the hegira of the Indian tribes from the littorals and islands of Lakes Huron and Michigan and their settlement near the post, the Jesuit Fathers abandoned their missions in that locality; the venerable Father de Carheil burned the chapel and mission house at Michilimacinac, the scene of his depopulated missionary centre, and sorrowfully returned to his brethren at Quebec.³

While the Chevalier Cadillac, under the protection of the Count de Pontchartrain, had defeated the machinations of one of the

¹ See Pontchartrain's letter in *Margry*, 5, 348.

² N. Y. Col. Doc. 9, 777.

³ See *in re* the instructions of Louis XIV. to Governor-General de Vaudr uil in *Margry*, 5, 345.

greatest monopolies existing in Europe or in America to wipe out the post and colony at Detroit, his correspondence on file in the archives at Paris proves that his documentary warfare against the Jesuit missionaries all through the decade of his career at the post was continuous and bitter.

It seems to us that his bitter sarcasms and calumnious insinuations was the great mistake of his adventurous career, and had the effect of weakening the confidence of his influential protector, the Minister of the Marine and Colonies, while having more or less influence in shaping its disappointing termination at Detroit.

In a few years the colony at Detroit, under the energetic administration of its founder, took deep root, while its population and trade increased.

The Indian tribes in the vicinity lived in peace; the warriors went to their hunting-fields and returned with their packs of furs, which were bartered to advantage at the storehouse of the post. The Indian women cultivated the prolific soil, whose harvests filled their granaries, leaving a surplus of grain and vegetables which was also sold.

Such was the status when in 1710 M. de La Mothe Cadillac was appointed Governor of Louisiana, which part of New France extended from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific.

It was an administrative position of great importance, with headquarters at what is now New Orleans. Whether this appointment had been made in the interest of France or had been dictated by adverse influence is a question; we incline to the opinion that it was by the latter. If, however, the enemies of the colony had brought about the removal of its founder with the expectation that it would decline and be abandoned, they were disappointed in the result.¹

The crucial period in its existence was during the second decade, which to some extent was tragic; it languished, then recovered. Thanks to the brave colonists, it grew and prospered.

¹ The succeeding commandants of the post were: 1711-1712, du Buisson; 1712-1714, de la Forest; 1714-1717, Charles Sabrevois; 1717, de Louvigny; 1717-1720, Henri de Tonty, cadet; 1720, de Noyelle; 1720-1727, Alphonse de Tonty; 1727, de Lepernouche; 1728, de St. Ours; 1728-1734, de Boishebert, during whose administration the colony made great progress; 1734, de Livandière; 1734-1738, Charles Sabrevois; 1738-1741, de Noyelle; 1741-1742, de Noyan; 1742-1743, de Celeron; 1743-1750, de Longueuil; 1751-1754, de Celeron; 1754-1758, de Muy; 1758-1760, de Bellestre. It fell to the latter, François Marie Picote, one of the most distinguished of the French rulers of the post, to lower the standard of France to the "border ranger," Major Robert Rogers, who had been sent with a company of New York rangers by General Amherst, after the capitulation of Montreal, to take possession. These abbreviated details may be studied *in extenso* in Farmer's *History of Detroit*, p. 227.

Under Beauharnois, Governor-General of New France, 1726–1747, who fully appreciated its importance, the colony was greatly favored, while inducements offered to colonists stimulated the emigration of a superior class of agriculturists and artisans, who secured grants of land and became permanent residents. In fact the soil was very prolific, while the climate was much more agreeable than that of Canada; which facts becoming known, Detroit came to be considered a desirable location for young married couples who had new homes to acquire and fortunes to create.

The wise policy of Beauharnois was continued by his successors.

There was no longer any protected opposition to the colony. The blight of the monopoly of *La Compagnie du Canada* had been replaced by commercial activity. External wars were, however, destined to change the political status of New France.

As we have stated, the Recollet friar, Nicolas Bernardin Constantine de Lhalle, was appointed by Governor-General de Calières *aumônier* of the initial expedition to establish the post and colony of Detroit, and he accompanied its leader, the Chevalier Cadillac, in his perilous journey from Trois Rivières to its termination.

It was apparently under the direction of this Recollet father that the primitive chapel was completed; it was dedicated in the manner stated to Ste. Anne.¹

We have seen no authentic account of the birthplace, the education, or of the ordination of Father De Lhalle.

His name indicates gentle lineage, he was probably inspired with a vocation for the sacerdotal state, and after his ordination he offered himself for Indian missionary work in New France.

According to Monseigneur Tanguay,² he came from France to Quebec in 1696; his age at the time is not stated. He officiated at Longueil in 1698. He is said by the same authority to have been pastor of the church of St. Francis de Sales, the locality of which is not mentioned.

The first chapel of Ste. Anne was destroyed by fire, with other buildings near the fort, in 1703. It was promptly replaced by a larger chapel and presbytery.

Father De Lhalle had commenced a baptismal registry on sheets of paper which were burned with the original chapel in 1703.³

¹ The chapel was built of hewn timber, the pieces of which were laid one over the other as in mason work.—RAMEAU, *Notes Historiques*, p. 7, Montreal, 1864.

² Répertoire Général du Clergé Canadien par ordre Chronologique depuis la Fondation de La Colonie, etc., par Mgr. Ciprien Tanguay, etc., Montreal, 1873.

³ The loss of these sheets is to be regretted. Father De Lhalle may have rewritten them, or intended doing so. Were they extant, some important questions might be definitely determined which their loss will ever leave in doubt.

On February 2, 1704, the parochial register now used in the church of Ste. Anne of Detroit was commenced. This register has been in use not quite two centuries; it comprises many strongly bound volumes of well-preserved pages, and altogether it is in fine condition. It is written in French; and besides the *actes* of baptisms, marriages and services for the dead, there may be found on its pages the record of important parochial events as they occurred during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It is probably the most unique religious and historical manuscript relating to the history of one parish during so long a period in the United States; and it contains the autographs of more priests and ecclesiastical functionaries than can be found in any other parochial record.

It was opened on the date mentioned by Father De Lhalle, when he baptized a daughter of the Chevalier Cadillac. To this entry he attached his own signature, which is followed by those of the sponsors.¹

During the enforced and continuous detention of the Chevalier Cadillac at Quebec, as stated, hostile tribes from the West and Southwest appeared during the summer of 1706 in the vicinity of the post, which was saved from plunder by the courage and skill of Captain Bourgmont, aided as he was by the friendly tribes who were the allies of the French. Before these hostiles had been defeated in battle, Father De Lhalle, the saintly founder of religion in Detroit, was murdered. He, with the Chevalier Cadillac and others, when the post was first established, had located *arpents* of land outside the stockade for cultivation, and as an example to others which might be followed with advantage.

These *arpents* were on the bluff east of the fort, overlooking

¹ The first page in the Register of Ste. Anne is in size about 7 by 9 inches. It is given in fac-simile in Silas Farmer's *Comprehensive History of Detroit*, page 528. It was written by Father De Lhalle, and is as follows:

"Moi Frere Constantin De Lhalle moine Recollet et aumônier au Fort de Pont-chartrain, certifie d'avoir conféré le saint baptême à Marie Thérèse, fille légitime de Monsieur Antoine de la Mothe Cadillac commandant pour le Roi au dit Fort, et de Madame Marie Thérèse Guion. Le père et mère a eu pour parrain Monsieur Bertrand Arnaud, et pour maraine Mdlle Gèneviève le Tendre. En foy de quoy nous avons signé le 2me Février de l'an 1704.

Frere Constantin De Lhalle Recollet.
Arnaud, Gèneviève Le Tendre."

Baptême de Marie
Thérèse Cadillac.

On the same page is recorded the baptism of a daughter of Pierre Roy, a *Coureur de Bois*, whose wife was a Miami squaw. It is said Roy and Jacques Pelletier, also a *Coureur*, were domiciled at the old rendezvous when the Chevalier Cadillac's expedition landed. The Indian name of Roy's wife is given as Ou-al-as-ki-kou. The child was baptized Marguerite Roy.

the strait, with attractive surroundings. Father De Lhalle was apparently fond of field-culture, for his garden was well planted, and it was his custom during the flower season to read his breviary daily while walking in his favorite resort. While thus engaged during one of the hostile raids he was seized, but released, presumably by direction of the attacking chief; but as he was about to enter the gate of the stockade he was fired at and killed by one of the hostile Indians.

He was buried in the habit of his order in the chapel.¹

Such was the tragical ending at the hands of a Pagan savage of the apostolic Recollet, chaplain of Fort Pontchartrain, and the first of the long line of friars of his order who served as pastors of Ste. Anne's of Detroit, 1701-1782.

There may be studied in the Register of Ste. Anne's the testimony of his several successors, which entwines his memory with saintly attributes. The community under the spiritual rule of Father De Lhalle was not a numerous one, but they invoked his intercession to their great advantage, for many were blessed with fervent faith. It is not asking too much of our readers to accept the belief of his venerable successors and of his spiritual children as to his sanctity.

The accomplished Recollet, Dominique de La Marche, replaced Father De Lhalle. He had been professor of theology in the community of his order in Paris, and had volunteered for missionary work in New France. He arrived at Quebec, according to Tanguay, July 18, 1706.

He left Trois Rivières with the fall convoy of that year bound for Detroit with the appointment, *ad interim*, of chaplain of the post and pastor of Ste. Anne, where he remained until the arrival of his successor in the fall of 1708.

His last entry in the Register of Ste. Anne is dated July 29, 1708, and records a baptism.

He returned to Quebec in 1709, where he was engaged in theological instruction and in occasional missionary work until he was recalled to France in 1733.²

The successor of Father De La Marche was the Recollet, Cherubin Deniaux, who had been ordained at Quebec December 3, 1700; his first entry in the Register of Ste. Anne, recording a baptism, is dated January 14, 1709. His pastorate continued

¹ This outline corresponds, so far as the tragedy is concerned, with Farmer's account in his *History of Detroit*, p. 529.

² Register of Ste. Anne; Tanguay.

until May, 1714, when he was recalled by his Superior to officiate at Beaumont, in the diocese of Quebec.

He died at Montreal in his 65th year in 1732.¹ He was succeeded by the Recollet, Hyacinthe Pelfresne, ordained in France, who arrived at Quebec June 16, 1710. While engaged in missionary work he was sent to Detroit to replace Father Deniaux.² His first official entry in the Register of Ste. Anne is dated August 20, 1715, and his last entry March 25, 1718.

He was recalled to Quebec, and subsequently stationed at Trois Rivières, where he died in 1723. There may have been a temporary intermission in the Recollet pastorate between the time of the departure from the post of the return convoy for Canada during the summer of 1718 and the arrival of the fall convoy.

But Father Calvarin, Vicar-General of Foreign Missions, had evidently wintered at the post, for his signature attests an *acte* in the Register of Ste. Anne as early as March 1, 1718. Father Jean Mercier, Priest of the Foreign Missions, records an *acte* August 3, 1718.

De Thaunur, also a Vicar-General of Foreign Missions, was at the post during the summer of 1718. It would appear from the signatures of these venerable officials in the Register that there were several priests at the presbytery of Ste. Anne during the year above mentioned.

The successor of Father Pelfresne was the Recollet, Antoine Delino, who had been ordained at Quebec August 14, 1714. His record shows that he officiated at St. Croix, at Chambly and at Beauport, before going to Detroit.³

The last entry of Father Delino in the Register of Ste. Anne is dated March 9, 1722. He was recalled to Quebec the same year. His record shows that he subsequently officiated in the parish of St. Jean, Isle d'Orleans, in 1725. He died at Chambly in November, 1740, and his ashes repose in St. Joseph's Church, Chambly, near Montreal.

Father Delino⁴ and his Recollet brother, Thomas Bertrand, were among the priests assisting at the ceremonies of the translation of the remains of St. Vallier, second Bishop of Quebec, to the tomb prepared in the General Hospital of Quebec, which this prelate, who had succeeded the saintly Laval, had founded in 1693. This entombment took place January 2, 1728, under the

¹ Register of Ste. Anne; Tanguay.

² *Ibid.*

³ Tanguay.

⁴ Father Delino had for his guest at the presbytery of Ste. Anne, during the summer of 1721, the venerable Father Charlevoix, S.J., who remained three weeks at Detroit.

direction of Eustache Chartier de Lotbiniere, Archdeacon of Quebec.¹

The Recollet, Father Bonaventura Léonard, who succeeded to the pastorate of Ste. Anne, was ordained at Quebec in 1720, and appointed to Detroit in 1722. His first entry in the Register is dated June 28, 1722. He built the third church of Ste. Anne, and under his direction in 1723 the remains of Father De Lhalle were exhumed and translated with solemn ceremonies to their second resting-place under the altar of the new church. The record of this act of filial devotion is to be found in the Register of Ste. Anne, as written by Father Bonaventure Léonard:

“L’an de Notre Seigneur 1723, 13me jour de Mai, à la r quisition du R v rend P re Bonaventure, Recollet, aum nier du poste du Detroit ; nous sousign es d clarons nous  tre transport e sur le terrain ou  tait ci devant l’ glise dans laquelle a  te inhum  feue le Reverend P re Constantin De Lhalle, Recollet, faisant les fonctions du aum nier du dit poste, au apr s avoir examin  le lieu o  pouvait  tre son corps suivant l’avis que nous en avait donn  le P re Bonaventure, avait engag  deux hommes pour faire l’ouverture de la terre, lesquelles trousv rent dans la journ e le cercueil du dit R v rend P re, lequel a  t  reconnu  tre son corps par les marques que chacun a vu, qui sont calotte ; plusieurs morceaux d’ toffe de son habit, de son cal e de crin bien distingu  ; apr s les examen, le dit R v rend P re Bonaventure fit enlever son corps, le porter   l’ glise

“ En foi de quoi nous assurons a qui l’appartiendra notre attestation v ritable.

“ Henri Campeau, Hubert Lacroix, Charles Chesne, Xavier Raquetuiade.

“ Attest  L onard Bonaventure.”

In the meantime, 1728, Father Armand de La Richardie, S.J., had established on the South littoral of the strait, at the Point de Montreal, nearly opposite Fort Pontchartrain, “*La Mission des Hurons du Detroit*,” which prior to the conquest became one of the most extensive missionary establishments in New France.

Father Bonaventure L onard was recalled to Quebec in 1735, and died there in 1741.² He was succeeded by Father Prisque Daniel, whose first entry in the Register is dated August 31, 1735, and his last June 19, 1738.

Father Louis Marie-Bonaventure Carpentier, Recollet, succeeded in 1738. According to Tanguay, he had been ordained at Quebec May 1, 1735, and had officiated at St. Croix before proceeding to Detroit.

He was known at the post as Father Bonaventure, but familiarly called by the habitants “*P re Bon.*” He exercised much influence over the Pottawottomis and Miamis in the vicinity, who gave him the name of “*Robe Gris*,” on account of his much-used brown habit ; while the Jesuit Fathers at the Huron Mission on

¹ Tanguay.

² Tanguay.

the south shore of the strait, whose uniform was black, were called "*Robes Noirs*." During the pastorate of "*Père Bon*" there was much agreeable intercourse between the latter and the Jesuit Fathers. We find in the Register of Ste. Anne an entry of Father Morinic, S. J., November 1, 1738, and again April 13, 1739.

Father de la Richardie, S. J., Superior of the Huron Mission, records baptisms at Ste. Anne, October 19, 1741, and August 17, 1743. There are other entries of Jesuit Fathers about the same time.

The state of religion at Detroit during the pastorate of Père "Bon" is occasionally indicated by entries in the account-book of the Huron Mission.

Father Pierre Potier, S. J., who made the entries, charges, among others, "*Père Bon*," June 13, 1743, with 20 livres for 20 masses offered for his intentions. Again, in the following year, 30 livres for 30 masses. In 1750, 50 livres for as many masses.

November 20th of the same year Father Petier made this entry: "*Père 'Bon'* has directed that 100 masses be offered for his intentions."

Here is evidence that in 1750 the pastor of Ste. Anne was under obligation to offer 150 more masses for his parishioners than he was able to perform, and that in the fulfillment of this duty he had recourse to the Jesuit Fathers across the strait. Considering the difference in the value of money in this locality 150 years ago and the present time, we may consider the relative value of the offering for each service as not far from the dollar of our own times.

Most cordial relations certainly existed. Father Potier adds to this entry: "He has also sent the Fathers of this Mission some home-made cheese, some Gruyère cheese, some snuff, and Spanish tobacco."¹ Father Bonaventure Carpentier was recalled to Quebec in 1754.

He was engaged in missionary work in that city and vicinity twenty-four years.

His forty-three years of sacerdotal life ended there in 1778.²

The Recollet Father, Simple Le Bocquet, succeeded the genial and holy friar "*Père Bon*." He arrived at Detroit August 10, 1754.³ The third church of Ste. Anne had in the meantime become too small for its parishioners, the second generation of whom

¹ *Livre de Compte de La Mission des Hurons du Detroit*. Translation and annotation, *U. S. Cath. Hist. Magazine*, Vol. IV., pp. 191 et seq.

² Tanguay.

³ *Ibid.*

had been born on the north littoral of the strait. Father Le Bocquet built and completed the fourth church of the name, and enlarged the presbytery. Its location was on Rue Ste. Anne, some distance west of the site of the third church. It was consecrated with religious, civic and military éclat, March 16, 1755.

The consecrating prelate was Rt. Rev. Henri Marie du Breuil de Pont Briand, sixth Bishop of Quebec, who, from the date of the ceremony, apparently had spent the winter at Detroit and vicinity; for it was hardly possible for the bishop, at that early season of the year, to have made the journey from Quebec by the route of the Georgian Bay or by bateau on Lake Erie.

This venerable prelate, while at Detroit, administered the Sacrament of Confirmation to postulants at Ste. Anne's, and to those of the Jesuit Fathers at the Church of the Assumption at the Huron Mission across the strait.

As an additional evidence of the veneration in which the memory of the saintly founder of religion in Detroit was held by the Recollet Fathers, we translate this official entry in the Register of Ste. Anne:

"July 13, 1755. We, Simple Le Bocquet, Franciscan priest, fulfilling the sacred functions of Chaplain of Fort Pontchartrain, at Detroit, and Rector of Ste. Anne's parish, in the name of King Louis, have transferred from the old church to the new one the remains of our venerable predecessor, Father Constantin De Lhalle, Franciscan missionary, who was killed by the Indians in 1706, while in the performance of his sacred duties, and have deposited them temporarily under the altar until the completion thereof, when we shall give them such final sepulture as becomes his memory *and the miracles wrought through his intercession.*"¹

It was the fate of Father Le Bocquet to witness the lowering of the lilled standard of his "King Louis" by Commandant Bellestre within six years of the time of the consecrational ceremonies of the fourth Church of Ste. Anne, at Fort Pontchartrain, when the border ranger, Major Robert Rogers, with a company of frontier militia from the Mohawk Valley, arrived at the post to assume control in accordance with the terms of the treaty of Montreal, when General Amherst accomplished the overthrow of French rule over nearly all of New France.

It was fortunate, perhaps, that such a distinguished man as Father Le Bocquet was pastor at Detroit at this crisis in the eventful history of the post, and equally fortunate that he had the advice and co-operation of Father Pierre Potier, S. J., Superior of the Huron Mission on the opposite shore of the strait and pastor of the parish of the Assumption on the south littoral.

¹ Register of Ste. Anne, 1755. The Italics are ours.

The force of Rogers was small, while a combination of Frenchmen capable of bearing arms, with the warriors of the Huron, the Miami, the Pottawottomi and the Ottawa nations, under Pontiac, chief of the latter, could have defied any attempt on the part of the British—for some years, at least—to take and hold the post of Detroit.

It would be a question of time, however, when such opposition would be overcome by an overwhelming force of British troops, while its inevitable result would entail serious consequences to the French and Indian races on both littorals. In restraining such opposition under these serious circumstances, and advising a passive acceptance of the situation, the influence of the respective pastors was exerted wisely and for the best interests of their parishioners, while at the same time the prospective horrors of an Indian war on the frontier was avoided.

With the surrender of Fort Pontchartrain to Rogers was ended the French *régime* on the Detroit.

While the French race in Canada at the time were exclusively of the Catholic faith, and while the majority of their Indian allies were Christian converts, national control had been won on the battle-fields of Quebec and Montreal by the army of an anti-Catholic monarch.

But the religious rights of the people of the conquered domain had been safeguarded in the treaties which consummated the dynastic change and political control made at Quebec, Montreal, and finally at Paris. It was also reserved for the venerable Recollet, Father Le Bocquet, as it was also for the distinguished Jesuit, Father Potier, to watch over the spiritual and temporal interests of their French and Indian constituents during one of the most critical and tragic periods in the history of Detroit.

“The conspiracy of Pontiac,” as it is so named in American history, was cradled at Detroit. The home of this most renowned of the American Indian chiefs was at the Ottawa castle on the bluffs of the strait, east of Fort Pontchartrain, across its waters. Most attractive pens have depicted the bloody episodes which crimson the methods of savage warfare as they occurred, and which, in the history of Pontiac, culminated at Detroit. It was a critical time for the French habitants whose sympathies, although covered, were on the side of the Ottawa chief; but it was fatal in its results for the Christian constituents of Fathers Le Bocquet and Potier among the Indian tribes on both littorals of the strait.

The pastorate of Father Le Bocquet ended in 1782, when he returned to Quebec. He had been twenty-eight years at Detroit,

and was the last of the venerable Recollet friars who during eighty-one years had served as pastors of Ste. Anne. His long and useful life was ended in 1787. He had been clothed with vicarial jurisdiction. He and all his saintly predecessors in the pastorate of Ste. Anne wore the brown habit of their order, and next their persons the penitential hair shirt. Father Le Bocquet's successor was Vicar-General Jean François Hubert, who came to Detroit by the spring convoy of 1781.

He was born at Quebec February 23, 1739, and ordained in the Cathedral of that city July 20, 1766. He became secretary to the Bishop, then a director, and for five years was Superior of the Seminary of Quebec before coming to Detroit.

In July following his arrival occurred the accidental death of the venerable Father Pierre Potier, S.J., last of the Huron missionaries, whose obsequies were performed in the Mission Church of the Assumption at Sandwich, by Father Hubert, a record of which in his handwriting, duly attested, and dated July 18, 1781, is to be found in the register of the Assumption parish. Father Hubert assumed control *ad interim* of this church and parish.

After four years of pastoral work on both littorals of the strait Father Hubert was promoted to the episcopacy. In 1785 he became the successor of Laval, and ninth Bishop of Quebec. A translation of his pastoral letter upon the occasion of his departure for Quebec is introduced to show the religious status of the people shortly after the termination of the eighty-one years of the Recollet pastorate at Ste. Anne's, and of the Jesuit missionary work at the Huron church across the strait :

"John Francis Hubert, by the mercy of God and the favor of the Holy Apostolic See Bishop of Quebec, etc., etc., to the inhabitants of the two parishes of Detroit, known under the names of Ste. Anne and the Assumption, health and benediction :

"The happy and peaceful sojourn that I made among you, my very dear brethren, has left in my soul sentiments of attachment and affection so deeply imprinted that you must class among the great consolations of my life that which I now feel in transmitting to you, a public and solemn testimony of my truly pastoral love.

"As you are aware, very dear brethren, the interests and salvation of your souls, the desire to induce you to tread the paths of justice, the hope of preserving in your hearts the maxims of our holy religion which other missionaries had taught you, these were the only motives which led me to you in 1781. If Divine Providence compelled me to leave with tearful eyes a beloved land in which I had hoped to end my days, it has not effaced from my memory the frequent instructions I gave you nor the pleasure with which you seemed to hear them."¹

Rev. Louis Payst, succeeded to the pastorate of Ste. Anne, who in 1786 was transferred to Michilimacinac. He was succeeded

¹ Shea, *Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll*, p. 468.

the same year by Very Rev. Pierre Frechette, who had been ordained at Quebec in December, 1784. Father Frechette was the last of the incumbents of Ste. Anne under the see of Quebec. His pastorate extended during ten years—1786—1796. During the latter year the British Government were forced to retire to the line established by treaty more than a decade previously, evacuating Detroit, which came under control of the United States.

The pastorate of Father Frechette was marked by the advent of the first Irish priest ever officiating in Michigan as early as the eighteenth century. This was Very Rev. Edmund Burke, who seemed to have been clothed with general vicarial powers from the See of Quebec, in British America. He was a *protégé* of Dr. Troy, Bishop of Dublin, and from his record on the Detroit frontier it is evident his mission was even more political than religious. He was so overzealous for English control that he became quite unpopular; so much so that he feared his life was in danger. When the American troops took possession of Detroit Father Burke retired to Canada, and subsequently became Bishop of Nova Scotia. His British tendencies were his worst failing. Dr. Shea says "he was an able theologian and controversialist and a good engineer." The spiritual rule over the vast regions of the Northwest Territory was assumed by Bishop Carroll in 1796. The Sulpitian Father Michael Levadoux was sent to Detroit to assume control of the parish of Ste. Anne, whose territory extended from the head waters of Lake Erie to the shores of Lake Superior, including the islands and littoral of Lakes Huron and Michigan.

Father Levadoux retired to France in 1798 and was succeeded by the Sulpitian Father Gabriel Richard. Here, in fact, commences the history of the Catholic Church in Detroit under the American hierarchy, inaugurated as it was by one of the most distinguished of the ecclesiastics which the French Revolution had sent as exiles to the American Republic.

To return to the Recollet pastors of Ste. Anne's of Detroit, who during the greater part of the eighteenth century were the spiritual mentors of the habitants of the north littoral of the strait. From the saintly Father De Lhalle, who first offered the Holy Sacrifice in 1701, the first in the illustrious line of brown-robed friars, down to Father Le Bocquet in 1781, there cannot be found the slightest shadow upon their record.

But the effect of their example and the thoroughness of their pastoral work is made evident in the history of Ste. Anne during the first decade of the pastorate of the Sulpitian Father Richard under the American hierarchy.

RICHARD R. ELLIOTT.

THE PRE-REFORMATION CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

PART I.

IN a letter remarkable for the pastoral solicitude and tender charity towards "all the churches" which mark the present occupant of the Papal throne, Leo XIII. recently addressed the Hierarchy of Scotland on the subject of the re-union of Christendom, with more particular regard to "our separated brethren" in Scotland. After alluding to the seeds of Christianity sown by St. Ninian—sent from Rome 200 years before Augustine came to England—watered by St. Columba and other holy missionaries, and fostered by the saintly Queen Margaret, the Pope reminds Scotsmen of the advantages bestowed upon their land by the Catholic Church when she reigned supreme there. It is proposed in this paper to take a glance at some of these advantages, in order to show the loss which Scotland sustained, over and above the loss of the true Faith, in what Leo XIII. terms "the terrible storm which swept over the Church in the sixteenth century."

Anything like an adequate review of the thousand and more years during which Catholicity grew and flourished in Scotland would be an evident impossibility in an article such as this. It would therefore seem more to the point to take our stand at the period which was the apogee of its external greatness and power—the early part of the sixteenth century—and thence view in detail the benefits bestowed by the Church upon the nation at large. It was a time when the power and prestige of the Church were most conspicuous; since, although heresy had dared now and again to rear its head, it was scarcely regarded yet as an enemy to be feared.

Glancing from our standpoint down the vista of past ages, we come in sight of many a saintly figure. Faithful Ireland had sent her missionaries—Columba, Drostan, Brendan, and a host of others, to evangelize the land. Scotland herself gave birth to others—Serf, Mungo, Ternan, Blaen, Nathalan, Duthac—to carry on the holy work. The blood of national martyrs—of Donnan and his companion monks, of Maelrubha and Adrian and Magnus—watered the soil; thousands more, the secret of whose sanctity is known only to Heaven, pleaded for the country, and enriched it with streams of grace. Through their prayers and

merits religion has flourished, and the Church has grown up to be a mighty tree, whose branches overshadow the land.

At the period we are considering, the Catholic Church energises through thirteen episcopal sees. Stately cathedrals, monasteries, collegiate and parish churches stud the realm. God is worshipped within them with a magnificence of ceremonial not fully realized, and scarcely appreciated, in a nineteenth century, when ritual is often bound to give place to practical utility. Prelates, distinguished not only for wisdom and holiness, but often by noble, and even royal blood, uphold the Church's dignity; in the primatial see alone, no less than six of royal pedigree have occupied the episcopal chair during a century. In Scotland, as everywhere and at all times, the Church has ever been the nursing-mother of learning and science, the patron of the liberal and mechanical arts, the faithful guardian of the rights of her children, defending them against oppression, relieving their hunger with lavish charity, harboring the homeless, cherishing the sick, providing, as far as lay in her power, for all their wants, both spiritual and temporal. It is the attempt of these pages to show in detail how, through all these channels—splendor of fabric and ritual, powerful prelates, learned men, tender and sympathetic lovers of their kind—she was the truest benefactor Scotland ever possessed.

David I., whom Scots love to designate "Saint," though a less generous successor to his throne styled him "a sair sanct for the crown," was the first of a series of pious and enlightened rulers sprung from St. Margaret. To this great King Scotland owed not only a host of monastic foundations—Dunfermline, Kelso, Lesmahago, for Benedictines; Melrose, Newbattle, Dundrennan, Kinloss, for Cistercians; Holyrood and Jedburgh, for Austin Canons; Torphichen, for Knights Hospitallers, and the rest—but she was also indebted to him for the introduction of method and order into the parochial system. His enthusiastic biographer, Aelred, the saintly abbot of Rielvaux, says that David found only three or four dioceses existing and left nine behind him; these further multiplied in succeeding centuries.

To attempt any adequate description of even one of the cathedrals of these dioceses, as they appeared in the sixteenth century, would be vain in so brief a review as this. The primatial see of St. Andrews boasted of a church 358 feet long, with a lofty central spire, numerous decorated pinnacles, and copper roofs blazing in the sun—its interior resplendent with polished pavements, carven images, and costly windows of painted glass. Then there

was Glasgow Cathedral, enshrining in its unrivalled eastern crypt the body of St. Mungo; Aberdeen, with its granite church—the only cathedral in the world built of that material—and its exquisite wood-carving, of finer workmanship than anything of its kind in Europe. To enumerate would be tedious, but at the risk of trying the reader's patience we cannot forbear a more detailed description of Elgin Cathedral—"The Lantern of the North"—which perhaps bore the palm.

It was 282 feet long and 87 wide, and stood on a cruciform ground-plan. Its architecture was in the purest early English style, with later additions in French flamboyant. The great western doorway, under a beautifully carved and moulded arch, was divided by a central pillar to form a double entrance. It was flanked on either side by a massive square tower, each one rising to the height of more than a hundred feet. A fine central tower and spire at the junction of the transepts measured twice that height. Entering the great nave, the visitor beheld, dividing off the choir, the grand Rood screen of carved woodwork, painted and gilded, with its beautiful crucifix above. Beyond were richly carved stalls for the canons. Minute and exquisite carving everywhere abounded; beautifying the pillars, the window-tracery, the numerous lateral chantries, the magnificent octagonal chapter-house. Stained glass filled the windows; that over the western entrance measured 27 feet in height, and a unique cluster of lancet lights in double tier, surmounted by a beautiful wheel-window, filled the entire wall-space at the eastern end of the choir. One of the bishops, speaking two hundred years earlier than the sixteenth century, called it "The special ornament of the land, the glory of the realm, the delight of strangers and foreigners who came to see it, a praise and excellency of praise in foreign countries for the number of its ministers, its sumptuous decoration, its pious worship of God, its lofty bell-towers, its splendid furniture, and countless jewels."¹ What, then, must have been the beauty of this vast building when two centuries of further benefactions had still more enriched its splendors."

But the glorious cathedrals were rivalled and often surpassed by the monastic and conventual churches scattered over the land. Some seventy abbeys and priories of monks and nuns, about a hundred houses of canons and friars, and forty collegiate establishments, presented a varied and beautiful spectacle of architectural display. Dunfermline—the "Durham of the North"—shel-

¹ Letter of Bishop Bar, quoted by Walcott, *Ancient Church of Scot.*, p. 140.

tered under its massive arches the shrine of St. Margaret, its first foundress. Arbroath, its glorious rival, possessed a splendid church of rose-red sandstone, built in the style of Chester and Lichfield cathedrals; it stood on a wind-swept height, overlooking the sea, and its nave and choir stretched to the length of 268 feet, while its roof rose 67 feet above its pavement. Kelso had a church of thirteenth century style, with graceful lofty arches, rich arcadings around its walls, and beautiful windows. Then Melrose was conspicuous for lace-like tracery and delicate carving; Sweetheart—the memorial of Devorgilla's wifely affection and of her husband's heart enshrined within it—had its noble clustered pillars and graceful wheel-windows. Of all these Benedictine and Cistercian churches we will single out one for more minute description.

The Cluniac Benedictine abbey of Paisley, founded in 1164 by Walter Fitz-Alan, High Steward of Scotland, and ancestor of the House of Stuart, was remarkable for the striking beauty of its situation, as well as for the splendid adornments of its buildings. It stood on a level mead near the clear waters of the little river Cart, in view of undulating, wooded slopes and lofty hills. The abbey precincts were enclosed by a wall of dressed stone, upwards of a mile in length. They consisted of spacious gardens and orchards, and even a park for fallow deer. The wall was adorned with carven statues, and shields bearing coats of arms. In a niche was enshrined the image of Our Lady; beneath it was inscribed:

“Hac ne vade via, nisi dixeris Ave Maria.
Sit semper sine vae, qui tibi dicit Ave.”¹

A stately gate-house led to the monastic buildings. The church was entered at the western end by a door set in a fine Early English arch, and at the north through a deep porch, surmounted by a chamber known as a *parvise*. This latter was the ordinary entrance. The porch, we may remark, was a common feature in the mediæval churches. Many parochial rites, such as the commencement of the marriage ceremony and of the baptism of infants, were performed there.

The church measured nearly 220 feet in length. Its graceful pointed arches were supported by clustered pillars, and a richly carved triforium ran over the aisles. The choir was longer than the nave—not an uncommon feature in the Cluniac churches; it

¹ This we have ventured to English:

“Pass not by this way, till you your Ave say.
From woe may he be free, who saith *Ave* to thee.”

contained stalls for twenty-six monks; these had been provided by Abbot Tarvas in 1459. The same devout abbot procured the great brass book-stand, the chandeliers of chased silver, and the beautiful tabernacle—"the statliest in al Skotland and the maist costlie"—as well as the rich hangings of cloth of gold and silver to decorate the sanctuary on festival days. In the south transept was an elaborately carved chapel, where the body of St. Mirin, one of the ancient missionaries of the country, lay in a gorgeous shrine, and was an object of devotion to numerous pilgrims. In its external adornments, also, this fine church was very striking. Its central tower and steeple rose to the height of 300 feet. Such was Paisley in its glory—a worthy House of God, in which the daily choral office celebrated His praise.

Other religious orders could boast of buildings no less magnificent than those of the monks. Jedburgh, belonging to the Black Canons, Dryburgh to the White Canons, were gems of architecture. Many of the churches of the friars, too, were famed for their beauty. That of the Observantines at Edinburgh was so magnificent that a foreign friar, Cornelius, could hardly be persuaded to take possession of it, thinking it incompatible with the poverty required by his rule. It needed the intervention of the Pope to settle his scruples. The Franciscan Church at Haddington was known as the "Light of Lothian," from the costly lamps which illuminated its beautiful windows by night. It was in the decorated style, and measured 210 feet in length.

Collegiate and parish churches, also, were often built with great magnificence. The stately church of St. Giles, Edinburgh's glory, escaped almost unscathed—as regards its exterior—the frenzy of fanatical reformers. The almost barbaric splendor of the exquisitely carved Roslin Chapel, near Edinburgh, is proverbial.

Such buildings would have been meaningless had the worship for which they had been erected been wanting in grandeur. That this was not the case is evident from the inventories of vestments and church furniture still extant. Aberdeen Cathedral possessed no less than thirty-six copes, of which ten were of cloth of gold, and others of rich velvet. It had also thirteen full sets of High Mass vestments, and a plentiful supply of hangings and other adornments. Holyrood Abbey could boast of various crosses, candlesticks, censers, cruets, etc., of gold or silver, besides many precious chalices and vestments. The same might doubtless be affirmed of all the great cathedrals and minsters.

With regard to the splendor of the ritual observed within them,

we are able to gain an insight as to its nature by comparing it with the contemporary ceremonial of England and other countries. It may perhaps bring the subject home more closely if we venture to describe in detail the celebration of some solemn feast as a worshipper would see it carried out in Glasgow Cathedral in the sixteenth century. Glasgow is selected as being one of the Scottish cathedrals in which the Sarum Rite was followed. That rite, differing in many details from the Roman, to which Catholics are now accustomed, was introduced at Glasgow by Bishop Herbert in the twelfth century, and was observed there up to the Reformation.

A visitor to St. Mungo's on the eve of the feast in question will await, with the crowd of laity who throng the nave, the entrance of the archbishop and canons. The festal pealing of the bells announces the approach of the prelate, and soon a stately procession sweeps through the great western entrance—only opened for such occasions—and passes up the nave to the jubilant welcome of organ and singers. Twelve officials lead the way. One bears aloft the archiepiscopal cross, the others carry maces of solid silver. Thirty canons in their choir dress of surplice and furred hood surround the archbishop, and a crowd of attendants bring up the rear. The brilliant throng passes through the gates of the choir, the "rulers of choir," or cantors, each robed in silken cope and bearing a silver staff of office, range themselves across the western end, near the beautiful Rood-screen, and the solemn evensong commences.

The canons, seated in their stalls on either side, join in the chanting with the help of the great choral-books bound in white leather, which form part of the church's rich treasury. The altar, decked for the feast, is resplendent with magnificent silken frontal—perhaps that one "powdered with crowns of gold," or that "of red silk with ornamentation of flowers and leaves," which figure in the inventory of this cathedral; above the altar, in the silver pyx which hangs from the carved and gilded canopy of the "Sacrament House" by chains of precious metal, is the Blessed Sacrament, surrounded by ever-burning lights. At the *Magnificat* two priests in copes jointly incense the High Altar; then, passing by opposite aisles down the church, offer the same act of honor to each of the twenty altars of the upper church. Vespers ended, the prelate and his attendants depart in the same stately array with which they came.

But it is at the Pontifical Mass on the morning of the festival that the ceremonial is most impressive. Entering in the same

state as for Vespers, the archbishop and canons, together with the inferior clergy, prepare to take part in the solemn procession with which the rite commences. Soon the spectator sees it issuing from the great gates of the choir. Three clerics, clad in albs and silken tunics and walking abreast, bear aloft three richly chased processional crosses of precious metal. Acolytes, thurifers, attendants follow. Cantors in copes, deacons and subdeacons—five, or even seven of each—vested in tunicles, canons wearing rich copes, follow in due order. The archbishop in his precious mitre and cope, bearing his pastoral staff—his cross borne before him—forms the principal figure in this magnificent assemblage. Passing down the aisle, the procession makes the circuit of the vast church and returns to the choir. After the office of Tierce has been sung the Mass begins. The cantors commence the solemn chant of the *Introit* as the celebrating prelate and his train of assistant ministers enter from the sacristy beyond the choir, clad in their vestments. With stately rhythm the august rite proceeds. Five deacons and as many subdeacons, and on the highest festivals seven of each order, take part in the function. During the Canon of the Mass the sanctuary presents a spectacle of imposing splendor. On the highest step of the altar is the archbishop in his jewelled vestments, below him the long line of deacons, lower still the subdeacons; in the choir are canons in copes and clergy in surplices. It is a scene of magnificence such as the Catholic Church alone can furnish, and one which might be witnessed in many a cathedral of Scotland in Catholic ages.

The ceremonies of the Church, imposing as they were in themselves, were rendered doubly so by the assistance of kings and nobles with their vast trains of attendants. The power and authority of the Church was all the more impressed upon the minds of the faithful when the great ones of the earth, in common with the lowliest, had to bend the knee before the King of Kings. It was the delight of James IV. to assist at the canonical office in the choir of St. Mungo's, where he was privileged to occupy a stall as honorary canon. Edward I. of England, when staying in Glasgow, made more than one devout visit to the shrine of St. Mungo, in the beautiful under-croft of the cathedral. Edward III. spent at Melrose the Christmas festival of 1340, and assisted at the solemn offices celebrated by the monks. Many more examples may be found in history.

The splendor with which monarchs took part in religious celebrations may be imagined from the descriptions extant of the progress of James IV. on one of his numerous pilgrimages to the

Shrine of St. Ninian in Galloway. When proceeding in state, with his queen, to offer thanks for the latter's delivery from the danger of death at the birth of her first child, the retinue was most imposing. The queen travelled in a sumptuous litter. Seventeen carriage-horses were employed to convey her wardrobe and effects, and four more for those of the King. It may be remarked, in passing, that James made no less than fourteen pilgrimages to the same shrine between the years 1501 and 1512. He also made pilgrimages to the Isle of May and to St. Duthac's shrine at Tain in Ross-shire.

But it was not as worshippers merely that kings and nobles proclaimed themselves humble sons of the Church. They loved to minister to her needs out of their worldly substance. Hence, such scanty records of the Religious Houses as survived the downfall of Religion give many instances of their generous benefactors. The munificence of King David I. has been already mentioned. Other monarchs were not slow in following his example in establishing foundations. William the Lion, Malcolm IV., Alexander II., Alexander III., Robert the Bruce, are conspicuous benefactors of the kind. Alexander II. was a munificent founder of monasteries for Dominicans, who owed to this liberal donor no less than eight of their houses—those of Edinburgh, Berwick, Ayr, Perth, Aberdeen, Elgin, Stirling and Inverness. Nobles imitated their sovereigns. Dryburgh Abbey was founded in 1141 by Hugh de Morville, Constable of Scotland; Crossraguel by Duncan, Earl of Carrick, in the twelfth century; Paisley, as we have seen, by Fitz-Alan, and so with others. Benefactions continued to flow into the treasuries of Religious Houses from such sources all through their history, until, in the sixteenth century—our standpoint—the Abbey of Abroath could boast of an annual rental equivalent to \$50,000 (£10,000) of our money.

We may have given, some may think, undue prominence to the external splendor of fabric and ceremonial and the *éclat* which resulted from the subserviency of kings and powerful nobles; but it is well to bear in mind that man's soul is reached through the senses, and that all this grandeur of form and beauty of worship were important factors in raising his thoughts to higher things than this present world, and keeping them in mind of the Supreme Being to whose honor it all tended. No Catholic will maintain that Scotland was benefited, either spiritually or æsthetically, by the wholesale hewing down of churches, battering of images and carvings, burning of vestments and stamping out of ritual.

Yet the Church of Scotland in the sixteenth century has something else to boast of beyond buildings and ritual. All through the ages she had been the generous patron of letters. Looking back to preceding centuries, the reader of history is struck by the fact that in Scotland, as in most of the countries of Europe, learning was the exclusive privilege of the clergy. Among a rude and warlike people this was only to be expected. When the bulk of the population have to be ready to take up arms at almost any moment, who but the clergy are capable of fostering the arts of peace? That this was eminently the case in Scotland, her historians testify. "During the long period," says one of them, "from the accession of Alexander III. to the death of David II. (1249-1370) it would be impossible, I believe, to produce a single instance of a Scottish baron who could sign his own name. The studies which formed the learning of the times were esteemed unworthy of the warlike and chivalrous spirit of the aristocracy and universally abandoned to the Church."¹

If we glance at the list of men distinguished for any branch of learning in the earlier period of Scottish history, it will be evident that although the laity, as yet, despised letters, the clergy held them in high esteem then, even as they did in later ages. To begin with the twelfth century, Godrich, Bishop of St. Andrews, was an author of some note in his day. He wrote, among other works, "Meditations on the Psalter" and "Hymni de Sanctis." Another renowned scholar was David Scotus, a professor in the Scots monastery of Würzburg and historiographer to the Emperor Henry V. He wrote the "Iter Imperatoris," "De Regno Scotorum," etc. Adam, a Premonstratensian Canon, who left Scotland for a French monastery of his order, was another writer of the same period. One still more distinguished than those mentioned above was Richard of St. Victor, a native of Scotland, who became an inmate of the monastery of St. Victor, at Paris. John *a Sacro Bosco*, a Canon Regular of the monastery of Holywood, near Dumfries, was a distinguished scholar at the University of Paris at this period, and became professor of mathematics there. His writings were still in repute three centuries later.

In the following century Scotland could boast of Hugo Bentham, Bishop of Aberdeen (1272), who was renowned for his knowledge of canon law. In the same century we meet the name of Simon Taylor, a Scottish Dominican, who studied at

¹ Fraser Tytler: *Hist. of Scot.*, vol. i., chap. vi. (append., sec. 5).

Paris and afterwards returned to his native land, where he effected an important reform in Church music. Another noted Scot who flourished in the thirteenth century was the famous Duns Scotus, the *Doctor Subtilis* of the Franciscan Order. His favorite pupil, John Bassoll, another Scottish member of the same order, became professor of philosophy at Paris, and afterwards studied theology and medicine at Rheims. Arnold Blair, a Benedictine monk of Dunfermline, who had studied at Paris, flourished at the end of the century. He was distinguished as a scholar, and wrote a life of Wallace, whom he served as chaplain.

The first Scottish historian, John Fordun, belongs to the next century. He was probably a chantry priest of Aberdeen, but scarcely anything is known of him beyond the fact that he was a Scottish ecclesiastic. His "Scotichronicon" was continued up to the middle of the fifteenth century by Walter Bower, the learned Abbot of Inchcolm, a House of Regular Canons. Contemporary with Fordun was Andrew Wyntoun, Prior of St. Serf's Monastery, Lochleven. He wrote a metrical chronicle of Scotland, concerning which Tytler, the historian, remarks: "Where is the student who is an enthusiast in the history and antiquities of his country who would not rather read the quaint and homely descriptions of the Prior of Lochleven than the pages of modern writers, where vigor, freshness and originality are so often sacrificed to insipid elegance?" In the same fourteenth century flourished the Scottish poet, John Barbour, Archdeacon of Aberdeen, who wrote a graphic and spirited poem describing the life and actions of the Bruce. "It is in every respect," says Tytler, "a remarkable production for so early an age as the middle of the fourteenth century, and contains many passages which, in the strength and purity of the language, in the measured fulness of the rhythm, and the richness of the imagery, are not inferior to Chaucer."¹

When we come to the beginning of the sixteenth century we find the roll of learned ecclesiastics considerably increased. Hector Boece, the well-known historian, a priest of learning and scholarship, studied at Paris, and became the close friend of Erasmus. He was the first Principal of Aberdeen University. His brother, Arthur, was also a distinguished scholar, and possessed remarkable eloquence; he became a canon of Aberdeen. John Bellen-den, Archdeacon of Moray, translated Boece's history from the Latin. He was also the author of a translation of Livy. John

¹ *Hist. of Scot.*, vol. i., append. to chap. vi., sec. 5.

Major, at one time Vicar of Dunlop, Ayrshire, was another famous writer of the period; he became principal of St. Andrews. Florence Wilson, another Scottish priest who became an accomplished scholar, was a native of Elgin. He wrote, among other philosophical works, "Dialogues on Tranquillity of Mind." The works of this writer are remarkable for profound learning and grace of style. Gavin Douglas, the witty and learned Bishop of Dunkeld, besides composing many poetical works, was the first to translate Virgil into English. Dunbar, a native of Lothian, and priest of the diocese of St. Andrews, was also held in high esteem as a poet. "The genius of Dunbar and Gavin Douglas," says Sir Walter Scott, "is sufficient to illuminate whole centuries of ignorance." This list does not pretend to be exhaustive, but it is sufficient to show that Scotland was not behind her contemporaries in producing remarkable scholars; those scholars being found, almost without exception, amongst the clergy.

But it would be a mistake to imagine that the Church made no effort to promote learning in the laity. "In almost all the periods of the history of Scotland," says an historian, "whatever documents deal with the social condition of the country reveal a machinery for education always abundant, when compared with any traces of art or the other elements of civilization."¹ It is true that no accurate statistics are to be found on the subject, but references to it constantly occur in the cartularies of many of the great monasteries. Perth and Stirling, in 1173, possessed public schools under the direction of the monks of Dunfermline. In 1224 the monks of Lindores were empowered to plant schools in Dundee. The monks of Kelso in 1241, as their cartulary shows, conducted the school of Roxburgh. Similar establishments existed at Ayr, South Berwick and Aberdeen. The noted schools of Haddington were under the patronage of the Abbot of Holyrood.

Besides these external schools, nearly all the important monasteries had one within their own walls. These, though primarily intended for the education of boys aspiring to the monastic state, seem to have been frequented by secular students also. An instance of this is to be seen in the cartulary of Kelso. Matilda, the Lady of Molle, resigned part of her dowry lands in 1260, to provide a certain rent to be paid to the abbot and monks of that abbey on condition that her son should be maintained and educated there amongst their scholars of highest rank.² A school was attached

¹ Burton, *Hist. of Scot.*, vol. iv., p. 107.

² *Liber de Calchon*, vol. i., p. 142

to the Priory of St. Andrews also, and youths were received there to be instructed in philosophy. The same good offices towards education were rendered in later ages by some of the friars. The school of the Dominicans in Aberdeen was renowned in the sixteenth century, as also that of the Franciscans of Edinburgh. The canons of St. Antony at Leith had a school also.

A proof of the Church's zeal in promoting education is to be found in the Act of Parliament, passed in 1496 at the instance of the clergy, enforcing compulsory education. The statute provided that all barons and freeholders should be compelled under a penalty of twenty pounds to send their sons to school at the age of eight or nine, and allow them to remain there till they had acquired a competent knowledge of Latin. They were afterwards to attend higher schools of art and law, that they might qualify themselves to become sheriffs and judges.¹

But the opportunities provided for primary education did not satisfy the aspiring youths who wished to pursue the higher studies. Previous to the fifteenth century this desire compelled them to seek an education in England or in continental universities. A large number went to Oxford, where the Lady Devorgilla, mother of the vassal-king, Baliol, had founded in 1282 the college which still bears his name, in memory of her husband, John de Baliol. They seem to have been somewhat unpopular there on account of their adherence to the opposite party during the papal schism—in which Scotland sided with France. It became necessary for Richard II. to write to the University authorities in 1382, forbidding the molestation of the Scots, notwithstanding their "damnable adherence" to the anti-Pope. Great numbers of Scottish students went to Cologne, where the registers show that they outnumbered any other foreign students, and that the greater part of them belonged to the diocese of St. Andrews. Paris also, from the high reputation enjoyed by its schools, and from the sympathy always existing during the middle ages between France and Scotland, had many such students. It was to benefit such that David, Bishop of Moray, founded certain burses in the University of Paris for Scottish youths in the fourteenth century. This liberality may be regarded as the first beginning of the Scots' College in that city.

It was to obviate the necessity of students seeking an education outside the realm that universities were at length erected in Scotland. This, the highest benefit conferred upon education, was the

¹ *Acts of Parl. of Scot.*, vol. ii., p. 238.

work of the Church, as Protestant historians testify. "It may with truth be said," remarks Burton, "that in the history of human things there is to be found no grander conception than that of the Church of the fifteenth century, when it resolved, in the shape of universities, to cast the light of knowledge abroad over the Christian world."¹ "The universities of Scotland," says Cosmo Innes, "are the legitimate offspring of the Church. They alone, of our existing institutions, carry us back to the time when the clergy were the only supporters of schools, and the bishop of the great diocese was the patron and head, as well as the founder, of its university."²

St. Andrews was the first to lead the way. Bishop Wardlaw, who had completed his own studies at Oxford, founded a university in his cathedral city, with the concurrence of the prior and canons of his chapter, in the year 1410. Bishop Kennedy, in 1444, founded in connection with it the College of St. Salvator, and Archbishop Alexander Stuart that of St. Leonard's in the following century. These colleges received the approbation of Popes Paul II., Nicholas V., Pius II., and other sovereign pontiffs.

The second Scottish university owed its existence to Bishop Turnbull, who petitioned Pope Nicholas V. for leave to found one in his episcopal city of Glasgow. This Pope, whom Macaulay has styled "the greatest of the restorers of learning," gladly approved of the project, and erected the University of Glasgow by a papal bull in 1450. The office of Chancellor was always to be held by a Bishop of Glasgow, and the new foundation received from the Pope the same privileges for professors and students as were enjoyed by the papal university of Bologna.

At the close of the same century, another great ecclesiastic founded the third Scottish university in his cathedral city; this was the learned and holy Bishop Elphinstone, of Aberdeen. The papal constitution which erected it bestowed upon it the usual privileges, and nominated the bishop of the diocese as *ex officio* Chancellor.

Edinburgh University is not strictly speaking a Catholic foundation, and scarcely falls within the scope of our subject; yet a passing allusion must be made to it, as there, also, it was an ecclesiastic who gave the impetus to its erection. Bishop Reid, of Orkney, who died in 1553, left by his will certain sums of money for the education of the sons of poor gentlemen at the Scottish

¹ *Hist. of Scot.*, vol. iv., p. 109.

² *Sketches of Early Scotch Hist.*, p. 220.

universities. He bequeathed at the same time 8000 merks for the foundation of a college in Edinburgh; this bequest resulted in the erection of the university of that city after the Reformation. In all these ways had the Church been the protector and fosterer of learning, and the sixteenth century was reaping the benefits which had been so lavishly bestowed during the preceding ages.

If we turn from the realm of science to that of the arts, we find the Church still cherishing everything that could in any way benefit her children. Taylor, the Dominican, the renowned musician of the thirteenth century, has already had a passing notice. The influence of his writings, "De cantu ecclesiastico corrigendo," "De tenore musicali," etc., was so great that he is said to have raised the standard of church music in Scotland to equal that of Rome. A more methodical cultivation of the art of singing was the result; for not long after his time the custom obtained of establishing schools for the express purpose of training boys to sing in the church services. About the middle of the thirteenth century the statutes of Aberdeen provided for "singing boys" to assist in the cathedral choir on great festivals. In the course of a century a definite institution, known as the "sang school," was established for the training of such choristers. An instructor was appointed, who bound himself to remain all his life in the burgh, "singing, keeping and upholding mass, matins, evensongs, completories, psalms, responses, antiphonies and hymns in the church on festival days," his salary being fixed at twenty-four merks per annum. The master of the "sang school" was also required "to instruct burgesses' sons in singing and playing on the organ, for the upholding of God's service in the choir, they paying him his scholage and dues." At Brechin, in like manner, as the Episcopal Register testifies, a "sang school" was endowed by the Earl of Athole, and a chaplain appointed to conduct it. The foundation of such institutions became frequent in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and continued after the Reformation, until all the more important towns could boast of one. Many of these, though their later purpose was to minister to the psalm-singing of Presbyterian conventicles, were the product of Catholic piety and generosity in a former age.¹

For the cultivation of the rest of the fine arts, Scotland is just as much indebted to the Church. The monasteries were at first the only refuge of the artist. In their quiet scriptorium the monks of Kelso, for example, labored patiently at the far-famed miniatures

¹ *Vide Edgar, Hist. of Early Scott. Educ.*, pp. 99 et seq.

of their illuminated manuscripts, and to such hidden workers the country owed the development of an early taste for painting. The charter of Malcolm IV. to that abbey, a truly magnificent specimen of early art in illuminating and miniature painting, is still preserved at Floors Castle. The monks of Kelso have been chosen in illustration of this subject because it was an important principle in the rule of the Tiron branch of the Benedictine Order—to which they belonged—that each monk should learn and practice some useful art. Hence the Tiron monks became famous for their skill in painting, metal work, carving, sculpture and glass-staining, and also for their practical knowledge of many less exalted but no less necessary arts, as the sequel will show.

The principle which Bernard of Ponthieu, when he founded his abbey of Tiron, thought so important, was to a certain extent held by all cloistered monks. St. Benedict in his Rule, specially inculcates the carrying out in the spirit of humility of any art or craft which a monk may have already learned to practice. The proficiency of many of the early monks is explained by the above principles. Not only did they embellish the structures of their beautiful churches, but there is good reason to suppose that they were themselves in most cases the architects. It is a remarkable fact, and it bears out this conjecture, that the names of the first designers of those glorious buildings have been left in oblivion.

Painting, sculpture, glass-staining and carving, which the monks cherished so faithfully and made use of for the beautifying of their churches, fostered a love of art in those who beheld the results of their genius and labors. Not only did prelates call in the aid of painter, sculptor and carver for the beautifying of their cathedrals and churches, but kings and nobles took a delight in providing such embellishments for the House of God, and, later on, for their own palaces and castles also.

A splendid specimen of painting still remains in the little church of Fowlis Easter, near Dundee, which will serve as an illustration of this. It consists of a series of pictures painted on the screen which separates the nave from the sanctuary. They represent the crucifixion with attendant figures, pictures of the apostles, and other subjects. The style of the work indicates the middle of the fifteenth century as the date of its execution. There is good reason for supposing that the whole surface of the walls of this little church bore similar decorations, but that they were effaced at the Reformation by the tearing down of the wall plaster. The panels of the screen were coated thickly with whitewash at the same period, and to this fact the preservation of the pictures is

due. They were discovered about the middle of the present century. The artist is conjectured to have belonged to the Flemish school. The presence of paintings of such superior excellence in a little village church testifies to the high state of culture in Scotland in the age which produced them.

Another instance of the appreciation of the painter's art is seen in the employment for three years of a foreign painter, Andrew Bairhum, by Abbot Reid of Kinloss, for the decoration of his abbey church. Traces of these frescoes of the sixteenth century may still be descried amid the ruins of Kinloss. The faint remains of mural paintings under the chancel arch and on the wall of a chapel at Pluscardyn Priory, near Elgin, which seem to have been executed at about the same period, may also be mentioned as a passing illustration of the same subject.

James IV. lavished his means on the decoration of his royal palaces and of the Chapel Royal at Stirling in a way which led to the imitation of his nobles, in his own and the following reigns. His son, James V., inherited these artistic tastes. His palace at Stirling became a marvel of art for that period, and ranked as one of the wonders of the kingdom.

Allusion has been already made to the diligence of monks in writing and illuminating manuscripts. The mere mention will suggest the conclusion that the country was entirely indebted to the Church for such books as were to be found in those early ages. The Sacred Scriptures, the writings of the Fathers, and even the classic poets and historians, were copied and recopied with painstaking labor by those indefatigable workers. Monks and clerics were for many ages the only scribes, and have been at all times almost the only writers who possessed the patience necessary for transcription. But the Church was to do more for Scotland than cause manuscripts to be written for such as chose to acquire them. The inestimable treasure of the printing-press may be attributed to her influence also. Under the patronage of Bishop Elphinstone of Aberdeen, Walter Chepman established the first press at Edinburgh about 1509, and almost the first work—if not the very first—executed by it was the "Breviary of Aberdeen," which that prelate had just compiled.

This portion of our subject may be fittingly concluded with a quotation from a Scottish historian, which sums up in a few words what has been set forth in some detail. "The churchmen of those remote times," says Tytler, and he is speaking of the middle ages, "did not only monopolize all the learning which then existed; they were the great masters in the necessary and orna-

mental arts; not only the historians and the poets, but the painters, the sculptors, the mechanics, and even the jewellers, goldsmiths, and lapidaries of the times. From their proficiency in mathematical and mechanical philosophy they were in an especial manner the architects of the age; and the royal and baronial castles, with the cathedrals, monasteries and conventual houses throughout Scotland, were principally the work of ecclesiastics."¹

It would be leaving the subject incomplete to omit all mention of the way in which the Church had benefited the nation at large in the early centuries by cherishing and promoting the less ornamental, but no less valuable, arts of agriculture and gardening, mining, salt-making, and the like, together with the impetus she gave to commerce and navigation. At a period when laymen might at any moment be called to war, the clergy—especially the monks—were practically the only tillers of the soil, since they alone could count with any degree of certainty on escaping the harrying and wasting of lands by the invader, sheltered as they were under the Church's protection. The vast possessions which had accrued to the monasteries during centuries of benefactions were administered in a way which excites the admiration of even Protestant historians. They repaid the liberality of their benefactors "by becoming," as Tytler says, "the great agricultural improvers of the country." In later ages they became landlords by the leasing out of portions of their property, and their own good example in the scientific management of their farms and estates was a practical lesson to their tenants. The historian quoted above tells us that in the fourteenth century, while the diet of the upper classes consisted of wheaten bread, beef, mutton, bacon, venison and game of all descriptions, and that in the greatest profusion, the lower orders, "who could look to a certain supply of pork and eggs, cheese, butter, ale and oaten cakes were undoubtedly, so far as respects these comforts, in a prosperous condition."²

Besides the cultivation of the land, the monks paid attention to gardening also. The Abbey of Lindores, for example, was renowned for its fruit trees. Not the least of the benefits bestowed upon the country by its monks was the importation of new kinds of apple and pear trees from France. The result is seen to the present day in the many fine specimens of fruit trees which grace the gardens and orchards in the vicinity of the ruins of that once

¹ *Hist. of Scot.*, vol. i., append. to chap. vi., sec. 5.

² *Ibid.*, sec. 1.

famous abbey. These trees claim descent from the old monastic stock, and some of the original trees planted by the monks still survive in the ruined enclosure of the abbey. The same enterprising gardeners are said to have successfully cultivated the vine. The old chestnut trees introduced by the Austin Canons are still flourishing around the ruins of their old monastery of Inchmahome, and the apple trees of Beauuly and walnut trees of Pluscardyn still survive. Recent investigations have brought to light the fact that these monastic gardeners proceeded on thorough scientific principles; some of the trees they planted are found to have been placed upon a basis of stone slabs in the most approved modern manner of fruit cultivation. It is a fact not generally known that the common daffodil or "Lent Lily" (*Narcissus pseudo-narcissus*), which is found growing wild in some parts of Scotland, is limited to those districts which formed part of the property of some monastic establishment. This seems to indicate the introduction and cultivation of the flower by the inmates of such houses for the purpose which its popular name suggests—the decoration of the altar for the Easter festival, owing to its appearance in early spring.

An important branch of the national wealth of Scotland lay in the fisheries. In this, too, the monks led the way; by their skill and enterprise they set an example to lay-folk, and taught them how valuable a source of wealth and comfort lay in the rivers and lakes of the country, and in the seas that surrounded it. The fisheries attached to the great monasteries formed a very valuable portion of their possessions, and are often mentioned in their cartularies.

The monks of Newbattle Abbey were among the first, and probably the very first coal-miners in Scotland, as their charters testify. From those charters the earliest information in reference to the country on the subject of coal is to be obtained. The same monks, as well as those of other abbeys, had extensive salt-pans—another branch of industry for which the country is indebted to their zeal and activity.

"In naval and commercial enterprise," says Tytler, "as in all the other arts and employments which contributed to increase the comforts and the luxuries of life, the clergy appear to have led the way. They were the greatest ship-owners in the country." He goes on to relate that they were the great exporters of wool, skins, hides and salted fish, as well as a large quantity of live stock—as horses, cattle and sheep.¹ As the towns had sprung

¹ *Hist. of Scot.*, vol. i., append. to chap. vi., sec. 4.

up in many cases around the larger monasteries, the markets and fairs were often under the control of the monks; this was another means by which they taught their contemporaries the value of agricultural industry, and benefited both them and their posterity.

We come now to the care which the Church manifested for the poor and suffering; for it is in this that her bounty appeals most strongly to the appreciation of men. She has never been wanting in any age in means whereby to succor those in need. All through the middle ages the monasteries had been the recognized support of the poor. The "Almonry Gate" at Dunfermline, where food was daily dispensed, still remains. Seven chalders of meal were distributed to the needy every week at the Abbey of Paisley. But a still more striking example is seen in the charity of Melrose Abbey. On one occasion, when famine had devastated the country, the starving people from far and near fled to the monks to crave food, and in a truly princely way was their confidence rewarded. No less than four thousand of them, dwelling in rude huts which they had hastily erected on the hillsides and in the woods round about, were daily fed by the loving charity of the monks for three months, and thus saved from starvation till the corn was ripe for the sickle. The same generous monastery had a hospital for the sick poor in the twelfth century. These are only instances taken at random from history, but they serve to show that the abundant riches of the monasteries were regarded as—what they truly were—the patrimony of the poor.

In what may be styled the monastic age of Scotland, the poor turned naturally to the monastery in all their needs. Like other branches of learning, that of medicine also was monopolized by the monks; they were the physicians of the time. At a later age the charity of prelates and nobles and of the faithful of less exalted rank, showed itself in the foundation and sustentation of hospitals for the sick and poor. Such were those charitable institutions known by the beautiful title of *Maison Dieu* at Elgin, Brechin, Old Roxburgh and other towns; such the Hospital of St. Nicholas at Glasgow, founded in 1470 by Bishop Muirland, in which women ministered as nurses. Then there were the "Lazar Houses" for more loathsome or infectious diseases, taking their name from the Lazarus of the parable who lay at the rich man's gate full of sores; many such were scattered over the country, as at Aberdeen, Ligerswood in Lauderdale, Lerwick in far-off Shetland, etc. More touching still is the tender sympathy which prompted the establishment of Leper-hospitals at Aberdeen, Glasgow, Old Cambus, Papastour in Shetland, and other places.

It is impossible to refrain from pointing out here that, although these and numerous other hospitals for the sick poor existed from their foundation up to the change of religion, their revenues were too great a temptation to the "Reformers"; they were consequently swept away, together with the Church. Nor were they speedily replaced. "The Ancient Church," says Chambers, "was honorably distinguished by its charity towards the poor, and more especially towards the diseased poor; and it was a dreary interval of nearly two centuries which intervened between the extinction of its lazar-houses and leper-houses, and the time when merely a civilized humanity dictated the establishment of a regulated means of succor for the sickness-stricken of the humbler classes."¹

But the Church, always keenly sympathetic with suffering or want of any kind, did not delay her charity till sickness came to harass the poor. Numerous hospitals, as they also were called, existed in Scotland, as in other countries, which were designed to serve as homes for the aged, infirm, or destitute. Thus, Robert Ballantyne, Abbot of Holyrood, founded in the fifteenth century his hospital, near Edinburgh, for seven poor folk. Sir James Douglas had already erected at Dalkeith, in 1396, a refuge for six poor men. Bishop Spens, of Aberdeen, founded at Edinburgh, in 1479, St. Mary's Hospital for twelve almsmen. Robert Spital, tailor to James IV., founded at Stirling an asylum for decayed merchants and tradesmen. Soltre, a town 17 miles distant from Edinburgh, possessed a hospital for pilgrims, travellers and poor folk, with which Malcolm IV. had endowed it in 1164. Turriff, in Aberdeenshire, was gifted by Alexander Comyn, Earl of Buchan, with the collegiate establishment known as "St. Congan's Hospital"; it consisted of a master and six chaplains. To this was attached an asylum for thirteen poor husbandmen. At Banff was a *bede-house* for eight aged women.

To enumerate further would only weary the reader. Suffice it to say that the sixteenth century possessed nearly eighty of such institutions in Scotland for the benefit of the poor. It is needless to remark that they were carried on in a far different spirit from that which reigns in our nineteenth century poor-houses.

We may have seemed to wander continually from the period which it was proposed to illustrate, but the digressions have always been made with a purpose in view. It would have been impossible to present to the reader any accurate picture of the Church of the sixteenth century, of the power with which she reigned in

¹ Chambers, *Domestic Animals*, vol. iii., p. 557.

Scotland, and the benefits the nation owed to her, without frequent excursions into earlier ages. For it must be borne in mind that whatever the sixteenth century possessed—learning and science in all their branches, splendid buildings, ornate ceremonial worship, institutions for the benefit of humanity—all these were but the product of earlier centuries, during which the Catholic religion and churchmen held undisputed sway.

One more point remains to be touched upon. Allusion has already been made to some of the chief men of learning produced by the Scottish Church up to the early part of the century we are considering. Some few others, whose names have not yet been mentioned, or if so, only in passing, must now be brought forward to illustrate another class of those who devoted themselves to their country's welfare. Ecclesiastics, since they were practically the only men who could be styled "learned," had always held a prominent place in the affairs of state from a very early period of history. The office of Lord Chancellor—the confidential adviser, the "keeper of the king's conscience," as he was often styled—was in Catholic ages always a prelate. From the end of the twelfth to the first quarter of the sixteenth century no less than ten of the primates held that office, while Aberdeen furnished three, Brechin three, and Dunkeld six. Other offices of state of less ecclesiastical character were also constantly filled by churchmen. Thus, as Lord Chamberlain, we find Bishops of St. Andrews mentioned in 1238 and 1328, Bishops of Dunkeld in 1250 and 1376, and others at various times. The office of Lord Privy Seal was filled from time to time by Bishops of Aberdeen, Brechin, Moray and other prelates. But the most striking proof of the superior efficiency of churchmen in offices of state is seen in the appointments of Lord High Treasurer—an office which would seem to have little in common with their clerical profession. In the latter half of the fifteenth and early part of the sixteenth century we find enumerated as having filled this important post, the Bishops of Glasgow, Dunkeld, the Isles and Caithness, the Abbots of Paisley, Dunfermline, Melrose, Arbroath, Holyrood, Cambuskenneth, and the Deans of Glasgow and Moray, with many other dignified ecclesiastics.

Among these great statesmen the name of William Elphinstone illuminates the commencement of the sixteenth century—"a name," says Innes, "to be revered above every other in the latter days of the ancient Scottish Church."¹ He was born at

¹ Cosmo Innes: *Sketches of Early Scotch Hist.*, p. 260.

Glasgow about the year 1431. In his twenty-sixth year he became a priest, and afterwards studied at Paris and Orleans. In 1474 he was made Rector of Glasgow University. In 1482 he became Bishop of Ross, and in the following year was translated to Aberdeen. He declined the primacy, which was offered to him in 1513, and died in the following year. Bishop Elphinstone was employed in embassies to France, England, Burgundy and Austria. He was Chancellor to James III. and Lord Privy Seal to James IV. His private life was irreproachable; he was assiduous in the study of the Holy Scriptures and of the Fathers and constant in his charity to the poor. He did much to beautify his cathedral at Aberdeen; to his bounty it owed the great central tower with its fourteen fine bells. He also benefited the town by building the great bridge over the Dee.

Another prominent figure during this period was Gavin Dunbar, who, after being Prior of Whitherne, became eventually Archbishop of Glasgow in 1523. He was tutor to James V., and afterwards Lord Chancellor.

Another Gavin Dunbar was Bishop of Aberdeen in 1519, after being Archdeacon of St. Andrews. He was Clerk of the Council in 1503, and afterwards held the office of Master of the Rolls. He founded a hospital for twelve bedesmen at Aberdeen.

Bishop Hepburn, of Moray, who had previously been Abbot of Dunfermline, held the office of Lord High Treasurer. He died in 1524.

A noted politician of this period was Gavin Douglas, the poet, who became, in 1516, Bishop of Dunkeld. At one time he seemed destined for the primacy at the death of Archbishop Stuart, in 1513; but it was eventually bestowed upon the Bishop of Moray, Andrew Foreman. Though a learned churchman, it was said of Gavin Douglas that he had the ascendancy of the House of Douglas more at heart than either the good of his diocese or the welfare of his country. He died in 1522.

The prelate who was eventually appointed to St. Andrews at this period was Andrew Forman, Bishop of Moray. His energy and ability rank him high among the Scottish bishops of his time. He had a short but vigorous episcopate, being the author of many measures calculated to improve the discipline of the Church. On his death, in 1521, he was succeeded as primate by James Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow. It was during the rule of this prelate that an ecclesiastic came into prominence who was destined to play a foremost part in the occurrences of that stormy period of Scottish history. This was the Archbishop's nephew,

David Beaton, who, after some years of residence abroad, returned to Scotland in 1525, and in 1528 was made Lord Privy Seal. His connection with the Reformation period must be deferred to a future article.

Such was the Scottish Church during the first quarter of the sixteenth century as exhibited in her glorious buildings and consecrated traditions and in the illustrious prelates and statesmen she had produced. Her life and honor seemed bound up with the welfare of her children, and she was enshrined in their hearts as a divine power in the land. Looking at the Church from without, it would seem impossible that she should ever be cast down from her high estate. The letter written to Pope Clement VII. by James V., on January 21, 1526, shows that this was the feeling in Scotland. He assured the Pope that the interests of religion were safe in his hands, not only against Lutheranism, but against every other form of heresy.

And yet in less than forty years the Catholic faith had been proscribed by law. The truth is that the causes of its downfall were already working—hidden under the glory which seemed so imperishable. That this was so we shall endeavor to show in a future article.

DOM. MICHAEL BARRETT, O.S.B.

St. Benedict's Abbey, Fort Augustus, Scotland.

FREEMASONRY IN LATIN AMERICA.

THE first Masonic Lodge in Spain was established in 1726; the first Lodge in Madrid was opened in 1731. Not having been condemned by the Church until 1738, the Brethren of the Three Points enjoyed twelve years of perfect freedom for the diffusion of their poison ere its deadly nature was perceived by the Spaniards. Lodges were soon founded in all the principal cities; and when, in 1756, the government of Ferdinand VI. awoke to a sense of its duty in reference to the sectaries, they had multiplied to such an extent, and their nefarious doctrines had been so widely spread, that very little good was effected by that celebrated prohibitory edict which Masonic apologists affect to stigmatize as "the greatest and most cruel persecution of their order." When Charles III. left Naples in order to mount the Spanish throne in 1759, many of his courtiers were adepts of the Square and Compass; for the Neapolitan court had been a hotbed of Masonry for many years. With the advent of these Italian brethren, the most prominent of whom was the Marquis of Squillace, the Lodge of Madrid found its power greatly increased; and from that day the influence of the sectaries on the policy of the Spanish government has been almost permanent. Much of this success was originally due to the fact that in those days the Spanish Lodges, like those of the Two Sicilies, depended from the Grand Lodge of London, and to the analogous fact that the English cabinet encouraged the propagation of Masonry in both Spain and Portugal for its own political and commercial interests. Keene, the English ambassador at Madrid, devoted most of his energy and time to the Masonic propaganda; and when Charles IV. ascended the throne, nearly all the commerce of Spain was in English hands. Under Charles IV., many of the highest functionaries of the kingdom and not a few ecclesiastics were votaries of the Dark Lantern. Even the Inquisition was invaded by the sectaries. Llorente, the secretary of the dread tribunal, was one of the most active Masons of his day; and to his perversion is due that shallow diatribe which the average Protestant regards as a "History" of the institution which is his most persistent nightmare.¹ The power of the sectaries had become so great in 1800,

¹ For an account of Llorente and his book, see our *Studies in Church History*, vol. ii., p. 402.

that Urquijo, the Prime Minister of Charles IV. and a Mason of high degree, thought that the time had come when Spain might definitely cease to have any relations with Rome, and he issued a series of edicts tending to that end. Fortunately the king hearkened to the representations of Pius VII., and revoked the schismatical decrees; but the Masonic influence was not easily thwarted. Urquijo and his brethren devised a plan for the un-Christianization of their country; he proposed to import several hundred thousands of Russian and other Jews into Spain, and to give them such pecuniary aid and political encouragement that in time they might dominate the Christian element in the kingdom.¹ The French invasions prevented the actuation of this design, and it was already forgotten when, in 1869, after the enforced abdication of Isabella II., the eminent Mason, Zorilla, endeavored to actuate a similar plan. Zorilla proposed to the government of the temporary Regency (Marshal Serrano) that an invitation to settle in Spain should be extended to many thousands of English Protestants. "These immigrants," he insisted, "*must all be English Protestants*"; and unpatriotically ignoring the fact that modern Spain had owed to Irish Catholic immigrants much of the military power that she still possessed, he added: "Spain (*i.e.*, Spanish Freemasonry) *has no use for Irish Catholics.*" In 1880 another luminary of Freemasonry, Sagasta, then Grand Master of the Grand Orient of Spain, and, unfortunately, Prime Minister of Alfonso XII., affected feelings of commiseration for the Russian Jews, against whom the Slavs, maddened by the poverty to which Hebraic usury had reduced them, had risen in wicked riot. The tender-hearted statesman urged Alfonso XII. to pay the travelling expenses of 80,000 of the Russian and Polish Jews if they would settle in Spain, and to give to each head of a family or adult unmarried man a share of the public lands, all necessary implements, etc., and a guarantee of support until they were able to sustain themselves—that is, until the greater part of the lands of their Christian neighbors would have fallen into their clutches.² Alfonso XII. declined to promote the Masonico-Jewish project; but, nevertheless, the brethren anticipated much power for their order during the reign of the weak son of Isabella II. In the "Bulletin of the Symbolic Scotch Grand Lodge," Jan., 1882, we read: "In Spain cruel trials have frequently been the portion of Freemasonry; tolerated and proscribed alternately, the lot of the

¹ La Fuente, *Ecclesiastical History of Spain*, vol. iv., p 144. Madrid, 1873.

² Deschamps, *Secret Societies and Society*, bk. iii., ch. 6, § i. Sixth edition. Paris, 1882.

Spanish brethren has never been an enviable one. We were a little anxious as to the course that Alfonso XII. would pursue in our regard; but we are satisfied, since his promises to enforce *liberty of conscience* have been fulfilled. The advent of the illustrious Grand Master, Praxedes Mateo Sagasta, to the Prime Ministership, assures to Freemasonry the power of exercising its *mission of benevolence*, and of diffusing its *enlightenment*." Sagasta had just given a proof of his desire to "enlighten" the Spaniards by an endeavor to make civil marriage the law of the land, and by a declaration that "if that law entailed a rupture with Rome; the government of Alfonso XII. would draw inspiration from the conduct of Charles III., and would give an example of firmness against the *obstinacy* of the Church."¹ Sagasta's project for the demoralization of Spanish society was perforce postponed to a more propitious moment; for the resistance of the Catholic deputies was then seconded by the fear, on the part of the government, of a Carlist rising in defence of legitimacy.

In just proportion with the increase of Masonic influence in Spain, the educational establishments of the kingdom had become corrupted. In many of the ecclesiastical institutions, during the reign of Charles III. (1746-1788), heretical doctrines were openly taught. Estalla, rector of the Seminary of Salamanca, and an avowed Freemason, taught a "natural religion," and therefore atheism, to the future religious teachers of the people; and the authorities of the seminaries of Osma, Cordova and Murcia soon imitated his audacity. In the time of Charles IV. (1788-1808), and for many years afterward, the once glorious Chapter of St. Isidore paraded its "enlightenment." In accordance with the system of Aranda,² it endeavored, nearly a century before Bismarck's similar enterprise in our day, to relegate to the regions of the past all doctrines which it chose to consider as "Jesuitical," and it did not hesitate to inoculate its students with the poison of Locke and d'Alembert. Incredulism and immorality, therefore, were not then the foreign exotics which they had hitherto been; although, just as in the Spain of to-day, the immense majority of the people remained true to their faith, and the nation was then, as now, the most moral of all the nations of continental Europe. The Spain of Ferdinand and Isabella and of Philip II. was a thing of the past; the Spain of Aranda, Urtijo, Campomanes, Jovellanos, and others of that ilk—all graduates of Masonry—was preparing the catas-

¹ *Association Catholique*, Jan. 15, 1882.

² See our *Studies in Church History*, vol. iv., p. 468.

trophe for the Spain which we know, the Spain of Espartero, Prim, O'Donnell, Castelar, Zorrilla, Sagasta, and other Masonic pygmies, who fancied, each in his turn, that the mantle of Cardinal Ximenes had fallen on his shoulders.¹

A natural consequence of the spread of Freemasonry in Spain was its introduction into the Spanish-American colonies. According to the "Mondé Maçonique,"² an organ of the Dark Lantern which has every facility for the acquisition of information concerning this and similar matters, there were, at the outbreak of the revolution against the mother-country, ninety-nine Lodges in Peru alone. That these and other Lodges were the instigators of the insurrections of 1815-1830, and that they simply obeyed the orders given by the heads of European Masonry, when they so acted, was deliberately stated by the Protestant diplomat, Count Haugwitz, in the memorial which he presented to the European sovereigns who formed the Congress of Verona in 1822; and as his assertion was not contradicted by the Masonic half of the assembly, it may be regarded as strictly true.³ Nearly all of the

¹ The reader who desires to learn how the ecclesiastical authorities in Spain were prevented, during the latter part of the eighteenth century and during the first years of the nineteenth, from displaying the energy which was necessary for a successful combat with Freemasonry, will do well if he studies the work by Henry Bruck, Professor in the Seminary of Mayence, entitled *The Secret Societies in Spain*. Mayence, 1881.

² In the issue for March, 1875.

³ Some passages from this memorial by Haugwitz, who was the Prussian Prime Minister of that day, ought to interest the reader. "Now that I am at the end of my career (he was then seventy years old, and had been in the Prussian cabinet nearly forty years), I think that it is my duty to draw your attention to the aims of those secret societies whose poison threatens humanity to-day more than ever. Their history is so intimately intertwined with my own that I cannot refrain from giving some details. . . . I had scarcely attained my majority when I found myself occupying a distinguished place in the highest grades of Masonry. Before I could even know myself, before I could understand the situation into which I had rashly plunged myself, I found myself entrusted with the chief direction of a part of Prussian, Polish and Russian Masonry. As far as its secret labors were concerned, Masonry was then divided into two sections. The first affected to aim at a discovery of the philosopher's stone; its religion was Deism, or rather Atheism; its directive centre, under Dr. Zinndorf, was in Berlin. The second section, the apparent head of which was Prince F. of Brunswick, was very different. In open antagonism with each other, these two parties united in order to obtain the domination of the world, to subjugate every throne—such was their object. It would be superfluous to tell you how, in the satisfaction of my ardent curiosity, I mastered the secret of each of these sects; the truth is that the secret is no mystery for me. And that secret disgusts me. It was in 1777 that I assumed the direction of some of the Prussian Lodges; it was three or four years before the Convent of Willhelmsbad, and the invasion of the Lodges by Illuminism. My sphere of action embraced the brethren scattered through Poland and Russia. Had I not seen the fact with my own eyes, I would not believe it possible that governments could close their eyes to such a disorder as a state within a state. . . . Our object, like that of the olden Templars, was to dominate over thrones and sovereigns. . . . There appeared a book en-

Spanish commanders-in-chief in America during the years 1815-1830 were Freemasons; hence the numerous understandings with the rebel leaders, and hence, notably, the capitulation of the Spanish army at Ayacucho, in Peru, in 1824.¹ When the Spanish-American colonies had become independent states, then the halcyon days of Spanish-American Masonry, if we are to judge from a Masonic point of view, entered on their course. "Then," says the "Monde Maçonique," "a love of enlightenment and of liberty arose at once, together with independence, as though from a propitious soil." The entire political history of most of the Spanish-American republics, and much of that history in the others, shows that while the soil may have been "propitious," its Masonic cultivators produced no other crops than chronic revolutions and all their attendant miseries. As for the "love of enlightenment" which the Lodges claim to have manifested in every land of Latin America during the periods when the civil power has been in their hands, it cannot be denied that if Satanic hatred of Catholicism and of its works be a test of "enlightenment," then indeed the Dark Lantern is more luminous than the sun of justice and of truth. It may be observed, however, that in Spanish and Portuguese America, just as in other Christian lands, "love of enlightenment" has not been the impelling motive of Freemasonry in its

titled *Errors and Truths*. This work produced a sensation, and it impressed me deeply. . . . At once I thought that I would now learn what was hidden under the emblems of the Order; but according as I penetrated further into the dark cavern, deeper grew my conviction that there was something very different in the last recesses. The light came when I found that Saint-Martin, the author of this work, was really one of the coryphees of the Chapter of Sion. . . . Then I acquired the firm conviction that the drama which began in 1789, the French Revolution, the regicide with all its horrors, had not only been long prepared, but that it was the result of our association, of our oaths, etc. . . . Those who know me can judge of the effect which these discoveries produced on me. . . . My first care was to communicate my discoveries to King William III. Both of us were convinced that all of the Masonic grades, from the lowest to the highest, were destructive of all religious principles, conducive to the execution of the most criminal designs, and that the lowest grades were used as mere mantles to cover the iniquities of the highest. This conviction, shared with me by the king, caused me to renounce Masonry absolutely; but the king deemed it prudent to abstain from an open rupture with the Order." When Haugwitz's memorial had been well discussed by the sovereigns assembled in Verona, the Prussian king alone refused to take measures against Freemasonry, and from that day the Lodges regarded Prussia as the sole continental State willing to accomplish their work, *fas aut nefas*. The emperors of Austria and Russia determined to act as energetically as their Masonic surroundings would permit. Alexander I., the Russian czar, had hitherto protected Masonry, but now he proscribed it; in 1816 he had expelled the Jesuits from his empire, but in 1824, as we have seen, he sent General Michaud to Rome to prepare the way for the return of Russia into the Catholic fold. He died mysteriously as soon as the errand of Michaud was made known. Was that death the work of Masonry?

¹ See the cited work by Bruck for several Spanish authorities for this assertion.

war to the knife against the Church. In the eyes of Freemasonry, the crying sin of the Church is not that she is ignorant rather than enlightened, despotic rather than liberal; her unpardonable fault is that she is the Church of Jesus Christ. As M. de Champagny well said, "There has ever been, from the beginning of the world, but one single war between the Church, whether patriarchal, Mosaic, or Christian, and that Proteus which was styled Paganism in ancient times, which appeared as Mohammedanism in the sixth century, which was disguised as Protestantism in the sixteenth century, which masqueraded as Incredulism in the eighteenth, and which now combats as the Revolution;"¹ and Freemasonry is the personification of each one of these pests. The Satanic sympathies of Freemasonry, whatever may be the individual sentiments of some of its adepts, are especially evinced in Latin America; for not one of the Masonic "Powers" in those regions interrupted its relations with the Grand Orient of France, when that great and shining exemplar of all the Masonic virtues erased from its Constitution the name of God and all mention of the immortality of the human soul.²

Elsewhere we have alluded to the peculiar tactics adopted by Freemasonry in its war against Christianity in Portugal;³ to the deliberate attempt to corrupt the entire Portuguese clergy—an enterprise the plan of which had been sketched originally by Weisshaupt as calculated to subjugate the German priesthood, and which was recommended afterward by the Roman "Alta Vendita" as promising to place a Carbonaro on the throne of Peter.⁴ This Satanic method of warfare had attained a measure of success in Germany and in Tuscany in the last years of the eighteenth century; and, as we have seen, it did not fail entirely when it was waged in Portugal in later days. With light hearts, therefore, the Brethren of the Three Points undertook in Brazil the most important campaign which they have ever conducted in Latin America. Their first victory entailed the capture of no less a personage than Don Pedro, the son and heir of John VI. In 1814 John VI. returned to Portugal, whence the Napoleonic invasion had driven him; but Don Pedro remained in Brazil and became a Mason. It is not improbable that it was the advice of his fellow-sectaries that induced Pedro to prefer an independent sceptre of Brazil to a double crown of Brazil and Portugal.⁵ In a letter written to his father on July 15, 1822, he advised the old monarch to imitate

¹ *The Power of Words*, p. 31. Paris, 1880. ² See our *Studies*, vol. iv., p. 436.

³ *Ibid.*, vol. v., p. 267.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 493.

⁵ Clavel: *Pictorial History of Freemasonry*, pt. ii., ch. 3.

him, since, as he argued, "the Portuguese were very foolish when they felt such horror for so philanthropic an institution."¹ In 1826 Don Pedro was made Grand Master of Brazilian Masonry, and during his entire reign he endeavored to establish the order firmly in his dominions. No open attack, however, was made on Catholicism during this reign, and the same prudence was observed during the greater part of the reign of Don Pedro II. (1831-1889). But during all these years the Freemasons were insinuating themselves not only into all the religious confraternities which abound in Brazil as well as in Portugal, but also into the priesthood, and even into the episcopacy. For many years before the persecution which we are about to narrate, it was with the greatest difficulty that any person could be admitted into the Confraternity of Mt. Carmel, or into the Third Order of St. Francis, unless he was previously enrolled in some Masonic Lodge;² and we can perceive the significance of this alarming fact if we remember that as in Portugal, so in Brazil, few persons of any respectability did not belong to one of these or similar confraternities, so great and manifold were the religious and social advantages reaped by their members.³ Certainly it seems strange that the adepts of Square and Triangle waited until 1872 to doff the mask which had hitherto hidden their hideousness.⁴ Perhaps they had not been sure of the approbation of the emperor, Don Pedro II., a sovereign who would have liked to serve God without displeasing the devil; but it is certain that just before the persecution, when Don Pedro was about to return from his travels in North America and Europe, it was common talk in Brazil that the stay of his Majesty in Italy

¹ This letter is given in its entirety by Mencacci, in his *Documents for the History of the Italian Revolution*, vol. ii., p. 67.

² Deschamps: *loc. cit.*, bk. iii., ch. 35, § 1.

³ The riots which occurred in Porto, in Portugal, in 1862, and in which the war-cry was "Down with the Sisters of Charity!" were instigated by the Third Order of St. Francis. These wonderful disciples of the Seraph of Assisi, in the letter of dismissal from their hospital which they sent to the Daughters of St. Vincent, protested that "their determination was caused by no unfavorable opinion of the Sisters." Such a remark was superfluous. They were Freemasons, and that fact explained their action.

⁴ In May, 1872, the *Bulletin of the United Grand Orient of Brazil* thus manifested the designs of the order: "We are fighting to fulfil the grand humanitarian and social mission which has been reserved for our order in the universal country which is afflicted by errors a thousand years old. . . . Our reason, our intelligence, tell us that we are progressing toward perfectibility, and the chief point is to regulate our march so as to arrive at the goal more surely. . . . Hidden behind the screen of so-called religious beliefs, the Black Men (the priests) propagate the fatal principle of obligatory ignorance, in order to perpetuate their sacerdotal authority. . . . The people will now tear off the bandages of slavery which the oppressors of the human conscience have placed over their eyes. . . . The advantages of modern civilization will now take the place of the routine of centuries."

had rendered him bitter against the Holy See, and that the Brazilian Church might expect trouble.¹

Whether or not this rumor was well-founded, the spring of 1872 was signalized by a declaration of open war, on the part of Freemasonry, against the Church of the immense majority of the Brazilians. At that time Brazilian Masonry was divided into two factions, each having its own Grand Lodge—the one being of monarchical spirit, and the other being essentially radical and revolutionary. The Grand Master of the first faction was Rio Branco, the President of the Cabinet. On March 3d the Rio Branco Masons gave a banquet to their leader, in order to congratulate him on some measures which he had induced the Parliament to vote; and one of the features of the celebration was a discourse *by a priest*. The speech was reproduced by the most important journal of the empire, the "Commercio," and the full name, position, titles, etc., of the orator were carefully detailed. The audacious ecclesiastic was immediately suspended by his bishop; and then, from every corner of Brazil, were heard the howls of "the friends of Brazilian liberty." Herod and Pilate shook hands; on April 16th the "Conservative" Grand Orient (the *Lavra Dio*) invited the Radical Grand Orient (the *Benedictinos*, so called from the place of its meeting) to sink all political differences in order to wage a more successful war against the "Black Men." That this union might be the more impressive,

¹ Villefranche narrates that one morning in 1872, at about seven o'clock, just as Pius IX. had finished his Mass, word was brought to His Holiness that the emperor of Brazil, who was then visiting Victor Emmanuel, desired an audience. In spite of the early hour, the Pontiff consented to receive Don Pedro. When the Brazilian had made his obeisance, the Pope said: "Well, what can I do for Your Majesty?" Don Pedro replied: "I beg Your Holiness not to call me 'Your Majesty'; at present I am the Count d'Alcantara." "Very well," said the Pope, "what can I do for the Count d'Alcantara?" "I have come," replied Don Pedro, "to ask permission to bring *the King of Italy* to Your Holiness." Villefranche says that Pius IX. arose, and with his eyes flashing, he cried, "There is no use in proposing such a thing to me. When *the King of Piedmont* restores to me my states, I may consent to receive him, but not until then shall I do so." The same interview is narrated a little differently by the Brazilian authority on whose report of the Masonic persecution Deschamps relies as being of such unimpeachable value that "it would be rash not to accord it full confidence." According to this authority, when Don Pedro had made his impudent request, the Pontiff calmly said, "My little Count, you understand nothing about these things; so don't talk about them." The pontifical retort, says the Brazilian friend of Deschamps, cut Don Pedro to the quick, and he determined to punish Pius IX. "One thing is certain," adds this authority; "before the emperor's return from Europe, it was circulated everywhere in Brazil that His Majesty had become ill-disposed toward the Church; that he was greatly excited against her, and that she might expect much misfortune. These rumors, I repeat, were heard everywhere before the return of the emperor, and events justified them."

both Orients announced in the newspapers that on a certain day the Brethren would have a solemn Mass of Requiem offered for one of their number who had just died "impenitent and unab-solved." The defiance of episcopal authority was unmistakable ; but unfortunately the bishop of Rio Janeiro neglected his duty, and the Mass was celebrated with all the pomp of Masonry. Having thus vindicated their claims to popular respect in the capital, the sectaries turned their attention to the provinces. Mgr. Vital Gonçalves de Oliveira, a prelate of sweet character and of great tact, had just been installed in his diocese of Olinda, when the journals announced, on June 27th, and in the name of the united Grand Orients, that on the Feast of Sts. Peter and Paul a Mass of thanksgiving would be celebrated in the Church of St. Peter, in commemoration of the foundation of the Lodge of Olinda. In spite of his gentleness, Oliveira was of stamina very different from that of the bishop of Rio ; therefore, he immediately wrote to each pastor in his diocese a reminder that no priest could officiate or assist at a function which was avowedly Masonic. The clergy refused to do the bidding of the Orient ; but the Brethren were not discouraged. On July 3d the newspapers told the public that a Mass of Requiem would be offered in the Cathedral for the repose of the soul of a recently deceased Brother, and that the Lodge of Olinda would attend with all its insignia. Again the clergy did their duty ; and then the Masonic journals called on the people to protest against the wickedness of the priests " who would not pray for the dead." The bishop of Olinda was asked to refute the following argument : " Why does the bishop so insult Freemasonry as to prevent it from appearing officially at the religious functions in his churches? Masonry is a holy institution ; the proof of this assertion lies in the fact that there are many Masons among his clergy, even in his Chapter, and also in the confraternities. The Freemasons are excellent Catholics, for the same hands which carry the mallet in the Lodges carry the sacred banners and images in religious processions." On December 28th Mgr. Oliveira sent a circular to all his clergy, calling on them to procure either an abjuration from all the Masonic members of the confraternities, or a resignation of their membership.¹ It was

¹ The reader must know that in this term "confraternities" were included in Brazil, as in Portugal, not only organizations like those to which that name is given in other countries, but also those bodies which had been instituted by Pombal for the administration of the business affairs of the parishes, but principally in order to attenuate the authority of the bishops. These parochial "confraternities" were very different from our Board of Trustees or the French *Conseils de Fabrique*, or the Italian *Fabriche* ;

found that in some of the confraternities there were no Freemasons ; but there were too many which proved that the sectaries had not belied them, and these were disciplined by the interdiction of their special chapels. As was to be expected, and as the Masons had hoped, the censured confraternities continued to hold their accustomed services in their interdicted chapels, one of their number presiding when no priest could be induced to officiate. They also continued to attend, in their special regalia, at all the parochial services in their churches. In the diocese of Para everything happened as in that of Olinda ; and the parish clergy of each diocese were notified by the rebels that if the confraternities were not allowed to appear in church and to receive the Blessed Sacrament "in their Masonic capacity," the said confraternities would remove the sacred vestments from the churches, and would take possession of the keys of the Tabernacles. The threat was fulfilled ; and whenever a priest was summoned to give the Holy Viaticum to the dying, he was obliged to humiliate himself before the president of his Masonic confraternity, unless time allowed him to go to the Tabernacle in the episcopal residence, or to that in one of the convents. In none of the parishes of Olinda and Para was Mass now offered ; and the interdicted confraternities confiscated to secular purposes (or to their individual pockets) the moneys which had been placed in their care for the celebration of Masses for the dead, or for other pious intentions. These diabolic outrages could not continue in a Catholic community without much risk of life and limb on the part of the perpetrators ; the people are not always as patient as their spiritual advisers. It became necessary, therefore, for the "Masonic Catholics" to invoke the aid of the civil authority against the Canons of the Church. They appealed to the Parliament, not having considered that the deputies of the people might sustain the authority of the bishops ; but their mistake was perceived by the Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs, a notorious Freemason, and he advised them to appeal to his tribunal. The advice was followed ; and with Masonry as a judge in a case to which it was a party, the issue was not doubtful. On June 12, 1873, an imperial decree ordered the bishops to withdraw the interdict which they had pronounced against the confraternities, the government alleging that the Papal condemnation of Freemasonry was of no value, since it had never received the royal *exequatur*, or, in plain lan-

they not only handled the parochial funds, but they arranged all festive celebrations, and invited whom they pleased to assist at them. They wore special costumes, and attended all marriages, funerals, and very many civil functions.

guage, since His Brazilian Majesty had not accorded to it his gracious approbation. By a strange coincidence, at the very moment that the decree of Don Pedro II. was placed in the hands of Mgr. Oliveira, he received also the Papal Brief, *Quanquam dolores*, in which, under date of May 29th, Pius IX. approved all that he and the bishop of Para had done in the matter of the Freemasons, and ordered him to communicate this approbation to the entire Brazilian hierarchy. The bishop of Olinda therefore wrote to the emperor: "Sire, I hold now in one hand your order to raise the interdict which I have inflicted, and in the other hand I hold a Brief in which His Holiness commends all that I have done in that matter. Your Majesty shall judge whether I am free to obey your commands."

Oliveiro immediately published the Papal Brief throughout his diocese, and the government summoned him to answer for the "crime" of publishing a document from Rome without the royal permission. But when it was learned that all the bishops in the empire had been equally guilty, the trial was postponed indefinitely, and other and more radical measures were taken against the principal offender. On January 2, 1874, an imperial commissary presented himself at the residence of the intrepid prelate in Pernambuco. When informed that the officer was charged with the unpleasant task of arresting him, Oliveira replied that he would yield only to force. Then the commissary laid his hand on the bishop's arm—the conventional sign that force was being used—and the prisoner asked to be allowed to retire to his private rooms for a few moments. Permission having been accorded, Oliveira withdrew. When seated in his chamber, he rapidly wrote a protest against the governmental proceedings. Then he put on all his pontifical robes, and went to his private chapel. After a moment of prayer, he opened the door, and asked the waiting commissary: "*Quem quæritis?*" Then he read his protest, and followed the officer to the man-of-war which was to convey him to Rio. Having arrived in the capital, he was confined in the arsenal for three days, and then he was visited by certain officers, who asked him what he had to say in answer to the charges which they read to him. No answer could be made; for, as a Catholic bishop, Oliveira could not admit the competency of a secular tribunal in religious matters. But he asked for paper, wrote a few words, and sealed the document. When the judges who were to try his case assembled, they were very anxious to learn the nature of his pleading; but when the important paper was opened, it was found to contain: "*Jesus autem tacebat.*" On

February 21st the daring criminal was condemned to four years of hard labor in a fortress ; but Don Pedro deigned to alleviate the sentence by exempting his victim from the hard labor. Immediately after the disposal of the case of the bishop of Olinda, that of Mgr. Macedo, the bishop of Para, received the same treatment, and ended in the same manner. After two years of imprisonment, both prelates were graciously "pardoned" by the emperor. But the bishop of Para was destined to undergo many more painful experiences at the hands of the Masonic apostles of "enlightenment and liberty." The most notable of these sufferings was that which was entailed by his condemnation of the Confraternity of Our Lady of Nazareth, an institute which, founded in 1842 for noble purposes of mutual edification, had latterly fallen almost entirely into the clutches of Masonry. In October, 1877, this association was celebrating one of its feasts with a grand procession, when suddenly the spectators were shocked by the sight of pictures of entirely naked women, and of other representations even more obscene, amid the images of Jesus, Mary and the saints.¹ The episcopal condemnation of this sacrilege, accentuated by an interdict of the chapel of the culpable confraternity, entailed legal proceedings which lasted for more than two years, and finally the Masons gained their cause ; for the president of the province, Goma y Abreu, was an adept. On the night of the day when it had been decided that the sacrilegious organization should retain possession of its chapel, the brethren passed in procession before the palace of the bishop, insulting him with hootings and groans. The religious images were carried, as usual, in this procession ; but the character of the participants was shown by the fact that nearly all wore their hats and had cigars in their mouths ; and in order that the victory might be more clearly understood as one of Masonry, the rooms of the Lodge of Para were grandly illuminated during the festivities, and the brethren furnished the populace with an expensive exhibition of fireworks, the chief features of which were Masonic emblems.² But in spite of the apparent triumph of the Lodges over the bishops of Olinda and Para, the more perspicacious of the brethren could not fail to perceive that their outrageous violations of law and justice, to say nothing of their open scorn of all that most Brazilians held as dearer than life, were drawing to the clergy the sympathies of all honest men, and were tightening the bond of unity between the hierarchy and

¹ Thus the *Paris Univers* of November 10, 1879, quoting the *Diario de Belem*.

² The *Univers* of December 31, 1879, quoting the *Boa Nova de Para*.

the priests. Therefore it was decided in the superior councils of the Dark Lantern that there should be a cessation of the high-handed proceedings of the previous seven years; that there should be a recourse to the more prudent wiles of European Masonry; that, in fine, the order should endeavor to gain possession of the family, and to control the education of the young.

This resolution was foreshadowed in the address which Saldanha Marinho, the Prime Minister, delivered on the occasion of his installation as Grand Master of the United Grand Orients of Brazil: "I now assume, before you and before Brazil, the onerous duty of defending zealously those grand social ideas, the realization of which is the aim of every free people. . . . I have always opposed the logic of truth to the subtleties of *Jesuitism*; the serenity of my conscience to the sophisms of hypocrisy; the rights of free reason to the excesses of fanaticism; the spread of healthy teaching to the propagation of error and obscurantism.

. . . Strong though he may be in the possession of truth, no one man can succeed in this propaganda of generous ideas; and here is revealed the power of our order. You have already demonstrated your good will and your zeal by a generous supply of the resources which are necessary for the success of the mission which I have undertaken; and, thanks to that aid, during the last seven years I have sent into the farthest corners of the empire, and even into foreign lands, the echo of our complaints and aspirations, and our demand for the restoration of rights which have been suffocated by the armies of fanaticism and superstition.

. . . The task which we have proposed to ourselves, and not merely in the name of Masonry, but for its sake, since the upholding of these principles involves the very existence of the order, is to procure the institution of *civil marriages*, so as to free our fellow-citizens from the tyranny of an exclusive and intolerant Church; and, secondly to obtain the *secularization of all cemeteries*, thereby protecting the mortal remains of the dead from the insults of a religious sect which pretends to extend its power into the domain of the *Infinite*."¹ But Saldanha Marinho relinquished his portfolio in 1880; and the new cabinet, beyond an enforcement of the principle of governmental supervision of education, evinced no desire to aid the Masonic propaganda. So "clerical," in fact, did the new administration show itself, that it even ventured to allow the Capuchins to undertake the evangelization of such of the Brazilian tribes as were still Pagan. The bishops were allowed compara-

¹ *Journal of Belgian Masonry*, Dec. 8, 1879.

tive freedom in the exercise of their pastoral duties; and large numbers of the deluded sectaries, who had learned from the recent persecution that Masonry was not an inoffensive and merely benevolent association, made their formal abjurations. The advent of the Republic, proclaimed in 1889, gave great encouragement to the Brethren of the Three Points; the laws were all revised in a Masonic sense; but hitherto the fervent Catholicism of the nation has prevented any open and extraordinary persecution of the Church.

While the "Liberator," Simon Bolivar, was fighting for the independence of Columbia,¹ the civil administration of the country was in the hands of the vice-president, General Santander, a democrat like the President, but a man of pronouncedly Masonic heart. Bolivar would have willingly allowed the Church to live at peace in a free state; but Santander could perceive no happiness in a state which did not hold the Church in slavery. By means of a Lodge which he founded in Bogota, entitled a "Society for Enlightenment," and of which he caused himself to be elected "Venerable," he spread the poison of a bastard Liberalism among the people, inoculating them with the notion that they would never be really free, until Columbia possessed a truly Liberal Constitution, and that such a panacea would never be obtained unless they ceased to elect to the Congress men who were "reactionaries, fanatics, and secret partisans of the Spanish Government."

In 1821 an imposing majority of Freemasons greeted General Santander when he met the new Congress in Cucuta. The first move of the precious body was to abolish the article of the Constitution which declared that the Catholic religion was that of the State; and the pretext was the non-necessity of such a declaration in a Catholic republic. When the leader of the minority, Dr. Banos, announced that his party could not vote for an enactment which was "radically vicious," he was instantly expelled from the Congress. Of course the Congress voted for the abolition of the Inquisition, which had been dead, to all intents and purposes, for many years; and it also decreed that the right of censorship should be vested in the government alone—a power which Santander immediately exercised by authorizing the publication of the works of Voltaire, Helvetius, Diderot, Bentham, as well as of many immoral pamphlets. The Congress also prepared the way for a schism, that favorite engine of Satan when

¹ Such was the name given in 1810 to the republic formed by the confederation of Venezuela, New Granada and Equador.

heresy is not immediately possible. The Holy See had allowed the Spanish sovereigns to exercise a *jus patronatus* in the nomination of bishops and in the administration of the ecclesiastical revenues, and the Congress pretended to have inherited this right from the defunct government. Then, in order to banish the last effects of "centuries of intellectual slavery," the Congress imposed a new plan of studies on the universities, and even on the ecclesiastical seminaries. One of the obligatory text-books was the work of the materialist and atheist, Bentham; and when a certain eminent professor, Dr. Margallo, stigmatized this author as impious, he was thrown into prison. Restrepo, the historiographer of Columbia and a friend of Santander, is constrained to say of this republican tyranny: "This congressional legislation made a *tabula rasa* of the customs, as well as of the religious convictions, of the nation; in a word, it was a complete anomaly in face of the sentiments of the people. Therefore the simple announcement of another session of this Congress caused as much consternation as though an earthquake or a hurricane had been predicted. In fact, such Congresses, being composed almost exclusively of lawyers and of lads who were crammed full of French theories (those of 1789), had but one object—to impregnate Columbia with the doctrines of Voltaire and Rousseau."¹ Had the Masonico-Liberal administration given to the people some material compensation for the impieties with which it deluged the land, the spirit of the world might have triumphed in Columbia; but brigandage, devastation, military executions for pretended royalism, and rapine of every kind, became the order of the day. This condition of affairs caused every lover of order and of common decency to call on Bolivar, the man who had liberated them from the "yoke of the Spaniards," to free them from the more intolerable yoke of Masonic Liberalism; some begged him to restore the Spanish domination; others, and the most respectable of all, suggested that he might don a crown as "Emperor of the Andes." These clamors reached Bolivar immediately after his great victory of Potosi, obtained on April 1, 1825, and by which he had liberated Peru. He prepared immediately to proceed to Columbia, and in the meantime he forwarded a proclamation announcing his journey: "The noise of your discords has reached me, even in Peru, and I return to you with an olive-branch in my hand. If your disorders do not cease,

¹ *History of Columbia*, cited by Berthe in his *Garcia Moreno, President of Ecuador, Avenger of Christian Right, and Its Martyr*. Paris, 1887.

anarchy and consequent death will triumph over the ruins of Columbia." During the ensuing three years the efforts of the Liberator to endow his compatriots with peace and prosperity were continually thwarted by the Santanderist Masons; the Lodges had resolved to rule, or to bury Bolivar and Columbia in the same tomb. But a crisis arrived on Sept. 25, 1828, when, at the hour of midnight, a band of these partisans of liberty and enlightenment assailed the presidential palace, and with daggers in hand forced their way to the bedroom of Bolivar, crying for his death. The attempt failed; the president had escaped by a secret passage. The leading assassins were shot; and Santander, convicted of complicity, was banished. Then the Liberator issued the following decree: "Considering, firstly, that the State would be soon brought to ruin if impunity were accorded to criminals and rebels, I resume the dictatorial power with which the people invested me. Considering, secondly, that *Secret Societies have the planning of political revolutions for their principal object, and that their baneful character is sufficiently manifested by the mystery with which they surround themselves, I order the suppression of all such societies, and the closing of their Lodges.*" Then, exhorting the clergy to inculcate unceasingly the principles of Christian morality, he continued: "It is because the country has abandoned correct principles that a spirit of madness has taken possession of it. In order to neutralize the wicked theories with which the people have become saturated, let the clergy preach obedience and respect to all." Finally, being persuaded that the youth of Columbia were being poisoned by the doctrines then in vogue in the universities, he decreed that the entire curriculum should be revised in a Christian sense, and that a profound study of religion should be introduced, "so that the young men of the nation might have weapons wherewith to combat impiety and their own passions." Nothing but sad experience and the ascendancy of truth could have wrung these admissions from Bolivar, for during his early years he had advocated the principles of 1789 almost to the point of deifying the Revolution. The adepts of Square and Triangle never forgave the Liberator for his declaration of these Christian sentiments; and, had not the day been near when his partisans would be obliged to appeal again to the polls for the approbation of the electors, he would have paid for his temerity with his life. In the meantime the people were made to believe that every vote cast for a partisan of the dictator would be a vote for a Columbian monarchy, and when

the elections had been held, it was found that the Masonic candidates had triumphed in nearly every instance.

On January 13, 1830, the new Congress assembled; and in spite of the entreaties of his friends, and although the diplomatic corps promised its unanimous support if he would retain his dictatorship, the Liberator resigned his office, never, as he protested, to assume it again. "And now," he wrote to the Congress, "*let my last official act be to recommend Congress to protect continually our holy religion, the fruitful source of the blessings of heaven; and to entreat Congress to restore its sacred and imprescriptible rights to public instruction, which has been made a cancer for Columbia. . . . Fellow-citizens, I must say, and with the blush of shame on my brow, that while we have won our independence, it has been won at the expense of every other blessing. . . .* For twenty years I have served you as soldier and as magistrate. During that long period we have freed our country, procured liberty for three republics, repressed many civil wars, and four times I have resigned to the people the supreme power which they confided to me. To-day I fear that I may be an obstacle to your happiness, and therefore I resign, for the last time, the magistracy with which you have honored me. The most unworthy suspicions have been expressed in my regard, and I have been unable to defend myself. A crown has been offered to me frequently by men who are now ambitious of supreme power, but I always refused that crown with the indignation of a sincere republican. I swear that a desire for a throne has never stained my soul. Columbians, I conjure you to heed my last entreaty. Be united, and do not become the assassins of your country!" On May 8th Bolivar departed from Carthagena, with the intention of sailing for Europe. While waiting for the ship which he was not destined to board, he heard of the dismemberment of the Columbia which he had founded. Venezuela had become independent under the presidency of General Paez. The three departments of Equador, namely, Quito, Cuenca and Guayaquil, had become autonomous under the rule of General Flores. His dearest friend, Marshal Soucre, the victor of Ayacucho, had been assassinated by his rivals—a crime which caused the Liberator to say: "It is the blood of Abel that has been shed." He heard also that the students in Bogota—lads who were pupils of Masonic instructors—were amusing themselves by making a target of his portrait. Perhaps he was not surprised when General Urdaneta, having made a kind of *coup d'état* in order to save the remnants of Columbia, sent to him a deputation with entreaties that he would undertake the restoration of the

republic. His reply was : " A gate of brass separates me from power—legality. I cannot assume an authority with which another has been invested." His friends begged him to think of his dying country ; but he replied : " There is no hope for my country. Such is my conviction, and my despair." The moral agony which such reflections entailed on Bolivar brought him to the tomb. Having been taken to the city of Santamarta, where his friends thought that he might obtain sufficient strength to enable him to prosecute his European trip, the bishop told him that he was at the point of death. He received the Last Sacraments with edifying fervor, and died in his forty-eighth year, on December 17, 1830, a victim of Masonic treachery and of Masonic essential lack of patriotism.

The Republic of Equador, born of the dismemberment of that ephemeral creation of Bolivar, the Republic of Columbia, was subjected for many years to the pretendedly " Conservative Liberalism " which found its fit exponents in men like Flores, Rocafuerte, and Roca. This Liberalism exhibited the sovereignty of the people as its essential principle ; but its Conservatism consisted in preserving itself in power, even in spite of the will of the nation. The hybrid did not trouble itself to persecute the Church, so long as the Church showed herself willing to serve as its obsequious servant. Under the rule of Urbina and Robles hypocritical Conservatism disappeared, and unblushing Radicalism seemed destined to consummate a ruin which was already more than half completed. But a new era dawned for Equador in 1861, when Garcia Moreno was elected to the too frequently prostituted presidential office. In his first message to the Congress the new president asked that body to adopt a Constitution which would be Catholic in every sense of the term—one which would furnish " the sole means of regenerating the country by an energetic repression of crime, by giving a solid education to youth, and by protecting the holy religion of our ancestors, so that by the aid of that religion we may procure a realization of reforms which neither government nor laws can effect by their own unaided efforts." The draft of a Constitution which Moreno submitted began with the declaration that the Holy Catholic and Roman Religion was the sole Religion of the State. But the Freemasons, who, in spite of the generally Catholic result of the recent elections, had obtained a few seats in the Congress, could not miss this opportunity of protesting against " a retrograde legislation." One of the sectaries, a priest, declaimed a discourse of Mirabeau in theatrical style, concluding with the sage observation that " since God

is as visible as the sun, it would be an injurious superfluity to recognize Him officially." Such reasoning did not convince the deputies; the entire Constitution was adopted, and Moreno found himself free to endow Equador with the blessings of a truly liberal and Christian government. Our limits do not permit any detailed narrative of all that was effected for his country by this "modern St. Louis." The loud-mouthed praters about popular enlightenment should have admired him; for when they murdered him, the free schools of the republic numbered 500, with 32,000 pupils, whereas under the Masonic government there had been only 200 schools, with 8000 pupils. The spirit which animated Garcia Moreno is indicated in the message which he had prepared for the Congress as he was about to enter on his third term of office, when the Masonic assassins sent him to his reward in heaven: "Only a few years have elapsed since Equador repeated every day the lament which the Liberator, Bolivar, expressed in his last message to the Congress of 1830: 'I must say, and with the blush of shame on my brow, that while we have won our independence, it has been won at the expense of every other blessing.' But since that time, having placed our trust in God, and having abandoned the course of impiety and apostasy which attracts the world in this epoch of blindness, we have reorganized ourselves into a thoroughly Catholic nation, and therefore each day has beheld an increase of happiness and prosperity in our beloved country. Once Equador was a body from which life was departing; it was being already devoured, just as a corpse is devoured by a multitude of those hideous insects which the freedom of putrefaction allows to develop in the darkness of the grave. But to-day, obeying the Sovereign Voice which commanded Lazarus to issue from his tomb, Equador returns to new life, although she still retains the winding-sheet of death, that is, some remnants of the misery and corruption in which she was once wrapped. In order to justify my words, I need only render an account of our progress during the last two years, referring you to the special reports of each ministerial department for documents and details; and, in order that you may perceive the extent of our progress during this period of regeneration, I shall compare the present conditions with those which once obtained. And I shall institute this comparison, not for our self-glorification, but in order to glorify Him to whom we owe everything, and whom we adore as our Redeemer, Father, Protector, God. . . . To the perfect liberty which the Church now enjoys among us, and to the apostolic zeal of our virtuous pastors, we owe a reformation of the clergy, an improvement in morals, and

so great a diminution in the number of crimes, that in our population of more than a million there are not enough of criminals to fill our penitentiary. To the Church we owe those religious organizations which constantly produce such happy results in the education of the young, and in the care of the sick and the poor. . . . If I have committed any errors, I ask your pardon a thousand times ; but I am sure that my will has not been at fault. But if, on the contrary, you find that I have succeeded in my endeavors, attribute all the merit, firstly, to God and the Immaculate Dispenser of the inexhaustible treasures of God's mercies ; and, secondly, to yourselves, to the people, to the army, and to all the members of the administration who have seconded my efforts so admirably."

A strange document, truly, in the closing years of the nineteenth century—a document which could never have emanated from a Cavour or a Bismarck, a Gambetta or a Thiers, a Metternich or a Von Beust, a Palmerston or a Gladstone. But all the messages of Garcia Moreno to the Equadorian Congress had sounded the same notes, and all of his governmental acts had accorded with his professions. When Victor Emmanuel completed his series of sacrilegious robberies by the seizure of the Papal capital in 1870, Garcia Moreno was the sole potentate in Christendom who protested against the iniquity. Immediately after the news of the crime had reached Quito, the president of Equador dictated to his foreign secretary the following protest, which was sent at once, according to constitutional formality, to the Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs : "The undersigned, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Equador, has the honor of addressing the following protest to His Excellency, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of King Victor Emmanuel, because of the melancholy events which occurred last September in the capital of the Catholic world. Since the very existence of Catholicism has been menaced in the person of its august head, the representative of Catholic unity, who has been despoiled of that temporal dominion which is the necessary guarantee of his independence in the exercise of his divine mission, Your Excellency will admit that every Catholic, and with much more reason every government which rules over a considerable number of Catholics, not only has the right, but is also bound to protest against this hideous and sacrilegious crime. However, before raising its voice, the Government of Equador waited for protests on the part of the more powerful states of Europe against the unjust and violent seizure of Rome ; and it waited for what would have been

much more gratifying—that His Majesty, King Victor Emmanuel, would voluntarily do homage to the sacred character of the noble Pontiff who governs the Church by restoring its stolen territories to the Holy See. But the Equadorian Government waited in vain; the monarchs of the old continent remain mute, and Rome continues to suffer under the oppression of Victor Emmanuel. For this reason the Government of Equador, in spite of its feebleness, and in spite of the enormous distance which separates it from the Old World, now fulfills its duty by protesting before God and before men, and especially in the name of the Catholic people of Equador, against the wicked invasion of Rome and the subjugation of the Roman Pontiff—deeds which have been perpetrated in violation of repeated promises, and which are now disguised by derisory guarantees of independence which do not hide the ignominious servitude of the Church. The Equadorian Government protests, finally, against the consequences which the Holy See and the Church will suffer because of this shameful abuse of power. While addressing this protest to you by formal order of His Excellency, the President of this Republic, the undersigned still trusts that King Victor Emmanuel will repair the injuries which he has inflicted in a moment of madness, before his throne is reduced to ashes by the avenging fire of the Revolution.”¹

Not content with this personal protest, Garcia Morena urged all the governments of South America to follow his example; but, as he afterwards said: “I had little hope that our sister republics would respond to the invitation; I merely wished to fulfill my duty as a Catholic by giving the greatest possible publicity to our own protest. Columbia replied in moderate terms, but negatively; Costa Rica answered negatively and in an insolent manner; Bolivia informed me very courteously that she would consider the matter carefully; Chili and Peru did not condescend to acknowledge the receipt of my communication. But, after all, what does it matter? *God has no need of us in order to accomplish His designs, and He will accomplish them in spite of hell, and in spite of the emissaries of hell, the Freemasons, who are more or less masters in every land of South America, saving our own.*”² The Brethren of the Three Points were not then masters in Equador, but their perennial efforts to obtain the supremacy were redoubled when Garcia Moreno so nobly stigmatized the chief masterpiece of their craft in the nineteenth century.

¹ *El Nacional*, of Quito, January 18, 1871.

² Berthe: *loc. cit.*, vol. ii., ch. ii.

In 1873 the sectaries were spurred to a definitive enterprise by a realization that Equador was indeed lost to them unless "the modern St. Louis" was deprived of power. Garcia Moreno, a president of an American republic, and in this enlightened nineteenth century, had proposed to an American Congress that the country they represented should be solemnly consecrated to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and the Congress had passed the resolution without discussion, and unanimously.¹ The "apostle of ignorance and of superstition" was sentenced to death in the secret councils of the Dark Lantern; but, as usual in the execution of Masonic sentences of the highly placed, the "removal" was to be made to appear as the natural result of the crimes of the victim. Incendiary pamphlets were scattered broadcast throughout Equador, all exhibiting Moreno as a fit subject for popular execration. Thus, the infamous Moncayo described him as a cruel hypocrite: "He avows himself a partisan of the *Syllabus*, in order to commit crimes at his convenience. Communicating and shooting; proscribing, scourging and confiscating; such are

¹ In the beginning of April, 1873, the bishops of Equador met in the Third Plenary Council of Quito, and Moreno informed them of his desire that they would do their part toward consecrating the republic to the Sacred Heart. On April 13th the synodals decreed that "the greatest happiness of a people being the preservation of the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman faith, and since that preservation depends on the mercy of God, the nation should humbly seek the Heart of Jesus in order to obtain that blessing. Therefore the Council of Quito solemnly offers and consecrates the republic to the Sacred Heart, supplicating that Heart to be the protector, guide and defender of this country, so that it may never wander from the Catholic Apostolic and Roman faith, and that all the inhabitants of Equador, conforming their lives to that faith, may find in it their happiness in time and in eternity." As soon as this decree was conveyed to the president he laid it before the Congress, and that body immediately decreed: "Considering that the Third Plenary Council of Quito has by a special decree consecrated the republic to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, placing us all under the protection of that Heart, it befits the representatives of the nation to associate themselves with an act which is so conformable to their eminently Catholic sentiments. Considering that this act, so efficacious for the preservation of our faith, is also the best means for assuring the prosperity and progress of the State, the Congress decrees that the republic, consecrated forever to the Heart of Jesus, adopts that Heart as its Patron and Protector. The Feast of the Sacred Heart shall be hereafter a civil holiday of the first-class, and shall be celebrated in every cathedral in the most solemn manner possible. Furthermore, in order to excite the zeal and piety of the faithful, there shall be erected in every cathedral an altar dedicated to the Sacred Heart, in front of which there shall be placed, at the expense of the state, a slab commemorative of the present decree." As we have said, this decree was passed unanimously. On the day appointed for the public ceremony of the consecration, while the function was being performed in each of the five other cathedrals of the republic, the president and Congress proceeded in grand state to the cathedral of Quito. After the archbishop had promulgated the decree in the name of the Church, Garcia Moreno repeated it in the name of the Republic of Equador. Has any ruler of modern times thus brought before the minds of his people the days of Charlemagne and of St. Louis?

the offerings which please the God of the Jesuits." From Lima there came a pretended "History of Equador," in which the following Masonic instigation to murder was read: "In that nation which has exterminated so many tyrants there is still energy enough to deliver it from this most detestable despotism. Let the ferocious terrorist and his accomplices tremble before the justice of the sovereign people! The young, the crowds, need no general to lead them to the combat. When suffering arrives to a certain degree of intensity, a martyr arises to lay the oppressor low." In a diatribe entitled, "A Perpetual Dictatorship," the impious Montalvo accused Moreno of having driven many women of the street to suicide, because they preferred death to a residence in the asylum of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd. The consecration to the Sacred Heart, said Montalvo, had turned Equador into a convent of idiots, with a permanent scaffold on the premises.¹ From time to time the Masonic journals throughout South America published accounts of Moreno's assassination, undoubtedly with the idea of impressing upon the popular mind the necessity of such a catastrophe. Thus, on October 26, 1873, twenty-two months before the real murder, a despatch from Guayaquil informed Peru that Moreno had just "fallen under the dagger of his aide-de-camp, Colonel Salazar, who had been helped by a crowd of persons who were hostile to the Jesuits. Twenty-three Jesuits perished with the president, and the people would have killed the Papal nuncio as well, had he not succeeded in escaping to the mountains." Frequently Moreno was warned from reliable sources that the Lodges had decreed his death, and that he should never go abroad without an escort. He always replied that if the Masons had decreed his assassination, no human means would prolong his life; that, however, he was in the hands of God. In reply to one of these warnings he said: "I have already learned from Germany that the German Lodges have instructed those of America to move heaven and earth to overthrow the government of Equador. Probably Grand Master X. is concerned in this instruction; but if God extends his mercy to us, what have we to fear, even though our power is equal to zero, when compared with the power of that clay-footed Colossus?"

¹ The charges of Montalvo were so absurdly calumnious that Charles Weile, who had been consul of the United States in Quito, was constrained to write to the *San Francisco Chronicle*: "These accusations cause a smile of pity and contempt on the part of all who have known Garcia Moreno. Having resided in Equador very many years, and being perfectly acquainted with all that has recently occurred there, I know well what I say; and I do not exaggerate when I declare that to me Garcia Moreno appears to be the most illustrious man that South America ever produced."

In July, 1875, Moreno wrote the following letter to Pope Pius IX. : "Most Holy Father, I implore your blessing, having been chosen again, without any merit on my part, to rule this Catholic republic during the coming six years. The new presidential term does not commence until August 30th, when I take the oath to the Constitution, and then I shall dutifully inform your Holiness officially of the fact; but I wish to obtain your blessing before that day, so that I may have the strength and the light which I need so much in order to be unto the end a faithful son of our Redeemer, and a loyal and obedient servant of His infallible Vicar. Now that the Masonic Lodges of the neighboring countries, instigated by Germany,¹ are vomiting against me all sorts of atrocious insults and horrible calumnies; now, also, that the Lodges are secretly arranging for my assassination; I have more need than ever of the Divine protection, so that I may live and die in defence of our holy religion, and for the dear republic which I am called once more to rule. What happiness can be mine, Most Holy Father, so great as that of being hated and calumniated for the sake of our Divine Redeemer? And how great a happiness your blessing will be to me if it procures for me from heaven the privilege of shedding my blood for the God who shed His own for us on the cross!" On the evening of August 5th a priest demanded audience with the president, stating that his business could not be deferred. When in the presence of Moreno, he said: "You have been warned that the Freemasons have decreed your death, but you have not been told when the sentence will be executed. I come to tell you that your days are numbered; that the conspirators have resolved to murder you as soon as opportunity offers. Probably the deed will be committed to-morrow; therefore, take your measures accordingly." Moreno quietly answered: "I have received many similar warnings; and, after mature reflection, I have come to the conclusion that there is but one measure for me to take, and that this measure is to keep myself in a state wherein I shall be fit to meet my God." Then he proceeded with his work, which was the preparation of the message, some passages of which we have given. At six o'clock on the following morning, August 6th, the Feast of the Transfigura-

¹ During the infamous Bismarckian "War for Civilization," it was the general belief among the Catholics of South America that the German chancellor was the prime mover of all the Masonic manoeuvres in their regions; that he took this means of adding to the embarrassments of the Holy See, while he was endeavoring to constitute a German National Church. Certainly the word of the well-informed and calmly judicious Garcia Moreno gives more than plausibility to the belief.

tion of Our Lord, Moreno assisted at Mass, according to his daily habit, in the church of St. Dominic;¹ and he received Holy Communion, undoubtedly fully prepared to recognize the Holy Eucharist as, in all probability, the Viaticum for his momentous journey. Having returned to his residence, he spent some time with his family, and then gave some finishing touches to his message. Shortly after midday he left his palace, followed at a little distance by an aide-de-camp, his intention being to read his message to the Congress. On the way he entered the cathedral, and prayed before the Blessed Sacrament for nearly an hour. Leaving the house of God, he turned his steps toward the Government House, on the opposite side of the Great Square; but he had walked only a few yards when seven assassins rushed on him. One of the murderers cried: "Die, strangler of liberty!" and as the martyr of liberty fell, pierced by six bullets and by fourteen dagger-strokes, he cried in a clear voice: "I die, but God does not die—*Pero Dios no se muere.*"² From among the innumerable panegyrics on Garcia Moreno we select the following tribute from the pen of Louis Veuillot: "Garcia Moreno was beyond vulgarity, indifference, and forgetfulness; he would have been beyond hatred, if God could permit that virtue should not entail hatred. It may be said of Moreno that he was the most *antique* of all moderns; he was a man who did honor to humanity. It was not sufficient for him to be one of Plutarch's characters; he entertained an idea of grandeur which was vaster and more just than that of Plutarch. Alone, unknown, but sustained by faith and his great heart, he effected all that Plutarch describes

¹ Moreno never missed his daily Mass; and every day he read a chapter of the New Testament and one of the *Imitation*. Every evening he recited the Rosary, generally with his family.

² The crime of 1875 was not the first that Masonry perpetrated against the life of Moreno. Shortly after the final catastrophe, the Roman *Civiltà Cattolica*, the calmest and most unsensational periodical in Europe, narrated how, in the fall of 1869, a certain Equadorian scientist received satisfactory proof that the Lodges had even at that time resolved to murder the great president. This gentleman had studied in various European universities; among others, in that of Berlin. When about to return home, where a professorship in the University of Quito awaited him, he called upon one of his Berlinesse professors in order to bid him farewell. The young man had won the admiration and affection of the German, who was highly placed in the councils of the Dark Lantern. When the old Freemason learned that his friend was about to accept a professorship to which he had been appointed by Garcia Moreno, whom the youth greatly admired, he remarked that there was no sense in accepting favors from a man who would be dead before the ambitious lad arrived in Equador. The words produced no deep impression in the mind of the hearer; but when he arrived in Guayaquil he learned that the president had just escaped assassination, and that very foolishly the chief criminal, Cornejo, had been punished merely by banishment for eight years.

his worthiest heroes as having effected ; and he did all this in accordance with his natural character, and by a careful observance of a rule which he had planned for himself. But he did more ; continually aiming higher, he dared to attempt a task that our epoch deems impossible. In the government of Equador he was a man of Jesus Christ. Let us salute this noble figure, the most beautiful of modern times ; it is worthy of history. A man of Jesus Christ ; that is, a man of God, in public life ! And he was, as the phrase runs, a man of his time ; he studied the sciences of his time, he appreciated its habits, he understood its customs and laws ; but nevertheless, he was never aught else than an exact follower of the Gospel, a faithful servant of God ; and he made his people, who had been Christian indeed, but were being devoured by Socialism, a people faithful in the service of God. It was a little republic of South America that showed this wonder to the world. Moreno was a Christian, and one of a stamp not at all affected by our modern rulers ; he was one of those leaders of whom the nations have lost all remembrance ; he was a dispenser of justice, such as the seditious and the conspirators of our day seldom meet. In Moreno there was something of Medicis, and something of Ximenes. He was Medicis, less the trickery of that prince ; he was Ximenes, less the cardinalitial scarlet. Of both Medicis and Ximenes he had the genius, the magnificence, and the love of country. What is wanting in the glory of Garcia Moreno ? Nothing. He furnished a unique example to the world amid which he lived ; he was an honor to his country ; and perhaps his death was the greatest service that he rendered to his people. He showed the human race what valor and faith can effect when they are united to enlightened patriotism."¹

On Sept. 20, 1875, Pope Pius IX., in one of those eloquent Allocutions in which the Captive of the Vatican was wont to unmask the designs of the persecutors of the Church, described the work of Masonry in France, Germany, and Switzerland ; and then turning his discourse to South America, he said : " Amid all these governments thus delivered to the delirium of impiety, Equador has been miraculously distinguished for its spirit of justice, and for the indomitable faith of its president. But alas ! even in Equador there are not wanting some impious men who consider it an insult to their pretended modern civilization that there should be found a government which, while devoting itself to the material welfare of its people, endeavors at the same time

¹ In the *Univers*, September 27, 1875.

to assure the moral and spiritual progress of that people. These valiant men decided to murder their illustrious president, and he succumbed to the steel of the assassins, a victim of his faith, and of his Christian love for his country." Freemasonry did not attain to power immediately after it had murdered Garcia Moreno; Borrero, the successor of the martyr, was a Liberal, but nevertheless a good Catholic. But in 1877 a creature of the Lodges, a drunken soldier named Vintimilla, was raised to a dictatorship, and a carnival of Masonry was initiated. A decree for the secularization of education, that is, for an atheistic training of the young, was issued immediately; and when the pastors, with the bishop of Riobamba at their head, protested against the iniquity, another decree pronounced the penalty of banishment against "ecclesiastics who alarmed consciences." Mgr. Chica, the archbishop of Quito, announced to the government: "Come what may, I shall continue to resist the propagation of error. Such is my duty, and with the grace of God I shall be faithful to it." Fifteen days after this protest, on Good Friday, March 30, the archbishop officiated at the Mass of the Presanctified in the cathedral. He had scarcely taken the wine of ablution when he was attacked by horrible convulsions, and died within an hour. The autopsy showed that twelve grains of strychnine had been given to the prelate. Of course the assassins were never punished. The remains of the archbishop had scarcely been placed in the tomb, when Vintimilla ordered all the pastors in the republic to celebrate, on April 19th, Masses of Requiem for the souls of "all the *martyrs of holy Liberalism* who had fallen since March 19, 1869"—this date being that of a famous insurrection against Moreno. To this decree the bishops opposed an order forbidding "a scandal to the Catholic people;" and as nearly all the Equadorians applauded the action of the prelates, the dictator perforce contented himself with an oath of revenge. In quick succession came a revocation of the Concordat which had guaranteed the liberty of the Catholic religion, a suppression of all the ecclesiastical salaries, and the exile of many pastors. The bishop of Guayaquil died with all the symptoms of poisoning, and the bishop of Riobamba escaped assassination by fleeing to the mountains. The people of Equador were on the verge of revolution, when Vintimilla resolved to change his policy. The exiled priests were recalled, and the bishops were made to understand that the government desired peace. This "treachery" on the part of their creature enraged the Masons; the Catholics could not rely on the sincerity of their recent enemy; and in

1883 a revolution, in which both Liberals and Conservatives took part, overthrew Vintimilla. From that time until the Masonic eruption under Alfaro, the sequels of which still persevere in the form of nearly every conceivable kind of persecution of the Church, the Brethren of the Three Points allowed Equador to rest in comparative peace.

The sad distinction of having succumbed, perhaps pusillanimously, to Masonic machinations more frequently than the other South American Republics, belongs to Brazil and Equador. But in all the other states the Church has found, at least in our day, much reason for sorrow. In Argentina the Government asked the Holy See, in 1875, to send some missionaries and some female religious who would labor in the outlying regions of the republic, where there was a dearth of spiritual and civilizing agencies. Pius IX. immediately arranged with the superiors of the Congregation of St. Francis de Sales, the now wide-spread society which had been founded in Turin by Don Bosco, for the departure of ten Salesians for the promising field; and he ordered twelve Sisters of the Congregation of Our Lady *della Misericordia*, the mother-establishment of which is in Savona, to set out for the same destination. In the audience of farewell which His Holiness accorded to the little band, he necessarily reflected on the iniquities recently perpetrated by Masonry in countries which were sisters to Argentina, and in order to encourage the new apostles, he said: "This time I am not sending lambs to a pack of wolves. You are going to a country where the authorities are favorable to you, and God will fructify your labors." But scarcely had the Salesians and their auxiliaries landed in Argentina, when they learned that the Masons, enraged because of a failure to induce the Congress to enter on a course of Satanic enterprise in regard to Catholicism, had incited the populace of Buenos Ayres to an anti-Jesuitical riot, massacred several of the Jesuit professors who were instructing the Argentine youth in the sciences apparently dear to the Masonic heart, and levelled the college to the ground. Nor did Chili—hitherto, perhaps, the most pronouncedly Catholic state in Latin America—escape the contagion. In 1875 the Grand Lodge of Chili, ruled by English and German merchants and speculators, drew up a plan for the "complete secularization"—that is, for the atheization—of the social institutions of the republic. This scheme, entitled a "Plan of Work for the Grand Lodge of Chili," was published by that excellent Masonic authority to which we are indebted for so much of our knowledge concerning the enterprises of the Brethren, namely, the "Monde

Maçonnique," in its issue of January, 1876. In the third Article of this plan it is ordered that: "The Section for Instruction shall attend to: 1st, the foundation of secular schools; 2d, to the furnishing of aid to every society (especially the Protestant *colporteurs*) which gives gratuitous instruction to the poor (that is, which tries to deprive the poor of their faith); 3d, to contribute to the prosperity of all the scientific, literary and artistic institutions in the country (provided that there were any which were not Catholic); 4th, to give popular conferences for the spread of such knowledge as tends to facilitate the progress of humanity." The Section for Benevolence was to occupy itself: 1st, with the foundation of hospitals (as though Chili needed hospitals); 2d, with aiding directly or indirectly all such institutions *when they do not pursue egoistic and sectarian objects* (that is, when they are not Catholic)." . . . The Section for Propaganda was to: "1st, defend and make known the veritable sentiments of Freemasonry (then why not abolish "the secret" ?); 2d, to try to introduce into all public institutions the principles of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity; and especially to labor for a separation of Church and state, *for the establishment of Civil Marriage*,¹ for the abolition

¹ Civil marriage, with its necessary consequence of divorce *ad libitum* and the ultimate destruction of the very idea of the family, is ever one of the dearest objects to the Masonic heart. Voltaire, Helvetius, d'Alembert, Rouillé d'Orfeuil and all *ejusdem furfuris* insisted upon the destruction of every trace of a sacramental idea in matrimony, and the Constituent Assembly of 1790 actuated this theory when it proclaimed the equality of bastards and legitimate children. In this Assembly Cambacérès, the future arch-chancellor of Napoleon and future Grand Master of French Masonry, declared: "There is a law which is superior to all others, and that law—the law of nature—tells us that illegitimate children have all the rights which some would take from them. . . . All children, without any distinction, have the right of succession to those who have given existence to them. The differences heretofore subsisting between these classes of children are merely effects of pride and superstition, and they are ignominious and contrary to justice." During the rule of the Paris Commune of 1871, as we learn from Maxime du Camp, in his *Convulsions of Paris*, the Central Council applauded the Citizen Gratien when, at a reunion in the Hotel de Ville, he thus perorated: "If we wish to give to all an equal and a revolutionary education, we must destroy the family. The child is not a property of a father and mother; the child belongs to the State." Ragon, whose *Interpretative Course* was approved by the Grand Orient of France in 1840 as "the work of a profoundly instructed brother," says: "The indissolubility of marriage is contrary to the laws of nature and of reason. . . . Its corrective is divorce; divorce is now among our customs, waiting for the day when it will be found among our laws." Louis Napoleon, in his *Napoleonic Ideas*, when recounting the mistakes of the French governments that preceded his own, numbered as one of those errors their failure to admit the right of divorce in their jurisprudence. Since such are the sentiments of Masonry in regard to marriage and the family, we were not surprised when we read in the *Official Municipal Bulletin of Paris* of September, 1882, that on the preceding August 12th, at a distribution of prizes to the schools of the Fourteenth Arrondissement, Brother Schmidt, an assistant to the mayor, told the young girls that it was the duty of French mothers "to make their children hate that

of all privileges, for the *secularization of all charities* (so as to provide fat salaries for the distributors, attendants, etc.); 3d, for the help of all victims of *religious intolerance*." In spite of the efforts of the English and German residents in Chili, this Masonic programme failed; but in 1881 the Masonic "Chaine d'Union" (p. 437) encouraged the Brethren with this information: "Brother Jose Vergara, Minister of the Interior, has been chosen Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Chili. We cannot doubt that, under the direction of this eminent Brother, the Chilian Lodges will recover all their activity, which is now so repressed by the clerical party. In Chili it is really the English and German Lodges that do the work." Nevertheless, hitherto the sterling Catholicism of the Chilian people has refused to accept the enlightenment which emanates from the rays of the Dark Lantern.

Venezuela has held its own fairly well in face of Masonic aggression, although during the three presidential terms of Guzman Blanco (1873-1887) the Brethren continually flattered themselves that Venezuelan Catholicism was moribund, thanks to the poison which the Liberalism of Blanco, the "Protector of the Masonic Order in the Republic," allowed them to administer to the people. Under date of March 29, 1874, the Grand Lodge of Venezuela sent "to all the Lodges in its jurisdiction" a circular, the barefaced mendacity of which has rarely been excelled in any of the documents which, after the dagger, have ever been the chosen weapons of South American Masonry in its campaigns of "popular instruction." We shall quote a few gems from this official pronouncement. "Having been called to regenerate Venezuela, and being filled with faith in the principles of Masonry, Brother Guzman Blanco has resolved to take the Masonry of Venezuela as his co-operatrix, and he presents himself as its declared and decided protector. . . . The Grand Lodge regards as enemies of Masonry all who make war on Masonic associations; all who do not respect the dignity of the country; all who try to suffocate the reason of man; all who try to dominate by means of ignorance; *all who foment fanaticism and superstition*. . . . Masonry holds that truth rests on science, and on science alone; Masonry repels absolutely all fanaticism and superstition, warring on them inexorably by means of instruction. . . . He is not a

religious cosmopolitanism which debases our earthly country beneath a hypothetical religion which is hidden somewhere in the vault of heaven," and that children should be taught to despise "that humility which impels a man to kneel before another who is no more infallible than himself."

true Freemason who does not support the government which represents the people of Venezuela in the combat *against the pretensions of the Vatican to a sovereignty on Venetian soil*—a sovereignty which would be superior to that of the Venezuelans themselves. The question is as to whether Venezuela is bound to receive the inspirations of the Vatican—of that power which recently *ordered its representative in Paris to see that in all the churches of France prayers were addressed to the Supreme Being for the ruin of the Republic* and the restoration of the Monarchy; of that power which has always insisted on ignorance as the principal support of the Holy See and of all thrones. . . . *You perceive how detrimental to all its servants this influence of the Vatican must be, since it leads them to the most criminal perjury. . . . The great majority of Freemasons are faithful Christians, fulfilling all the duties which the Church imposes on them, although they do not renounce the exercise of their reason, since that reason is sacred to them, being an emanation from the Supreme Being. . . . During many centuries the Church of Rome prevented the diffusion of knowledge, and punished as heretics all who penetrated the secrets of nature, and revealed those secrets to other men. During many centuries the Church of Rome denounced the education of the masses as prejudicial to both ecclesiastical and civil tyranny; and the Holy See appealed to all sovereigns, in the name of their own existence, to combat liberal principles. . . . Against this injustice Masonry has fought from the first days of its existence, and the hour has now struck for all our Brethren to work for the manifestation of truth in its entirety.”* With the President of the Republic (we should say, its *dictator*) as the gracious Protector of Venezuelan Masonry, it is not strange that the Venezuelan people were afflicted, during the entire period of their suffering under the incubus of Guzman Blanco, with laws which “manifested (Masonic travesty of) truth in its entirety”; and that the usual Masonic persecution of the clergy became the order of the day. Only one of the Venezuelan bishops was derelict. Mgr. Guebara, archbishop of Caracas, having refused to swear fidelity to the Masonico-Febronian enactments, was exiled, and his see was offered to the bishop of Guayana, an aged, weak, but ambitious prelate, who signified his willingness to commit spiritual bigamy. Pope Pius IX., under date of July 8, 1874, wrote to the unfortunate man a strong but fatherly reproof, dwelling on the wickedness of the new laws to which the bishop of Guayana had sworn fidelity, and stigmatizing the hypocrisy with which the weakling had assured the

Holy See that "he would have liked to refuse the archiepiscopal dignity on account of his age and feebleness."¹

Peru has suffered much anxiety because of the intrigues of Masonry, supported by the funds at the disposal of the so-called "missionary" bodies which are so plentifully endowed by gullible Protestants in the United States; but of open persecution Peru has experienced but little. During the first years of the pontificate of Pius IX. the Masons endeavored to incite a war with the Holy See on the subject of episcopal and parochial appointments; but the Pontiff checkmated the Brethren by according to the presidents of Peru the right of patronage which his predecessors had granted, in the olden time, to the kings of Spain.² Hitherto the exercise of this right of patronage seems

¹ "One fact modifies our grief," said the Pontiff; "you have not yet usurped the diocese of another bishop; you have caused a great scandal, but you have not yet become formally an intruder. You remind us that you are an old man. Think, therefore, of the judgment which you must soon undergo. What will you reply to Jesus Christ, when He demands an account of your stewardship and upbraids you for having rended His seamless garment? . . . Dignities, wealth, the favor of the powerful, form a vain paraphernalia which will soon be taken from you; reflect on the punishment that awaits you, if you persist in preparing the way for schism and apostasy. . . . Hasten, venerable brother, by a public and immediate retraction of your wicked oath, to remove the stumbling-block of scandal which you have placed in the path of the faithful; hasten to redeem your lamentable weakness by an apostolic firmness of soul and by an intrepid defense of the rights of the Church."

² Pius, Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, for the imperishable remembrance of this matter: Among the singular favors which God has conferred on the Peruvian nation, none is so striking as the gift of Catholic truth which the Peruvians have carefully preserved from the day when they first received it from the preachers of the Gospel, and which they have cultivated so well that from among them have risen several heroes whom the Church has regarded as worthy of the honors of her altars. . . . To this zeal in preserving Catholic unity have been added many other acts performed by the governmental authority. Thus the endowments of dioceses already existing have been liberally augmented, and those of new dioceses have been readily accorded; aid has been given to the seminaries, and to the colleges which missionaries have founded for the propagation of the faith; similar generosity has been exhibited in providing for the diffusion of sound doctrine by the endowment of parishes among those (savages) who have been converted to the faith; and, finally, considerable sums have been expended in the restoration and ornamentation of old churches and in the erection of new ones. . . . Wherefore, wishing to condescend to the prayers which the Peruvian government has addressed to us through its representative, and following the example of our predecessors who have ever granted special favors to those who have deserved well of Christendom, we have resolved, after consultation with certain cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, to concede by our Apostolic authority that hereafter the President of the Republic of Peru, and his successors, shall enjoy that right of patronage which, by the favor of the Apostolic See, the Kings of Spain enjoyed in Peru before that country was separated from the rule of the Spanish crown. . . . The President of the Republic of Peru, and his successors, shall enjoy the right of presenting to the Apostolic See, whenever an archiepiscopal or episcopal see is vacant, the names of certain fit and worthy ecclesiastics; so that, according to the regulations prescribed by the Holy Canons, the canonical institution may be effected. . . . Nevertheless, the candidates thus presented shall enjoy no

to have prevented any extraordinary manifestations, on the part of the Peruvian government, of greed for ecclesiastical property, or of jealousy of ecclesiastical privileges.

At the present moment, no country of Latin America is so subjected to the nefarious influence of Masonry as is our neighbor, the Republic of Mexico. In 1867, the "Freemason's Journal" of Leipsic published a correspondence from this sectary-ridden land, which ascribed to the votaries of the Dark Lantern the "credit" of all the revolutions which have cursed the country ever since the "yoke" of Spain was discarded.¹ The Masonic writer, in fact, gave a mere paraphrase of the report "On the Form of Government which Mexico Ought to Adopt," which was accepted by the Assembly of Notables which undertook, in 1863, to give to their country some semblance of a stable and Christian government.² Whatever may be our opinion concerning French intervention in the affairs of Mexico, or concerning the weak scion of the Hapsburgs who vacillated between the conservatives and the "liberals" until resolution was of no use, who condescended to humor Masonry by signing a Concordat which the Holy See was obliged to condemn,—it is certain that the Assembly of Notables represented all that was respectable in Mexico, both for morality and for education. The solemn utterances of such a body, spoken in the face of expectant America and Europe, are worthy of attention. Alluding to the separation from the mother country, the notables insisted that if, at that time, "Mexico had not forgotten her ancient institutions, undoubtedly she would have reached the height of prosperity; but she knew not how to profit by her emancipation, and she abused her independence." The Federal Constitution, "an imperfect imitation of that of the United States," contended the notables, "proved to be the ruin of Mexico"; but the evil was increased and confirmed "by the establishment of Masonic Lodges"—those of the Scotch Rite and of the Rite of York. "These secret societies, by their conspiracies, and by means of poison and the dagger, decided the

right of episcopal administration, until they shall have received the Apostolic Letters conferring their institution. . . . The said President shall also enjoy the right of presentation to canonicates *de officio*, and to parishes, providing that the canonical regulations concerning *concursum* and examination shall have been observed. . . . Finally, the Presidents of Peru shall receive, in all the churches of the Republic, the same honors which were formerly accorded to the Kings of Spain, because of the right of patronage which was granted by this Holy See. . . . Given at Rome, near St. Peter's, on the Third of the Nones of March, 1874; the Twenty-ninth Year of our Pontificate."

¹ This correspondence was reproduced in *Le Monde* of July 14, 1867.

² This report was published in the Paris *Moniteur* of Sept. 13, 1863.

destiny of the country, and played with the lives of the citizens." It was because of the inspiration of the Lodges, declared the notables, that in 1828 the city of Mexico beheld the governmental authorities supervising the pillage of the Grand Bazaar, sanctioning attacks against private property. "From the Lodges came the iniquitous laws of banishment decreed against all persons of Spanish birth"; laws which affected so many innocent persons, which destroyed commerce by banishing capital, and which ended in the public sale of exemptions from the decree of exile. "The highest positions in the republic are frequently occupied by common highwaymen. The public treasury is constantly depleted. The property of the Church is wickedly confiscated, and with no profit to the country." With the fall of Maximilian came dark days indeed for the Catholics of Mexico; but not until November 24, 1874, was the "Separation of Church and State" effected in a manner which was calculated to satisfy Masonry while it waits for the moment when it will be able, as it fondly trusts, to sweep from Mexican soil the last trace of Catholicism. By the new law, which has hitherto been inexorably enforced, no officer of the government (civil or military), no body of troops, no corporation of any kind, can assist officially at any religious service. No holidays, save the purely civil, are recognized by the State, but "Sunday may be observed as a day of rest from labor." All religious instruction and all acts of religious worship are prohibited in every establishment of the State. "No act of worship or of a religious nature can be performed outside of the churches, under pain of a fine of from 10 to 200 piastres, or of imprisonment for from two to fifteen days. A fine of from 100 to 200 piastres is incurred by an ecclesiastic every time that he appears in public (outside a church) in an ecclesiastical dress, or with any insignia of his office. All services in the churches are to be constantly under the eyes of the police." No religious institution can acquire real estate or capital which is derived from real estate. By the nineteenth article of this law even the Sisters of Charity were attacked. They were forbidden to wear any distinctive costume, or to live in community. The matter of dress might have been arranged, but the prohibition of "community life" was equivalent to a sentence of banishment. Four hundred of the daughters of St. Vincent de Paul sought refuge in France.

REUBEN PARSONS, D.D.

BISMARCK'S DECLINE AND FALL.

WE are reminded by the peevish exclusiveness of Bismarck's epitaph, as written by himself, of a dog story familiar in childhood's day. "Touch me not: I belong to Cæsar," was the inscription on the collar of a pet of the great man which warned off all intending dog-stealers. "The faithful German servant of the Emperor William I." is Bismarck's description of himself. With Emperor William II. he will have no connection, even in death. A good deal of the mastiff, too, is discernible in the grim lines of that old face with its heavy brows and mustache, and a good deal of the mastiff's ferocity and tenacity. "A faithful German servant" may be freely translated in quite the opposite way. The faithful servant who was able to lead the master whithersoever he willed—a servant only by a fiction, a master in reality.

Whatever sentiments the career of Bismarck as a public force may inspire, it is impossible to look upon his years of banishment from office without some feeling of pity. We now learn, from the disclosures made after his death, how poignantly he felt the blow inflicted by the Emperor's hand in the acceptance of his resignation. It amounted virtually to a dismissal. As Bismarck was the man who made the Empire, the tragic irony of the climax became all the more sharp and fit. The height of cynical repayment is here beheld; Nemesis justifies her place among the Fates.

Prometheus chained to the rock, with the vulture tearing at his vitals, was an allegory surely invented to typify such a case as the dismissal of Bismarck and the moral effect of the ingratitude upon a despotic spirit accustomed to overbear and to rule all things according to his own standard of right and wrong.

During the old Emperor's time, we now find, Bismarck was the Mayor of the Palace, and the other a veritable *roi fainéant*. We find from Dr. Busch's testimony that Bismarck was so daring that he could browbeat the old monarch into making war against his will and his judgment. He even had the unbridled audacity to mangle the King's telegrams so as to make it appear he was provoking the war, while in reality the deluded potentate was doing what he could to avert hostilities. When we behold a man who had for many years wielded power so unusual, so tremendous, as this, cast out of office and fuming his tempestuous soul away in petty domestic cares, we can almost sympathize with his demigod

bitterness of soul. The serpent's tooth must have rankled even to the marrow. Bismarck did not pretend either to forgive or to forget. In the servile-seeming epitaph for Friedrichsruhe he has left a perpetual memorial of his implacable resentment and sense of wrong. The end was characteristic of the man. He had become the Tymon of politics, and he died with a Tymon-like imprecation upon those whom he despised, as we may fairly interpret it.

While the contemplation of Bismarck's personality must long prove an interesting employment for the student, to the Catholic scholar it is especially valuable as a means of tracing out the singular agencies through which the Divine wisdom operates for the probation and triumph of the Church. Bismarck was an anomaly and an anachronism. He fetches us back from the nineteenth century to the sixteenth, by his policy, his speech, and his tremendous action. He united in himself the fury of a Peter the Great and the profound duplicity of a Machiavelli, in his attempt to beat down the Church, and he lived to find that as easily might he hack the intrenchant air. The negative results of his policy were vastly more momentous in the spiritual world than the positive ones in the political. While he succeeded in building up and solidifying a mighty temporal empire, he set in motion an immense centripetal moral force under whose influence the scattered and objectless factors of Catholicism in Germany coalesced and harmonized so as to form an unassailable rampart for the Church, in the one aspect, and a powerful fortress for civil liberty in another. As in the physical order we find the cataclysm and the convulsion of nature working out the constructive purposes hidden from our gaze, so in the moral dispensation forces seemingly inimical and overturning make for advancement and perfection. How admirable, then, the ways of the Divine Architect—how baffling to all mere human judgment and wisdom!

Bismarck was no lover of the people, and herein we may get a clue to his otherwise unintelligible action against the Church. Taking him dispassionately, we do not find those elements in his disposition which ordinarily mark the bigot. Statesmen of his rank and mental stature are above the littleness of bigotry. They may utilize bigots as instruments and materials to work upon in the development of their policy, but in religious creeds they are usually lax and tolerant. Richelieu as a politician, apart from his personality as a Churchman, may be cited as a good case in point. Bismarck's *bête noir* in his domestic policy was the Social movement. He saw he could not put it down with the strong

hand; hence, as the lion's skin was short, he tried the fox's, like Richelieu in the play. He coquetted with Socialism, took up the theories of Lassalle, and endeavored to formulate a tentative scheme of "State Socialism"; and Mr. Chamberlain in England rendered him the flattery of imitation in his famous proposal for old-age pensions. His contempt for the democracy was as deep as his contempt for the press, yet he stooped to cajole the one and to bribe the other. He had a successful rival in the Church, whose old social system had struck its roots so deep in Germany that it became an easy matter to extend and strengthen them when the time came to make this the gage of battle. In that Socialism which springs from infidelity the Church sees a danger to be dreaded as devoutly as Bismarck and his master dreaded it, but not to be answered or turned aside in the way these bunglers attempted. Its method is love and wisdom; theirs, hate and folly. Modern history fails to furnish any example of State weapons being so dramatically turned against the hands that forged them as in this double movement of Bismarck against the Church and the Social movement. There is complete poetical justice in the *denouement* of the drama. The Church has emerged stronger than she has ever been in Germany, as far as what may be termed political solidarity is concerned, and her social organization, which was only inchoate or sporadic when the struggle began, is now an all-pervading beneficial influence, moral, intellectual and industrial, without parallel for extent and spirit in any other portion of the globe. Of this, something will be appropriate later on. What is to be considered immediately is the apparently accidental character of the circumstances which aroused the latent genius and resources of German Catholicism, and developed and strengthened a spirit of resistance to oppression, and made that spirit a force for public freedom for the whole people, non-Catholic as well as Catholic, which is the wonder of outside spectators as well as the despair of unconstitutional rulers.

Side by side with the star of Bismarck's success there traveled that of another leader no less puissant in statesmanship of a different purpose than the welder of German imperialism. This man, Louis Joseph Ferdinand Windthorst, whose birth preceded Bismarck's by only three years, seemed to have been raised up by Divine Providence to thwart and defeat the far-reaching malice and ambition of this new master of many legions. Like Bismarck, his parentage was connected with the feudal aristocracy, but, unlike Bismarck, his physical mould was not such as to inspire awe or admiration, but rather ridicule. He was almost a dwarf, and

his features were what many called ugly ; and an enormous head added a grotesque element to the malproportion of his figure. But that head was freighted with brains, and the heart which beat within that distorted frame was always throbbing with the courage of a paladin, the tenderness of a woman, and the devotion of an old saint. A spirit of irrepressible mirth and drollery had been likewise bestowed upon him by kindly Nature, as a charm against the melancholy which so often characterizes the race of Quasimodo, of whom Windthorst might almost be said to be one. It looks paradoxical, but it is true, that this very "ordinary" mortal possessed a fascination of manner quite as irresistible as though he were an Apollo. This is the subtle influence which springs from a heart that is fearless, noble, and conscious of the right. A friend of his, a Berlin Jew, one August Stern, thus sketches the man, exteriorly and inwardly : "He who has never seen Windthorst laugh, nor followed the mirth growing from the smile on his broad mouth to the outburst of jovial appreciation in his hearty laugh, can form no idea of the power of expression in his mobile features. His pictures give no idea of the kind and humorous man whose expressive features cannot be copied in the staid pose of a portrait."

Nor was his formidable adversary, Bismarck, in his more gentle moods, deficient in this quality of geniality or the mysterious sort of odic force which often springs from it. But there was this difference between the two men : Bismarck could dissemble. He could wear a mask of cordiality and bluff good-nature whenever it was politic. As the wife of the Thane of Cawdor advised, he could "look like the smiling flower, but be the serpent under it." But not so with Windthorst. He was too honest a man for dissimulation. He had no mask of state to wear, no powerful enemies to cajole, when he could not bully, into accepting his friendship. His art is well described by the eminent Continental *litterateur*, or contemporary historian, rather M. de Blowitz, for whom Prince Bismarck sent during the Berlin Congress of 1878, in order to secure his services in "squaring" the London "Times" over the Batoum question. He writes of the incident—a very extraordinary one, indeed, in the annals of statecraft—in these terms :

"This man whom fame immeasurably extolled is one of the few whom I then found equal to and above their reputation. He struck me with profound admiration by the terrible simplicity of the means employed by him for carrying on diplomacy after his own fashion. Dinner was immediately served, and even before we had seated ourselves, turning to me, he said : 'I am glad to see you, and I hope that, with the help of the

"Times," we shall be able to smooth over this Batoum question which threatens to disturb the work of the Congress.' Once seated at table and placing me on his right, he gave me the never-to-be-forgotten spectacle of the fascination which a man can exercise when bent on winning over anybody to whom he attaches some interest or importance. This assumed quite the proportions of an art, and I did not even attempt to resist it. He told me simply what he thought should be made known to England and Europe. He explained to me that the English plenipotentiaries had to prepare the country for the concessions imposed on it by their desire for peace, and he asked with admirably feigned modesty, in what shape I thought proper to give the reflections which he had just communicated. Then, satisfied with my answer, he dropped Batoum as a settled question and set himself to charm and seduce his auditor.

"Never have I seen such a Jupiter changing himself into a gentle rain, so formidable a personage assuming a tone of graciousness and charm. At a certain moment he turned to me and said, 'Perhaps you would like a glass of beer? My old Munich friend brews it expressly for me'; and he poured me out a glass. I began laughing, and he asked the reason. 'Because in my childhood a kind of lunatic said to me, 'Thou wilt rise in the world and princes will offer thee drink,' and behold his prophecy is fulfilled in a glass of beer.' The Prince assumed a serious air. 'Well,' he said, 'it is a true prophecy, for I do not offer drink to everybody,' and pouring out a second glass he said, 'It is better to fulfill the prediction twice over.'"

It was by exhibitions of this kind, M. de Blowitz adds thoughtfully, that the great Chancellor prepared himself for the war with France by worming himself into the good graces of Benedetti, the French ambassador; and the secret history of that proceeding, as unfolded in the pages of Dr. Busch, the Chancellor's Boswell, shows a more revolting process of trickery and misrepresentation than ever was dreamed of by Machiavelli. But this is more the concern of the historian and the statesman than the moralist; we are chiefly interested in the motives and the results of that memorable struggle known as the *Kulturkampf*, because of the vastness of the conflict and the completeness of the victory of the arm of the spirit over that of the flesh.

Two Bismarcks are now being put before the world. One is sketched by such pens as that of the editor of the "Review of Reviews," in whose sight the departed statesman was a sort of terrible demigod, like one of the great mythical figures of the Nibelungen legend. Mr. Stead's "appreciation" may be epitomized in a couple of his own fervid sentences:

"Despite all his opportunist ways, he kept the testimony of a good conscience—of a sort, and stuck to his post to the last. It was not with his own good will that he was compelled to hand over the duty of steering the ship of State to the Kaiser, William the Second. This faith of his in his providential mission, however little foundation others may believe it to possess, unquestionably gave steadiness to his purpose and a ruthless edge to his resolution. If, as he once phrased it, he did 'not despair that God in His mercy would not take away from me the staff of humble faith with which I seek my way amid the doubts and dangers of my position,' it is to be feared that those who stood in his way found that 'staff of humble faith' used about their shoulders as if it were the quarter-staff of Friar Tuck. For Prince Bismarck was a Christian of the

Church Militant, a Christian crossed with a Berserker, whose dominant note resembled the war songs of Valhalla rather than the seraphic melody of the Sermon on the Mount. M. Thiers declared he was a barbarian of the type of Atilla or Genseric. He was a Prussian Junker but half-baptized; a disciple of Thor of the Thunder Hammer, rather than of the Pale Galilean."

These enthusiastic linnings have been imitated in a greater or less degree of warmth by sundry writers in the non-Catholic religious press who have been completely captivated by Bismarck's "confession of faith" in the style of Captain Philip, of the battleship Texas—a confession which, *par parenthèse*, might have been made by Shelley, or Hume, or any deist who ever rejected the tenets of Christianity. This "confession" is recorded by his private secretary, Dr. Busch, whose recently published book has produced spasms of horror among Bismarck's admirers and certain circles in diplomacy wherein the belief seems to be held that something of the mystery of the Grand Llama should surround the life of a statesman. In Dr. Busch's diary the acknowledgment appears in this form:

"His God and his King' were ever in Bismarck's thoughts. 'If I were no longer a Christian I would not serve the King another hour,' he said. Continuing in the same vein, he added these words:

"If I did not put my trust in God I should certainly place none in any earthly masters. Why, I had quite enough to live on, and had a sufficiently distinguished position. Why should I labor and toil unceasingly in this world and expose myself to worry and vexation if I did not feel that I must do my duty toward God? If I did not believe in a Divine Providence which has ordained this German nation to something good and great, I would at once give up my trade as a statesman or I should never have gone into the business. Orders and titles have no attraction for me. A resolute faith in a life after death—for that reason I am a royalist; otherwise I am by nature a republican.'"

If we contrast this effusive declaration with very many of the acts of the man who made it, as recorded by the same faithful and servile pen, our wonder grows deeper and deeper how easily a man may impose upon himself. A belief in God held concurrently with an absolute disregard of the most elementary morality in all dealings with other persons is one of those psychical phenomena which are as mysterious and inexplicable as the obscurest problems of hypnotism. No perfidy could be greater than that by which the war with France was brought about against the will of the old king, William. It is the blackest chapter in European history since Machiavellianism became the guiding principle in European statecraft. The moral sense which could sanction such sanguinary duplicity found no difficulty in railing at what its possessor styled a "reptile press," and being itself the chief figure in the creation of such an execrable institution. Dr. Busch relates at consider-

able length the part which Bismarck took in getting up a scare about a danger to European peace over the Battenberg marriage question, and how he got him to write an article for the "Grenzboten" on the subject, and how, after it was published, Bismarck himself inspired an article in the "Borsenzeitung" declaring that he was most indignant at the appearance of such an article, because of the attacks it made upon the Empress Victoria—the one woman who seemed to understand and not to fear the unscrupulous bully of Friedrichsruhe. To find the man who was guilty of such shocking profligacy prating about belief in God so elaborately and insistently makes one shudder. It reminds us of the piety of Cromwell's hordes, whose oft-drenched sword-blades usually bore choice texts of Scripture for mottoes of massacre.

Bismarck was fond of apothegms ; he loved them so much that he became renowned as the maker of some. One of his best beloved ones was : "The freedom of the Church means the rule of the Church." Like Napoleon, he believed that the only proper use for the Church was as a department of the State ; and his ideal bishop was a sort of Prussian grenadier or heavy dragoon with a cassock over his jack-boots. He persuaded himself that he believed in religion, but he himself was the authority to prescribe the kind and degree that were to be administered by the State. "A certain amount of positive Christianity," he said, "is necessary for the ordinary man, if he is not to become dangerous to human society." Regarding what other people believed, as we have said, Bismarck was no bigot. He was simply a man who hated the democracy and aimed at substituting Prussian militarism for the constitutional, moral and religious law of the various States of which the present German Empire is composed. Toward the end of his life he affected a certain degree of piety or reverence for Biblical religion ; but he was then in retirement, and in a sense like Job on his dunghill with his enemies exulting over his misfortunes. He had felt how sharp was the serpent's tooth of royal ingratitude ; he was sick in body and spirit ; like Macbeth he had begun to weary of the sun, and he took to religious consolation in the same reluctant way as he took to the advice of his doctor. How different the closing days of this saturnine old courtier from those of the manful constitutionalist, Windthorst ! He died in harness, it might be said almost literally, for he was in the midst of his parliamentary duties, fighting the battles of the people against the coercive policy of the Empire, when he was stricken down. It was on the 9th of March, 1891. He was seized with a fever, which was attended with delirium. Yet, all through, his mind was

busy with his life-work, and in his delirium he made eloquent appeals on the Christian school question, the return of the Jesuits to Germany, and kindred topics. His daughter was sent for, and during his occasional moments of consciousness he took leave of her, sent messages of love and resignation to his wife, who was too ill to travel from Hanover, and received the last sacraments of the Church.

Could we find anywhere, in all modern or ancient record, any example more eloquent of the greater happiness of the man who serves his conscience rather than an earthly prince? Had it been possible for the two men to change places in their latter days, Windthorst, the deposed minister, would have shown a very different spectacle from Bismarck the toothless lion. He would have his religion to support him, with the consciousness of duty done without wrong to any man; and he would not be found troubling the world with petulant complaints or garrulously prating of the secrets of his royal master, as Bismarck was never tired of doing in those frequent days when gout, combined with a poignant sense of wrong, had stung him into paroxysms of savage moroseness.

Yet these two men, widely sundered as they were in every mental and physical characteristic, were destined to play a part to some extent analogous and co-equal in the development of Teutonic civilization. While to the one was given the task of unifying the German Empire in a material sense, to the other fell the higher part of unifying its scattered Catholic forces and welding them into an impregnable barrier for both religious and political freedom. "The Reformation," says Emilio Castelar, with curious infelicity, in a recent paper, "gave Prussia freedom of thought." The result of this singular sort of emancipation was, as we all know, the letting loose of the most fantastic floods of metaphysics that ever perplexed the minds of mortals, concurrently with theories of military absolutism and bureaucratic rule that, as a reaction, produced Socialistic dreams and combinations which threatened dismal internal convulsion. We have seen how, in the early days of Socialism, Bismarck was struck with the principles and propositions of Lassalle, not so much through any especial philanthropy of his own nature as because his sagacity enabled him to foresee what influence such ideas were likely to exercise on the great game of life which lay before him. We find him adopting Lassalle's theories to a modified extent, and propounding them tentatively under the name of State Socialism, but we find him also making the country too warm for Karl Marx when that unfortunate demagogue attempted to secure the adoption of the Socialistic principle

without the hall-mark of the State. The trouble with the Socialists in Germany was scarcely less difficult to deal with, to Bismarck, than the trouble in France with the new revolution personified in Victor Noir ; and when we seek for the secret sources of the great war of 1870-71 we find somewhat similar currents of domestic perturbation sought to be diverted into long closed-up channels by the two astute and unscrupulous men then controlling the destinies of the European continent. Windthorst and the faithful friends who acted with him were no less keen to read the signs of the times, but infinitely more sagacious in applying them to the living opportunities of the hour. Socialism they knew to be only a new name for a form of civilization to which the German people had long been accustomed as the practical application of Christianity to the problem of material life. It had flourished in the feudal ages, and brought peace and prosperity to all the Empire, until the sinister advent of the "Reformation," which shattered all the bonds of kindly intercourse between classes and communities, and substituted the principle of individual selfishness as the complement to the right of private judgment. This Socialism differed from the Socialism of the new theorists in that it had its springs in the spirit of charity and fraternalism, while the other was a cold philosophic or economic panacea for incurable ills, standing in much the same relation to true benevolence as the British work-house system does to the divine attribute of charity. It was a singular coincidence that the great achievement of Bismarck, the federation of the German States and the formation from them of the German Empire, the master-stroke which was to obliterate all things old and set up the entirely new—was the very means by which this long-dormant spirit of fraternity was destined to be revived. When Bismarck returned triumphant from the pageantry at Versailles he found that the new policy had produced a new party. This party was called the Centre party, and it was known it was also a Catholic party. The object of the combination was to guard the several members of the new Empire against oppression by the dominant State of the federation. The principal "planks" of its programme were thus set forth in a manifesto issued in March, 1871, and signed by Herr Windthorst, Prince Löwenstein, Dr. Reichensperger, Von Malinckrodt, Von Savigny, and Herr Freytag :

"1st. That the fundamental character of the Empire as a State confederacy shall be known by its efforts to change the federal character of the imperial constitution, and by not interfering with the decisions and activity of the individual States in all interior matters any more than is necessary for the interest of the whole.

“2d. That the moral and material good of the masses should be furthered, that the civil and religious freedom of the subjects, especially of religious bodies, be continuously protected from legislative greed.”

Bismarck at once saw the drift of these resolutions, and saw, at the same time, as he thought, the means of thwarting their aim. Hanover had resisted his consolidation policy, and Hanover had been crushed in the Austrian struggle and forced to bend to his will. Windthorst had, as Minister of Justice in Hanover, been his most formidable opponent, and here he was now, under Bismarck's own arrangement of an imperial parliament, leading the scattered forces of opposition against his darling policy. In his mad student days he had crossed swords in the duelling field, according to the German usage, with Windthorst; a combat of a sterner character had to be undertaken now. The dogma of Papal Infallibility had been enounced, and a bitter logomachy, led by Mr. Gladstone, was raging over it; the times were as propitious as in the poisoning scene in “Hamlet”:

“Thoughts black, hands apt, drugs fit, and time agreeing.”

He affected to see in this new party a grave menace to the safety of the new Empire. He began by an attack upon Windthorst's loyalty. In the Prussian House of Deputies, where Herr Windthorst sat as member for Meppen, he said, in January, 1872:

“In this house I contemplate the most extraordinary spectacle. A sectarian faction setting itself up as a political party; a party which, should all other sects accept its principles, must be confronted as an evangelical body. This would lead us into a tortuous path, for theology would necessarily be introduced into our debates. It was a great mistake of policy, perpetrated by these gentlemen, to build a political party on sectarian foundations, for they draw their co-religionists from the various parties through the subtle influence at their command. On my return from France I could only look on this party as a factor decidedly opposed to the State, and I asked myself, ‘Will this mutinous body be true to the government—will it aid it or oppose it?’ My fears increased when I saw at its head so argumentative and aggressive a member as the deputy from Meppen. Gentlemen of the Centre, you would have shown yourselves more in sympathy with the State had you chosen some other than your Guelphic leader and had you not admitted to your ranks Guelphic Protestants who are not of your mind. Since the war ceased—so gloriously for us and so unfortunately for the hopes of the Hanoverians—the Catholics have been made use of to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for the Guelphs!”

Guelph, it may be recalled, was the patronymic of the royal House of Hanover, the last King of which was that English Duke of Cumberland whom the Irish-Orange body, in conjunction with a large number of high officials in the British army, plotted to place upon the throne of England instead of the present Queen. Bismarck hated these Guelphs with all the intensity of their an-

cient foes, the Ghibellines, because of their English affiliations, and his endeavor to fling the brand of religious discord into the kingdom where so great a post as Minister of Justice had been filled by a Catholic showed to what unscrupulous means he was willing to resort to break down the passive opposition of the newly-absorbed kingdom. But he had confronting him a man who was insensible to fear. Windthorst at once picked up the glove of defiance.

“The ‘Centre’ party, to which I have the honor to belong,” he said, “is not a sectarian faction. The programme of the party has been publicly announced, and all who agree with its provisions are invited to join it, no matter to what sect they belong. If it happens that the greater number of those who agree with us are Catholics, it merely shows that Catholics view political questions from the more humane premises. But it is not true that the principles of my party are mostly adopted by Catholics. There are a great number of Protestants who sympathize with us, and the truth of my words come more into evidence day by day. Further, the ‘Centre’ is now willing, and will be ever willing, to unite with any party offering a programme acceptable to their convictions. Yes; in the cause of peace it would go even further; when the Catholic grievances are settled, when the unjust attacks on the Church cease, the ‘Centre’ will willingly disband. But so long as these attacks continue, so long will the ‘Centre’ hold its ground.”

Thus began the war between those two master-minds and their respective forces. Brute force gained the upper hand for the time being, but in the end the astuter strategy of Windthorst gained for the Catholic cause the victory. By allying himself with the leaders of genuine labor reform—the men of thought and moderation, and not the demagogues and Socialists—he secured the most powerful alliance upon which he could possibly rely. But it must not be thought that this was resolved on merely as a piece of political strategy. Windthorst was sincerely devoted to the betterment of the laboring classes and the friendly co-operation of both capital and labor—that system which has done so much to solve the most perplexing problem of the age. Those who remember the success with which the late Mr. Parnell utilized the cause of agrarian reform in Ireland for the furtherance of his policy of Home Rule may trace some connection between his idea and that of Windthorst when the latter accepted this seemingly unequal conflict with the greatest military power of modern days.

We have it now under the authority of Dr. Busch that Bismarck had no real fear of the effects of the decree of Papal Infallibility, as he pretended, when he began the Kulturkampf. In his old days he admitted this, and threw the blame for the enactment of the May Laws upon Dr. Falck. It is scarcely

credible that a man of German birth, no matter how estranged from the rest of his countrymen by his position and his bringing-up, could deliberately contemplate a widespread persecution of a large proportion of them for conscience' sake, as part of the development of a vast, intricate and profound scheme of imperial policy. We can conceive of his using duplicity in the carrying out of his policy so far as it related to a foreign power like France, but the cold-blooded action of this bold schemer regarding Denmark and Austria (wherein German blood was as largely represented in the population as in any other portion of the Teutonic regions of Europe) reveals to us the utterly unmitigable and unscrupulous fibre of his mind. He was well served in his ambitious designs by one who was equally devoid of scruple. Posterity shudders at the treachery of Count Julian, the betrayer of his country to the Moors, and the perfidy of the Irish king who brought the Norman lances into Ireland in support of an unholy cause. These high crimes had at least the excuse of revenge, but what shall we say of the action of a general like Von Moltke, himself a Dane, in planning the campaign against his own country and leading her enemies to the attack in person? Bismarck and Moltke—these were the two Mephistophelean intellects who began the readjustment of the map of Europe as the Treaty of Paris had left it in 1815, and enabled the edifices of "unity" in Italy and Germany to be raised on the bases of perfidy and plunder of the weak.

Twenty years have now passed since the battle of the Kulturkampf ended by the retreat of the aggressor, and the whole incident, under the softening influences of remoteness, loses its roughness and angularities. Persecution for religion's sake, some good souls would have us believe, is only a tradition of the incorrigible past; the enlightened present rejects it with pity. But we are dealing with facts as hard as granite, and not to be so easily polished. Bismarck's persecution of the Catholics of Germany was no *Kriegspiel*; it was real grim-visaged war—war without provocation, and war waged of malice aforethought and in cold blood. As it would be impossible in the limits of a brief paper to give an idea of what that persecution meant in every diocese and every parish of an extensive empire, over so extended a period as it covered, it will be found serviceable to present an outline of the general proceedings of the Imperial Government for a short given period, as a guide to the sum total.

The dioceses of Posen and Gnesen may be taken as types. Shortly before hostilities were suspended their condition was thus authoritatively stated:

In the diocese of Posen, twenty parishes, counting thirty-one thousand five hundred and twenty-two souls, were deprived of divine service, partly by the death of priests whom Government does not allow to be replaced, partly by the imprisonment of those who refused to name the apostolic delegate.

The parish of Nekla, near Kostryn, one thousand two hundred and fifteen souls, is equally deprived of divine service. The priest of this parish, having corresponded with the commissary intrusted by the Government with the administration of church property, lost the confidence of his parishioners, and was obliged to resign.

In the diocese of Gnesen divine service has ceased in ten parishes (twelve thousand five hundred and thirty-three souls) in consequence of the demise of their vicars.

Five other parishes of seven thousand seven hundred and fifty-one souls were, during, more or less, four months, deprived of divine service in consequence of the imprisonment of their parish priests, for refusing to name the apostolic delegate. They were released as soon as the Government succeeded in finding him out.

In both dioceses the ecclesiastical seminaries were closed—at Posen two years ago, at Gnesen three months ago. The two assistant bishops were exiled, and will be imprisoned should they return. The one was condemned to nine months' imprisonment for having consecrated the oils on Holy Thursday, the other to six months' imprisonment for having given Confirmation once only.

Fifty parishes at least in the two dioceses have but one priest, when, by the size of the parish, two or three are required. Young priests sent to these parishes two years ago have been expelled, imprisoned or banished.

In the parishes deprived of their clergy, no priest, even from an adjoining parish, was allowed to bear spiritual assistance to the dying, unless he obtained leave from the chief President of the province, residing at Posen. The first transgression is punished by a few weeks' imprisonment; the next, by a longer imprisonment, followed by expulsion from their country. Saying Low Mass in another parish, whether it be in a church or in a private chapel, was subject to the same penalty, if it were proved that any one person was present besides the servers.

Some young priests wore disguise, and let their beards and whiskers grow in order not to be recognized, and to be thus able to make themselves useful here and there: none had been discovered. If they were, they would be condemned to prison for a period not exceeding two years, to be followed by banishment.

Parishioners bereft of their clergy assembled in their churches for prayer and chanting in common on Sundays and feast days. If sometimes a priest in disguise entered the church and performed the service, sentinels were placed on watch in order to give notice in case of the approach of the police.

When it became known that a priest had been in the church, and the police asked his name from the peasants, and whence he came, they always answered he must have come from Jerusalem or from Rome.

Domiciliary visits were very frequent. Some priests have had to undergo more than one. Private papers and letters not only were read with curiosity, but were confiscated, especially if they seemed to throw any kind of suspicion on anyone. Such searches could not be made unless authorized by the *procureur*. However, when they did take place illegally, complaints were of no avail.

Those priests who were imprisoned only for having refused to name the delegate were allowed the use of books, paper and pen; they might have light in the evening and procure their own food.

Mass was not allowed, not even in the chapel of the prison.

The heaviest penalties were inflicted on those priests who had refused to correspond with the commissaries appointed by Falck to administer the property of the Church. This refusal involved enormously heavy fines, exceeding in several cases the yearly income of those who were condemned to them. If the offence was repeated, the delinquent was forthwith banished.

The clergy of the Archdiocese of Gnesen and Posen who were imprisoned and banished for infractions of the Falck laws up to August, 1875, comprised one archbishop, two bishops, four canons, one prelate of the household of the Holy Father, twenty-nine deans, thirteen parish priests, and fifty-one vicars, young priests and monks.

Some were imprisoned merely because they had performed their spiritual functions without the authorization of the civil power; others, on feast days at their neighbors', had been found to preach, say Mass, and hear confessions; or, in a destitute parish, to administer the holy sacraments to the dying.

At least four hundred priests of the two archdioceses were fined. The fines imposed were in some instances very large, sometimes as much as a thousand thalers.

But Bismarck soon found that he was merely trying to cleave with his cavalry sword "the intrenchant air" in this inglorious domestic war. It was not a seven weeks' war, like that with Austria; nor was it ended so soon as the more terrible struggle

with France. Two years of unsuccessful aggression convinced him that he was fighting a losing cause ; then he reluctantly called off the bandogs. Before Windthorst died, in May, 1875, he had the gratification of knowing that the struggle was almost over, and that victory rested on the Catholic banners.

Whoever has watched the course of events since that period must have noted the logical sequence between that merciless persecution and the gradual decline of the tall bully who conceived and directed it. The consolidation of the Catholic forces was directly due to it, as by a natural law. Bismarck had made the mistake which Von Moltke never committed. He had underestimated the power of the party whom he had made a foe. He had undervalued the tenacity of the Centrists ; he had underrated the sympathy which they were likely to attract by reason of the identity of their aim with the aspirations of the better classes of the toilers in field and factory. The *Gesellen Verein* was already in existence before the *Kulturkampf* began. It was composed of the respectable young mechanics in all the towns, and its universality and close organization throughout the Empire told eloquently of the genius and perseverance of its originator, the late Rev. Adolf Koplmg. This vast organization, which reckons over a thousand branches, is a strictly Catholic body ; but there are other associations which, though not strictly religious, are in sympathy with it, and are, therefore, equally reliable as a rampart against both infidel Socialism and that military despotism which is so largely responsible for the growth of infidel Socialism in many parts of Europe. The *Bauern-Verein* and the *Arbeiter-Verein*, great peasants' and artisans' associations of strictly economic origin, have been found immensely helpful. But one of the greatest forces which the persecution called into being were the parish religious organizations for the instruction of the young. These had been already in existence to a large extent before that era, but when the hour of trial came and the parishes were bereft of their legitimate guides and friends a new ardor was developed, and the zeal and number of those lay helpers increased in wonderful ratio. The passive resistance of the Catholic people to the wanton outrage of the creator of German unity, in the result, proved far more effective in its real unification than the defeat of the armies of the component States in the field and the moral preponderance of Prussia.

Bismarck's real aim in starting the *Kulturkampf* was not so much to persecute the Catholics as to bend the Church to the level of the "Evangelical" establishment, as the State Church in

Prussia is called. This ecclesiastical body has accepted the control of the State unreservedly. It is perfectly willing to be regarded as a department of the State. Its ministers are obliged to study in a university provided by the State, and Cardinal Moran is authority for the statement that with one solitary exception these professors are all avowed atheists and infidels. In the dogma of Papal Infallibility he discerned the most formidable obstacles to this unscrupulous ambition of his ; hence his declaration that that decree made Rome the national enemy of every European State. The Falck laws, he over and over again repeated, were not set up as a persecution of Catholics, but only a measure of defence against foreign aggression. "We will never go to Canossa," he proudly declared, when beginning the war ; but it was an idle boast. He was utterly unprepared for the strenuous resistance which he encountered all along the line. The vitality and spirit of the Catholics was a factor he had altogether left out of calculation when maturing his plans.

Bismarck's failure to crush freedom in Germany proves nothing more conclusively than the power of egotism to blind men to their own mortal weaknesses. Egotism is the vice of the age. It is accountable for the destruction of armies, the ruin of empires. Had Bismarck been capable of learning, he would have profited by the experience of Bonaparte in his bootless attempt to put down the Papacy and chain the Church to his chariot-wheels. But the intoxication of military success was upon him, so that he dreamed, like the Titan, he might be able to scale heaven. But what a different being do we find him twenty years later ! It was such a man, surely, Shakespeare contemplated when drawing the picture of the Duke of Gloucester contemplating his own fate :

"To have no creature love me living, nor my memory when dead."

What could be more profoundly pathetic than Bismarck's wail in his last illness ?

"Nobody loves me for what I have done. I have never made anybody happy—not myself, nor my family, nor anybody else. But how many have I made unhappy ! But for me three great wars would not have been fought, eighty thousand men would not have perished. Parents, brothers, sisters and widows would not be bereaved and plunged into mourning. . . . I have had little or no joy from all my achievements ; nothing but vexation, care and trouble."

No wonder men involuntarily say, "God reigns."

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

RECENT ENCYCLICALS OF POPE LEO XIII.

DESPITE his great age, the Holy Father continues to furnish to mankind such proofs of unabated mental activity, together with the physical vitality which is necessary to sustain it, as the world is rarely wont to behold on the part of those who are nearing the nonagenary mark. Recently we had from his pen two Encyclicals of a character destined to be historical. One was addressed to the Scottish Church and people, the other to the Italian bishops and clergy. In the first-named document we find the logical sequel to the first official act of the Holy Father. The "evvivas" of his enthronement as Pontiff were still ringing in his ears when he sat down to pen an Encyclical restoring to Scotland her ancient system of hierarchy, thus completing the work began by his illustrious predecessor, Pope Pius IX., with regard to the Church of Great Britain. The new Encyclical affords proof of the integrity of those splendid mnemotechnical gifts which frequently shine forth in the Holy Father's pronouncements, and as a graphic sketch of the glories of the Scottish Church in the past is not a little calculated to stimulate study and inquiry in this somewhat neglected field, by a happy coincidence this REVIEW is enabled to lay before the reader in this issue the first of a couple of scholarly papers treating of the subject from the pen of the Sub-Prior of the Benedictines at Fort Augustus, Scotland, the Very Rev. Dom. Michael Barrett. The next of the series will deal with the exciting period of the onslaught of the "Reformers" and the murder of Cardinal Beaton, whose virtues and talents have been strikingly set forth in a recent article by that eminent Scottish writer, Mr. Andrew Lang, in a noble vindication of the prelate from the ignorant aspersions of Robertson and other shallow historians. In his affectionate address to the stray sheep of the Scottish fold, the Holy Father pays tribute to their fidelity under all circumstances to the Divine Word, and in this respect, at least, Scotland occupies a place distinct from the leading countries which rejected the authority of the Church. There is very little atheism or agnosticism there; wild and fanciful metaphysical speculation is alien to the Scottish intellect.

We cannot believe that his affectionate and weighty words will be altogether wasted. Much of his appeal will, no doubt, fall

upon barren soil, but some must assuredly find more genial ground, take root, and fructify.

Concerning the Encyclical on Italian affairs, the reasons which have called it forth are of a widely different character. The men who are now awkwardly attempting to lift the chariot of State out of the inextricable plight into which Crispi and his bungling successors guided it have had the audacity to blame the Vatican for the recent disorders in the peninsula. Is it to be expected that the illustrious Head of the Church should remain silent, and so, inferentially, acquiescent under so great a wrong? Personally he has borne much from the instruments of Italian tyranny; when they attempt, under the most flagitiously false pretences, to scourge the Church and to break up its social arrangements all over the country, it is surely time that the supreme shepherd should be heard in defence of his charge. If the Italian Government had not been so thoroughly driven to its wits' end by the desperate straits of its downward course, it could never dream of demolishing those barriers against that anarchy for the existence of which that government itself is so largely responsible. But as drowning men in their agony of fear clutch even at straws, the incapable holders of portfolios have resorted to the extreme measure of making the situation worse in the desperate hope of the ruined gambler when he flings his last coin into the balance of adverse chance. It will be observed that the keynote of the remarkable document in which the Holy Father delivers himself on this suicidal folly is courage. Not a tremor is perceptible in the voice which proclaims the wrongs of the Church and the protest of its illustrious head. Calmness under trial is counselled to the flock, yet the shepherd will not waive one iota of his indefeasible claims, no matter how the storm of persecution rages. In spirit, in energy, in the confidence of Divine sustainment in all vicissitudes of mundane fortune, this Encyclical takes rank with the most memorable declarations of the Apostolic See on questions which have changed the faces of kingdoms and human society. It is a truly historic Encyclical, and therefore its text will be carefully preserved by every historical student and philosopher. It is the custom of this REVIEW to give these important pronouncements of the Holy Father in a carefully revised translation, but it is rarely that one follows so closely upon the appearance of another as in this case. The fact speaks eloquently of the vigilance, the comprehensiveness, and the solicitude with which the Holy Father, bowed down as he is by a great weight of years, continues to watch over the interests of his world-wide flock.

TO THE BISHOPS OF SCOTLAND.

TO OUR VENERABLE BRETHREN
THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF SCOTLAND.

LEO XIII.

VENERABLE BRETHREN,
HEALTH AND APOSTOLIC BLESSING.

THE ardent charity which renders Us solicitous of Our separated brethren in no wise permits Us to cease Our efforts to bring back to the embrace of the Good Shepherd those whom manifold error causes to stand aloof from the one Fold of Christ. Day after day We deplore more deeply the unhappy lot of those who are deprived of the fulness of the Christian Faith. Wherefore, moved by the sense of the responsibility which Our most sacred office entails, and by the spirit and grace of the most loving Saviour of men, Whom We unworthily represent, We are constantly imploring them to agree at last to restore together with Us the communion of the one and the same faith. A momentous work, and of all human works the most difficult to be accomplished; one which God's almighty power alone can effect. But for this very reason We do not lose heart, nor are We deterred from our purpose by the magnitude of the difficulties which cannot be overcome by human power alone. "We preach Christ crucified . . . and the weakness of God is stronger than men" (1 Cor. i. 23-25). In the midst of so many errors and of so many evils with which We are afflicted or threatened, We continue to point out whence salvation should be sought, exhorting and admonishing all nations to lift up "their eyes to the mountains whence help shall come" (Ps. cxx.). For indeed that which Isaias spoke in prophecy has been fulfilled, and the Church of God stands forth so conspicuously by its Divine origin and authority that it can be distinguished by all beholders: "And in the last days the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be prepared on the top of mountains and shall be exalted above the hills" (Is. ii. 2).

Scotland, so dear to the Holy See, and in a special manner to Us, has its place in Our care and solicitude. We love to recall the fact that over twenty years ago the first act of Our Apostolic

Ministry was performed in favor of Scotland, for on the second day of our Pontificate We gave back to the Scottish people their Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. From that day forward, with your efficient co-operation, Venerable Brethren, and that of your clergy, We have constantly sought to promote the welfare of your nation, which is naturally inclined to embrace the truth. And now that We are so far advanced in years that the end cannot be delayed much longer, We have thought it meet to address you, Venerable Brethren, and thus give your nation a further proof of Our Apostolic affection.

The terrible storm which swept over the Church in the sixteenth century deprived the vast majority of the Scottish people, as well as many other peoples of Europe, of that Catholic Faith which they had gloriously held for over one thousand years. It is most pleasing to Us to revert to the great achievements of your forefathers on behalf of Catholicism, and also to allude to some of those, and they are many, to whose virtue and illustrious deeds Scotland owes so much of her renown. Surely your fellow-countrymen will not take it ill that We should again remind them of what they owe to the Catholic Church and to the Apostolic See. We speak of what you already know. As your ancient Annals relate, St. Ninian, a countryman of yours, was so inflamed with the desire of greater spiritual progress by the reading of Holy Writ, that he exclaimed: "I shall rise and go over sea and land, seeking that truth which my soul loveth. But is so much trouble needful? Was it not said to Peter: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it'? Therefore, in the faith of Peter there is nothing wanting, nothing obscure, nothing imperfect, nothing against which evil doctrines and pernicious views can prevail, after the manner of the gates of hell. And where is the faith of Peter but in the See of Peter? Thither, thither I must repair, that going forth from my country, from my kindred, and from my father's house, I may see in the land of the Vision the will of the Lord and be protected by His Temple." (*Ex Hist. Vitæ S. Niniani a S. Aelredo Ab. cons.*) Hence, full of reverence he hastened to Rome, and when at the Tomb of the Apostles he had imbibed in abundance Catholic truth at its very source and fountainhead, by command of the Supreme Pontiff he returned home, preached the true Roman faith to his fellow-countrymen, and founded the Church of Galloway about two hundred years before St. Augustine landed in England. This was the faith of St. Columba; this was the faith kept so religiously and preached

so zealously by the monks of old, whose chief centre, Iona, was rendered famous by their eminent virtues. Need We mention Queen Margaret, a light and ornament not only of Scotland, but of the whole of Christendom, who, though she occupied the most exalted position in point of worldly dignity, sought only in her whole life things eternal and divine, and thus spread throughout the Church the fame of her virtues? There can be no doubt she owed this her eminent sanctity to the influence and guidance of the Catholic Faith. And did not the power and constancy of the Catholic faith give to Wallace and Bruce, the two great heroes of your race, their indomitable courage in defence of their country? We say nothing of the immense number of those who achieved so much for the commonwealth, and who belong to that progeny which the Catholic Church has never ceased to bring forth. We say nothing of the advantages which your nation has derived from her influence. It is undeniable that it was through her wisdom and authority that those famous seats of learning were opened at St. Andrews, Glasgow and Aberdeen, and that your judicial system was drawn up and adopted. Hence We can well understand why Scotland has been honored by the title of "Special Daughter of the Holy See."

But since then a great change has come to pass, the ancient faith having been extinguished in the minds of the vast majority of your countrymen. Are we to suppose that it will never be restored? There are indeed some signs which lead Us to hope that, by the grace of God, a brighter religious future awaits the Scotch people. We see that Catholics are more liberally and kindly dealt with as time goes on, that Catholic doctrines are no longer publicly held up to scorn, as perhaps was formerly the case; but, on the contrary, are favorably considered by many, and accepted by not a few. We also perceive that false views and opinions, which effectively prevent the perception of truth, are gradually disappearing. May the search after truth spread more, for there is no doubt that an accurate knowledge of the Catholic Religion, drawn from its own, and not from extraneous sources, will clear away many prejudices.

Great praise is due to the Scottish nation, as a whole, that they have always shown reverence and love for the inspired Writings. They cannot therefore be unwilling to listen to a few words which in Our affection We would address to them on this subject with a view to their eternal welfare; since We find that in revering the Sacred Scriptures, they are in agreement with the Catholic Church. Why then should this not be the starting-point for a re-

turn to unity? We beg them to remember that they have the Books of the Old Covenant and of the New from the Catholic Church and from the Catholic Church alone. If these Inspired Writings have passed unscathed through the many and dangerous vicissitudes of centuries, such a blessing is to be attributed to her never-failing vigilance and unceasing care. History attests that in the early ages of the Church the integrity of the Scriptures was preserved by the ever-memorable efforts of the Third Synod of Carthage and of Innocent I., the Roman Pontiff. At a later time no less watchfulness was shown, as we know, by Eugenius IV. and by the Council of Trent. We Ourselves, not unmindful of the necessities of the present day, published a short while ago an Encyclical Letter in which We gravely addressed the Bishops of the Catholic world and diligently admonished them as to the means to be adopted in order to safeguard the integrity and the Divine authority of the Sacred Writings. For owing to the restlessness of modern thought, there are many whom the inordinate desire of superciliously inquiring into everything, and contempt for antiquity, pervert to such a degree, that they either refuse all authority to Holy Writ, or at least seriously curtail and minimize it. These men, puffed up by an exaggerated estimate of their own knowledge, and having an overweening trust in their own judgment, fail to perceive how rash and monstrous it is to try to measure the works of God by our own puny intelligence; nor do they sufficiently heed St. Augustine's warning: "Honor God's Scripture, honor God's Word though not understood, reverently wait in order to understand" (in Ps. 146, n. 12). "Those who study the Venerable Scriptures ought to be admonished . . . that they must pray in order to comprehend." (Doct. Chr. lib. iii., c. 37, n. 56.) "Lest anything unknown be rashly asserted as known . . . let nothing be rashly asserted, but all things cautiously and modestly examined" (in Gen. Op. Imp.).

But as the Church was to last to the end of time, something more was required besides the bestowal of the Sacred Scriptures. It was obviously necessary that the Divine Founder should take every precaution, lest the treasure of heavenly given truths, possessed by the Church, should ever be destroyed, which would assuredly have happened, had He left those doctrines to each one's private judgment. It stands to reason, therefore, that a living, perpetual "magisterium" was necessary in the Church from the beginning, which, by the command of Christ himself, should, besides teaching other wholesome doctrines, give an authoritative explanation of Holy Writ, and which, being directed and safeguarded

by Christ himself, could by no means commit itself to erroneous teaching. God has provided for these needs most wisely and effectively through His Only-begotten Son Jesus Christ, Who placed the true sense of the Scriptures in safety when He laid upon His Apostles as His primary and most momentous injunction, not to devote themselves to writing, nor to spreading the volumes of the Old Testament indiscriminately and unguardedly among the multitude, but to teach all nations with the living voice, and to lead them by speech to the knowledge and profession of His Heavenly doctrine: "Going into the whole world preach the Gospel to every creature" (Mark xvi., 15). But the supreme teaching authority was committed to one on whom, as on its foundation, the Church must rest. For Christ, when He gave the keys to Peter, gave him at the same time the power to govern those who were charged with the "ministry of the word"; "Confirm thy Brethren" (Luke xxii., 32.) And since the faithful must learn from the "magisterium" of the Church whatever pertains to the salvation of their souls, it follows that they must also learn from it the true meaning of Scripture.

It is easy to perceive how unsafe, how inadequate, and how useless is the method propounded by those who think that the only way to interpret Scripture is by the help of Scripture itself. For on that principle the ultimate law of interpretation would rest with the individual judgment. But, as we have already stated, each one will undertake the reading of Scripture with entirely different feelings, views, and prepossessions, and will interpret God's written Word accordingly. The result will be that those divergent interpretations will necessarily produce discussions and disputes, and thus turn what was intended as a source of union and peace into a source of contention and strife.

The truth of what We have just stated is proven by what has actually taken place, since, of all the sects, deprived as they are of the Catholic Faith and disagreeing among themselves on religious matters, each one claims that its own teaching and practices are in accord with Holy Writ. There is no gift of God so sacred that man cannot abuse it to his own detriment; since, according to the stern warning of Blessed Peter, "the unlearned and unstable wrest" the very Scriptures "to their own destruction" (2 Peter iii., 16). Hence Irenæus, who lived shortly after the Apostolic age, and who is a faithful interpreter of Apostolic doctrine, always taught that a knowledge of the truth could only be had from the living voice of the Church: "Where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God, and where the spirit of God is found, there is the

Church and all grace, and the Spirit is truth." (Adv. Haer. lib. iii.) "Where, therefore, the gifts of God are placed, it is necessary to learn the truth from those who have in the Church the Apostolic Succession." (Adv. Haer. lib. iv.) And if Catholics, who may differ on all other matters, are found united in marvellous concord in the faith, there can be no doubt that this is chiefly owing to the authority and power of the "magisterium."

We know that many of the Scottish people, who do not agree with us in faith, sincerely love the name of Christ, and strive to ascertain His doctrine and to imitate His most holy example. But how can they obtain what they are striving for, if they do not allow themselves to be taught heavenly things in the way prescribed by Jesus Christ Himself; if they do not give heed to the Church whose precepts they are commanded to obey by the Author of faith as if they were His own: "He who heareth you heareth me; he who despiseth you despiseth me"; if they do not seek the nourishment of their souls, and the sustenance of all virtue, from him whom the Supreme Pastor of souls made His vicerent, to whom He confided the care of the universal Church? In the meantime We are resolved not to fail in doing Our share, and especially to be constant in fervent prayer, that God may move their minds to what is good, and vouchsafe to impart to them the most powerful impulses of His grace. May the Divine clemency, thus earnestly implored by Us, grant to the Church that supreme consolation of speedily embracing the whole Scottish people, restored to the faith of their forefathers "in spirit and in truth." What incalculable blessings would not accrue to them, if they were once more united to us? Perfect and absolute truth would everywhere shine forth, together with the inestimable gifts which were forfeited by separation. There is one amongst all others, the loss of which is more deplorable than words can express; We allude to the most holy Sacrifice in which Jesus Christ, both Priest and Victim, daily offers Himself to His Father, through the ministry of His priests on earth. By virtue of this Sacrifice the infinite merits of Christ, gained by His Precious Blood shed once upon the Cross for the salvation of men, are applied to our souls. This belief prevailed among the Scottish people in St. Columba's day and in subsequent ages, when your grand and majestic cathedrals were raised throughout the land, which still testify to the art and piety of your ancestors.

Now, the very essence of Religion implies Sacrifice. For the perfection of Divine Worship is found in the submissive and reverent acknowledgment that God is the Supreme Lord of all

things, by Whose power we and all our belongings exist. This constitutes the very nature of Sacrifice, which, on this account, is emphatically called a "thing Divine." If Sacrifices are abolished, Religion can neither exist nor be conceived. The Evangelical Law is not inferior, but superior, to the Old Law. It brings to perfection what the Old Law had merely begun. But the Sacrifice of the Cross was prefigured by the sacrifices of the Old Covenant long before the Birth of Jesus Christ; and after His Ascension, the same Sacrifice is continued by the Eucharistic Sacrifice. They greatly err, therefore, who reject this doctrine, as if it diminished the reality and efficacy of the Sacrifice which Christ offered on the Cross. He "was offered once to exhaust the sins of many" (Heb. ix., 28). That atonement for the sins of men was absolutely complete; nor is there any other atonement besides that of the Cross in the Eucharistic Sacrifice. As Religion must ever be accompanied by a sacrificial rite, it was the Divine counsel of the Redeemer that the Sacrifice of the Cross should be perpetuated. This perpetuity is in the most Holy Eucharist, which is not an empty similitude or a mere commemoration, but the very Sacrifice itself under a different appearance, and therefore the whole power of impetration and expiation in the Sacrifice flows from the death of Christ: "For from the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation: for my name is great among the Gentiles" (Mal. i., 2).

It remains for Us now to address the Catholics in a more special manner, and We do so in order that they should co-operate with Us in realizing what We have at heart. Christian charity bids each one labor, according to his opportunities, for the salvation of his fellow-men. We therefore call upon them first of all constantly to offer prayers and supplications to God, Who alone can give the necessary light to the minds of men, and dispose their wills as He pleases. And furthermore, as example is most powerful, let them show themselves worthy of the truth which through Divine mercy they possess, and let them recommend the faith which they hold by edifying and stainless lives. "So let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works" (Matth. v., 16). Let them at the same time distinguish themselves by the practice of virtue in public life, so that it should be more and more clearly shown that Catholicism cannot be said, without calumny, to run counter to the interests of the State; but that, on the contrary, nothing else contributes so much to the honorable and successful discharge of social duties.

It is likewise of vital importance to defend most strenuously, to establish more firmly, and to surround with every safeguard, the Catholic education of youth. We are not unmindful of the fact that in Scotland thoroughly efficient schools exist, in which the best method of teaching is to be found. But every effort must be put forth, and every sacrifice must be made, so that Catholic schools should be second to none in point of efficiency. We must not allow our youth to be inferior to others in literary attainments, or in learning, which the Christian faith demands as its honorable accompaniments with a view to its defence and adornment. The love of Religion and country requires that whatever institutions Catholics already possess for the purposes of primary, intermediate, or higher education, should, by the due and proportionate co-operation of all, be consolidated and extended. Justice similarly demands that the education and training of the clergy should be most zealously promoted, as they cannot nowadays occupy worthily and usefully their position, unless they have the prestige of wide erudition and solid learning. In this connection, We can find no institution more worthy of being recommended than Blairs College. An excellent and noble work, begun with exceptional zeal and generosity by one devoted Catholic, this institution should not be allowed to decline and disappear by neglect, but should be sustained by a similar charity, and completed as soon as possible. This will be tantamount to making provision that, for nearly the whole of Scotland, priests will be trained and educated according to the needs of the present time.

All these things, Venerable Brethren, which Our affection for the Scottish people has suggested to Us, we commend to your thoughtfulness and charity. Continue to exercise that zeal of which you have given Us such abundant proof, so that everything may be effected which may conduce to the realization of what we have in view. The matter in hand is extremely difficult, and one the accomplishment of which, as We have repeatedly stated, surpasses all human efforts; but it is most holy and desirable, and in perfect harmony with the counsels of Divine Goodness. Wherefore, We are not so much deterred by the difficulties as We are encouraged by the conviction that the Divine help will not fail, if you devote yourselves to the fulfilment of these Our Wishes and behests.

As a pledge of Divine grace, and as a token of Our fatherly affection, We lovingly impart to you, in the Lord, Venerable Brethren, to your clergy and people our Apostolic Blessing.

Given at St. Peter's, Rome, the 25th day of July, in the year 1898, and the twenty-first of Our Pontificate.

LEO XIII., POPE.

TO THE BISHOPS, CLERGY AND PEOPLE OF ITALY.

LEO XIII.

VENERABLE BRETHREN AND MOST DEAR CHILDREN, HEALTH
AND APOSTOLIC BENEDICTION.

OFTENTIMES during the course of Our Pontificate, moved by the sacred duty attaching to the apostolic ministry, We have had to complain and protest against the acts designed for the detriment of the Church and of religion by those who, after the changes now so well known, are at the head of public affairs in Italy.

It is unpleasant for Us again to have to speak upon so serious a matter which fills Our soul with profound sadness. We allude to the suppression, recently decreed in various districts of the Peninsula, of so many Catholic institutions. This undeserved and unjust rigor has called forth the reprobation of all honest men, and to Our great sorrow We see that it includes and makes even still more cruel the injuries which now for years past We have had to suffer.

Though the facts are well known to you, Venerable Brethren, We nevertheless deem it opportune to go back upon the origin and necessity of those institutions, which are the fruit of Our solicitude and of your devoted care, in order that all may understand the thought that inspired them and the religious end, both moral and charitable, which they had in view.

A RETROSPECT.

After the downfall of the civil power of the Popes the Catholic Church in Italy was gradually robbed of her elements of life and action as well as of her native secular influence in public and social life. By a progressive series of systematized oppressions the monasteries and convents were closed; by the confiscation of ecclesiastical property the greater part of the patrimony of the Church was taken away; military service was imposed on the clergy; the freedom of the sacred ministry was shackled by unjust exceptions. Persistent efforts were made to deprive all public institutions of their religious and Christian character; dissident

religions were favored ; and whilst the widest liberty was given to the masonic sects, intolerance and odious repression were reserved for the one religion which was ever the glory, the stay and the strength of the Italian people.

We have never failed to deplore these grave and reiterated outrages. We deplored them on account of the danger to which they exposed our holy religion, and we deplored them, too—and We say this from Our heart—on behalf of our country, for religion is the source of a nation's prosperity and greatness and the principal foundation of all well-ordered society. Religious feelings raise and ennoble the soul and instil into it notions of justice and honesty, and when they are weakened men fall away and abandon themselves to their savage instincts and to the pursuit of material interests. The logical outcome of this is bitterness, dissension, depravity, strife, and the disturbance of the public peace—evils which will find no certain or effective remedy in the severity of the law, the rigors of the courts, or the employment of armed force.

In letters addressed to the people of Italy We have more than once warned those on whom falls the serious responsibility of power of this natural and necessary connection between religious decadence and the development of the spirit of revolution and disorder. We have also drawn attention to the inevitable progress of socialism and anarchy, and to the endless evils to which they expose the nation.

But We were not listened to. Paltry sectarian prejudice seemed to blind the public mind, and the war against religion was continued with unabating energy. Far from any measure of redress being undertaken, a persistent attempt was made in books and the daily papers, in schools and universities, clubs and theatres, to scatter broadcast the seeds of irreligion and immorality, to shiver the principles which give birth in a people to morality and uprightness, and to spread the maxims which have for their result perversion of the mind and corruption of the heart.

A CALL TO ACTION.

It was then, Venerable Brethren, that, foreseeing a dark future full of peril for our country, We thought the moment had come for Us to raise Our voice and say to Italians : Religion and Society are in danger ; it is time to unfold all your activity and to meet the evils which threaten you with a solid opposition of word and work, by associations and committees, in the press and at public congresses, by confraternities for mutual charity and prayer—in a

word, by every peaceful and lawful means which was calculated to maintain a people's religious spirit and relieve the misery which, ever an evil counsellor, had become so deep and general through the shameful economic condition of Italy. Such were Our recommendations, several times repeated, and particularly in the two letters which we addressed to the Italian people on October 15, 1890, and on December 8, 1892.

And here it is gratifying to Us to declare that Our exhortations fell upon fruitful soil. Through your generous efforts, Venerable Brethren, and through those of the clergy and of the faithful confided to your care, such happy results followed that We were able to hope for still happier in the near future. Hundreds of associations and committees arose in various parts of Italy, which, by their zeal, established rural banks, cheap bakeries, night shelters, clubs for recreation, and catechism classes, whilst others had for their object the visitation of the sick, the protection of widows and orphans. There were, besides, many other charitable institutions which were welcomed with gratitude and blessings by the people, and which received the praise they so well deserved even from the lips of men who belonged to the parties opposed to them. In displaying this praiseworthy Christian activity, Catholics, having nothing to conceal, worked, according to their custom, in the full light of day, and at the same time kept themselves well within the limits of the law.

But, alas! then came those ill-fated riots which resulted in so much disorder and bloodshed, and which flung several districts of Italy into mourning. No one suffered more deeply in his heart's depths, no one was more grieved, than We at this sad spectacle.

We did think, however, that in seeking the secret causes of these riots and civil strifes, those who have the direction of public affairs would recognize the baneful, though natural, fruit of the evil seed which had been so widely, for so long and with such impunity, scattered over the peninsula. We thought that, tracing effects to their causes, and profiting by the sharp lesson they had just received, they would again have recourse to those Christian rules of social organization by the aid of which nations, unless they wish to perish, should reform themselves, and that they would therefore restore to a place of honor those principles of justice, uprightness and religion from which the material well-being of a people flows. We thought that, at least, in searching for the authors and ringleaders of these riots, ministers would be sure to seek them amongst those who hold Catholic teaching in abhorrence, and who excite in men's minds all lawless desires by

naturalism and scientific and political materialism, and amongst those who hide their guilty intentions in the shadow of sectarian assemblies, where they whet their arms against public order and the safety of society. And, indeed, even in the camp of our adversaries, men of elevated and impartial minds were not wanting who understood, and had the praiseworthy courage to proclaim in public the real causes of these deplorable disasters.

Great, then, was Our surprise and sorrow when We learned that, under a ridiculous and ill-concealed pretext, in order to lead public opinion astray and more easily to accomplish a long-premeditated plan, people dared to lay at the door of Catholics the stupid charge of disturbing the peace in order to saddle them with the blame and the disastrous results of the rioting enacted in several parts of Italy.

Our sorrow increased the more when these calumnies were followed up by violent and arbitrary action, and when several leading outspoken Catholic journals were suspended or suppressed, diocesan and parochial committees proscribed, the sittings of congresses disallowed, some institutions rendered powerless and others menaced even amongst those whose only end and aim was the development of piety amongst the faithful or public and private charity; and finally, when numerous inoffensive and useful societies were dissolved, to the destruction, in a few stormy days, of the patient and modest charitable work which had been accomplished during long years by noble minds and generous hearts.

INCONSISTENCY OF THE MINISTRY.

In harking back to these excessive and odious measures the public authorities put themselves at the outset in complete contradiction to their previous professions. For some time past they had sedulously represented the population of the peninsula as in hearty agreement with themselves in their work of revolution and hostility against the Papacy. Now, however, they turn round and belie their former professions by having recourse to exceptional legislation in order to stifle innumerable associations spread throughout Italy for no other reason than their devoted loyalty to the Church and the cause of the Holy See.

Such measures strike at the foundations of justice and even at the regulations of existing laws. In virtue of these principles and regulations it is lawful for Catholics, as for all other citizens, to combine their forces for the promotion of the moral and material well-being of their neighbors, and to devote themselves to practices of piety and religion. It was therefore a most arbitrary

proceeding to dissolve so many Catholic charitable societies, which in other countries are allowed to exist peaceful and respected, and that without any proof of their guilt, without any previous examination, and without any documentary evidence which would show their participation in the disorder that had come about.

It was also especially insulting to Us, who had organized and blessed these useful and peaceful associations, and to you also, Venerable Brethren, who had promoted their development with so much care and watched over their steady progress. Our protection and your vigilance ought to have made them respected and placed them above all suspicion.

We can no longer refrain from declaring how pernicious such measures are to the interests of the people, to the social well-being and the real good of Italy. The suppression of these societies only increases the misery, moral and material, of the people whom they sought to humanize by every possible means; it deprives society of a powerful conservative force; for their organization and the spread of their principles was a bulwark against the subversive theories of socialism and anarchy—in a word, it aggravates more and more the religious conflict which all men who are free from sectarian passion regard as fatal to Italy, whose strength, cohesion and harmony it undermines.

We are not ignorant that the Catholic associations are accused of tendencies opposed to the actual political situation in Italy, and are therefore regarded as subversive. Such an imputation is, however, founded on an equivocation which has been invented, and is designedly maintained, by the enemies of the Church and of religion in order to place in a favorable light before the public the hateful ostracism which they wish to inflict on these associations. But We intend that this mistaken idea should be dissipated forever.

THE ATTITUDE OF ITALIAN CATHOLICS.

In virtue of the well-known and immutable principles of their religion, Italian Catholics will have nothing to do with any conspiracy or revolt against the public authorities, to whom they render the obedience which is due to them. Their conduct in the past, to which all men of unbiassed mind can bear honorable witness, is a guarantee of their future behavior, and should be sufficient to secure for them the justice and liberty to which all peaceable citizens have a right. We go farther; by the doctrine they profess they are the staunchest supporters of order, and so they are entitled to respectful treatment. If their worth and merits were properly appreciated, they would, moreover, have a right to the regard and gratitude of those at the head of affairs.

But, at the same time, the Catholics of Italy, for the very reason that they are Catholics, cannot renounce the desire to restore to their Supreme Head the necessary independence and full and effective freedom which are indispensable conditions of the liberty and independence of the Catholic Church. On this point their sentiments are not to be changed either by threats or violence. They will put up with the present situation of affairs, but so long as it shall, at the instigation of anti-religious sectaries, aim at the downfall of the Papacy, they will never be able, without violating their most sacred duties, to uphold it by their adhesion and support. To expect the active co-operation of Catholics for the maintenance of the present order of things would be unreasonable and absurd, for they would then no longer be able to obey the teaching and precepts of the Apostolic See. On the contrary, they would have to act in opposition to that teaching, and to depart from the line of conduct observed by the Catholics of all other nations.

WHY THEY REFRAIN FROM POLITICS.

This is the reason why, in the present state of affairs, Catholic action, keeping outside politics, concentrates itself upon social and religious work, and looks to raise the people by rendering them obedient to the Church and her Head, by shielding them from the perils of socialism and anarchy, by inculcating respect for the principle of authority, and by lightening their load of poverty by the manifold works of Christian charity. How then can Catholics be called enemies of their country and be confounded with the parties which threaten law and order and the safety of the State? Such calumnies fall to the ground before plain common sense. They rest solely upon the idea that the destiny, unity and prosperity of the nation consist in the deeds that have been perpetrated to the detriment of the Holy See, and which are deplored by men above suspicion who have plainly pointed out the error of provoking a conflict with that great Institution divinely established in Italy, which was, and will ever be, her special and incomparable glory: that wondrous Institution which dominates the course of history, and by which Italy has become the successful teacher of nations, and the head and heart of Christian civilization.

Of what then are Catholics guilty when they long for the end of this long quarrel which is the source of the greatest injury to Italy in the social, moral, and political order; when they demand a hearing for the fatherly voice of their Supreme Head, who has so often claimed the reparation which is his due, demonstrating at the same time what incalculable good would result to Italy.

THE POSITION OF THE POPE.

No ; Italy's real enemies must be sought elsewhere ; they must be sought amongst the men who, urged on by the spirit of irreligion and having no hearts to feel for the evils and dangers which menace their country, reject every real and effective solution of present difficulties, and endeavor by guilty designs to protract and increase their bitterness. It is to such men as these, and to no others, that the rigorous measures aimed at useful Catholic associations should be applied—measures which afflict Us profoundly for a higher reason that regards not only the Catholics of Italy, but those of the whole world. These measures place in fuller light the painful, precarious, and intolerable position to which We have been reduced. If certain events, in which Catholics had no part, have been sufficient to bring about the suppression of thousands of guileless charitable works, in spite of the guarantees they possessed in the fundamental laws of the State, every sensible and fair-minded man will understand what is the value of the assurances given by the public authorities for the liberty and independence of our Apostolic ministry. To what a point is Our liberty reduced when, after having been deprived of the greatest part of the ancient moral and material resources with which Christian ages had enriched the Apostolic See and the Church in Italy, We are now even deprived of those means of religious and social action which Our solicitude and the admirable zeal of the Bishops, clergy, and people had got together for the defence of religion, and for the good of the Italian people? What is this pretended liberty when another occasion, any incident whatsoever, might serve as a pretext for going still farther along the road of arbitrary violence, and for inflicting fresh and deeper wounds on the Church and on religion?

We wish to point out this state of things to our children in Italy and in other nations. To all of them, however, we would say that if Our sorrow is great, not less great is Our courage, nor less firm Our confidence in that Providence which governs the world, which so constantly and lovingly watches over the Church, and which identifies itself with the Papacy according to the beautiful words of St. Ambrose, "*Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia.*" Both are divine institutions which have outlived every outrage and attack, and which have seen the centuries go by unshaken, drawing from their misfortunes fresh force, energy and constancy.

As for Ourselves, We shall never cease to love this beautiful and noble country in which we first saw the light, happy in spending our remaining strength in preserving for it the precious treasure

of religion, in keeping its sons in the honorable paths of virtue and duty, and in relieving their misfortunes as long as We are able.

In this noble task We are sure that you, Venerable Brethren, will assist Us with the effective co-operation of your zealous care as enlightened as it is constant. Yes, continue in this holy work, stirring up piety amongst the faithful, preserving souls from the errors and seductions with which they are on all sides surrounded, consoling the poor and the unfortunate by every means that charity can suggest. Whatever may be the trend of events and the opinions of men, your labors will not be in vain, for they have an object higher than the things of earth ; and so, no matter how your toil may be rendered powerless, it will serve to free you before God and man of all responsibility for the evils that, owing to the hindrances placed in the way of your pastoral care, may befall Italy.

And you, Catholic Italians, the chief object of our care and affection ; you who have been the butt of the most painful vexations because of your nearness to Us and your unity with this Apostolic See, you have for your support and encouragement the firm assurances which we give you ; as in past times and in the midst of serious and stormy circumstances the Papacy was always the guide, defence, and safety of Catholic peoples, and especially of the people of Italy, so in the future it will never fail in its great mission of defending and demanding your rights and of assisting you in your difficulties, with all the more love the more you are persecuted and oppressed. You have given, and especially during these later times, numerous evidences of self-sacrificing activity in well-doing. Do not lose courage, but keeping rigorously, as in the past, within the limits prescribed by faith, and in full submission to your pastors, follow out the same line of action with genuine Christian enthusiasm.

Should you encounter fresh contradictions and fresh signs of hostility on the road, do not allow yourselves to be cast down ; for the righteousness of your cause will become clearer day by day for the very reason that your adversaries will be compelled, in order to meet you, to have recourse to similar weapons, whilst the trials you will have to suffer will increase your merit in the eyes of all good men, and what is much more important, before God.

And now, as a pledge of heavenly favor and a token of our special affection receive the Apostolic Blessing, which from the depths of Our heart We lovingly impart to you, Venerable Brethren, to your clergy, and to the Italian people.

Given at St. Peter's, Rome, the 5th day of August, in the year 1898, and the twenty-first of Our Pontificate.

LEO XIII., POPE.

Scientific Chronicle.

THE MARVELS OF LIQUEFIED AIR.

In the recently-accomplished reduction of hydrogen to a liquid by chemical process we are likely to witness some startling thaumaturgy, to use the language of the mediæval alchemists. To Professor Dewar, the distinguished English experimentalist, is due the credit of having found the means of accomplishing this feat, a thing often dreamed of by others. The results so far ascertained seem to place the utility of the product far beyond what any experimentalist deemed possible. Others had succeeded in liquefying this factor of the atmosphere in very minute quantity, but Professor Dewar's discovery renders it possible to produce the liquefaction in unlimited volume. He also succeeded in liquefying helium. The importance of the successful carrying out of what has proved a stumbling-block to scientific investigators in the past cannot be overrated. It is already rumored that the density of liquid hydrogen far exceeds that previously arrived at by calculation. The liquefaction of helium was rendered possible by the use of liquid hydrogen, and thus one result of the liquefaction of hydrogen has been the accomplishment of what has hitherto baffled all efforts.

"The Pharmaceutical Era" says, of the discovery, that the idea of a liquid boiling several hundred degrees below zero rather upsets our ordinary conception that boiling means heat that burns. We are not accustomed to air which can be ladled out by the dipperful as a quiet, mobile fluid—one which, while actively boiling, will freeze a beefsteak or absolute alcohol. We have been accustomed to consider heat and cold and boiling and freezing as absolute rather than relative terms, and our prejudices and cherished delusions have been rudely shocked by these scientists. The liquefaction or solidification, by the combination of cold and pressure, of elements hitherto believed to be not susceptible to such changes, has done much to assist the chemist in the verification of his theories, but has, at the same time, shown him that many properties heretofore considered inherent attributes of these elements are characteristics of condition only. The chemical activities and affinities and the physical properties of elements and compounds are changed to a marvellous degree in passing from the gaseous to the liquid state. It has been believed that if hydrogen could only be liquefied, many problems would be rendered easy of solution, many an obscure question be cleared up. Liquid hydrogen is now a fact. Professor Dewar has produced half a wineglassful of liquid hydrogen in five minutes, and reports that the process is applicable to any quantity. Mr. Tripler, the liquid-air manufacturer, will show us how to make it by the gallon or milk-canful. But the interesting feature of Dewar's achievement is that liquid hydrogen boils at 240° below centigrade, or, in other words, it must be liquefied

at or below that temperature. The theoretical absolute zero of the scientist has been put at -273° C. Either Dewar is pretty close to it, or absolute zero must be put down a few more degrees.

The question of the utilization of liquefied air as a motive-power has been discussed, and considerable doubt has been expressed as to its feasibility or its usefulness from both the dynamic and the economic point of view. The subject was exhaustively treated in "The American Machinist" by Mr. Frank Richards, who summed up the matter in these postulations:

"The phenomenon of the boiling of the air is so closely similar to the boiling of water that it is quite possible to conceive of the liquid air being pumped into a carefully-insulated boiler with an ample and always operative safety-valve, just as the feed-water is pumped into a steam-boiler. Here it could re-evaporate just as the water is converted into steam, and then be led to a suitable engine. No fire, of course, would be necessary for the re-evaporation. The simple removal of part of the insulation would insure a sufficient communication of heat. There would always be danger of too rapid communication of heat, and consequent uncontrollable increase of pressure."

If we suppose air to be compressed by an exertion of 73 horse-power, then liquefied by Mr. Tripler's process, and then allowed to boil away as suggested above, using the product to drive an engine, we should get from its expansion a little less than one-half of one horse-power, or about two-thirds of 1 per cent. of the initial power employed. Under these circumstances we are not likely to see liquid air extensively and practically employed for power transmission.

But to another class of scientists the possibilities of liquefied air are sought for in quite different fields. We have a story of its powers so wonderful that it recalls the search for the Elixir of Life and the fabled mysteries of the Rosicrucians. A Russian physician (whose name has not yet transpired) has already begun to experiment with it. He placed a dog in a room with the temperature lowered, as stated in "London Engineering," to 100° below zero. After ten hours the dog was taken out alive and with an enormous appetite. The physician tried the test himself. After ten hours' confinement in an atmosphere of still, dry cold, his system was intensely stimulated. So much combustion had been required to keep warm that an intense appetite was created. The process was continued on the man and the dog, and both grew speedily fat and vigorous. It was like a visit to a bracing northern climate. The old saw about "living upon air" will no longer, then, be used in derision; but, along with the blessing of restored digestive powers to the dyspeptic, there arise frightful visions of enormously-increased larder bills to the struggling housekeeper, should liquefied air fulfil the anticipations of the Russian scientist. So while to the few it may be a boon, to the many it may turn out to be something in the nature of a Grecian gift. But it is too soon to anticipate.

MACHINERY AND TOOLS OF THE ANCIENTS.

A favorite subject of speculation is the sort of appliances used by the workmen who put up the temples which such cities as Persepolis, Karnak and Thebes still show, and the still mightier marvels of the Pyramids. It has been shown that the old builders, in Egypt at least, were familiar with steam power, for a contrivance evidently adapted to this agency was found a good many years ago in contiguity to one of the Pyramids. In "Gibbon" will be found a curious anecdote proving the ingenuity of the early Byzantine Greeks in the heating of houses by steam, and we have a good deal of other evidence to show that the famous discovery of Dr. Watts was only the recovery of a lost art. Many mechanical appliances of the present day are found to have been in use among the ancient Egyptians, and the manual implements of the craftsman in the very early ages of their famous architecture bore a striking resemblance to those in use generally to-day.

A two years' study of Gizeh has convinced Flinders Petrie that the Egyptian stoneworkers of four thousand years ago had a surprising acquaintance with what had been considered modern tools. Amongst the many tools used by the Pyramid builders were both solid and tubular drills and straight and circular saws. The drills, like those of to-day, were set with jewels (probably corundum, as the diamond was very scarce), and even the lathe tools had such cutting edges. So remarkable was the quality of the tubular drills and the skill of the workmen that the cutting marks in hard granite gave no indication of wear of the tool, while a cut of a tenth of an inch was made in the hardest rock at each revolution, and a hole through both the hardest and softest material was bored perfectly smooth and uniform throughout. How the tools themselves were made, and of what metal their heads were composed, is, however, an insoluble mystery.

HOMCEOPATHIC TREATMENT OF YELLOW FEVER.

The American medical fraternity are investigating the possibility of applying the method of the mother of Achilles to the problem of producing what are styled "immunes." Yellow fever, it is surmised, may possibly be rendered harmless if the subject of it has had one attack before, and got over it without serious results. Dr. Giuseppe Sanarelli, of Brazil, is making successful experiments, it is asserted, in this direction. He has been given an opportunity to put his theories to the test by the Brazilian Government. The State of San Paulo, the richest in Brazil, and highly attractive to emigrants, is made the theatre of experiment. They contract the seeds of disease at the port of their arrival, and then go inland to set up new centres of infection; and

thus the disease formerly confined to coast towns is diffused everywhere, like a spreading conflagration.

Dr. Sanarelli holds entirely original views as to the nature and seat of the disease, and he has studied it so long that people were inclined to give him his way in the making of experiments. But the earlier results were startling. The destruction of life among the newly arrived Europeans, unacclimated and not knowing how to live in tropical countries, had risen to ninety per cent.

In the city of San Carlos do Pinhal is an isolation hospital, and here, at an invitation of the authorities, Dr. Sanarelli, in February last, inaugurated a series of experiments that demonstrated the value of his anti-amarillic serum. He clearly showed that the earlier the serum is used after symptoms appear, the better. It has a direct and immediate action on the kidneys, and he proved that the best action follows injecting it directly into a vein; he calls this the *intensive* method. The mortality here was only twenty-seven per cent.—a great falling off from ninety.

The serum is produced by subjecting a horse to gradually increasing doses of the yellow-fever virus till he can withstand an amount which, if administered at first, would surely have proved fatal, and the animal has to be under treatment for a year or fourteen months before his blood reaches the proper stage.

ARTIFICIAL PRODUCTION OF ALCOHOL.

We believe nearly as many chemists have been wrecked over the theory of the productibility of alcohol from substances other than those used in the distillery as empirics in the hunt for the philosopher's stone. At last, it seems, the momentous question has been decided, and the humble mushroom of commerce is the agency by which the bacchanalian soul can indulge its tastes at a moderate cost, so far as production is concerned. The discovery is claimed for the Pasteur Institute of Lille, the inventor being the president, Dr. Clamette. From Chinese yeast Dr. Clamette succeeded in cultivating a sort of fungoid growth which entirely replaces the yeast hitherto employed. Trials on a large scale have proved the enormous advantage afforded by the use of these cultivated fungi in the place of yeast. In the case of maize brought to fermentation by means of the fungi a much larger quantity and a better quality of alcohol are obtained at a considerably lower expense, the spirit being cleaner and containing less empyreuma—a term expressive of the peculiar smell of burning which characterizes the vapor produced by destructive distillation—as a consequence of the absence of microbes found in yeast. A thousand kilogrammes of corn (a kilogramme being about $2\frac{1}{4}$ pounds) required but a few grains

of the fungi for purposes of fermentation. Dr. Clamette has further proved that this aseptic method of fermentation works with equal success in the factory and the laboratory, whether employed on a large or a small scale, not one malignant microbe having been found in thousands of gallons.

MOSQUITOES AND MALARIA.

Dr. Koch has adopted the theory that we are indebted to our disagreeable little acquaintance, the mosquito, for the germs of malaria, but it is claimed by other medical authorities that this is by no means a new or original supposition. The *Medical Record* gives the theory a pretty respectable antiquity.

“Linnæus,” it states, “was among the first to make the suggestion, although his views in this respect gained no foothold. Dr. Drake and Sir Henry Holland also drew attention to its probability. Latterly many investigators have endeavored to show that the mosquito is indirectly instrumental in the production of many diseases, and especially in that of malaria. Dr. Charles Finlay, of Havana, in 1881, submitted some papers to L'Académie Royale des Sciences Médicales in Belgium, tending to prove that the mosquito under certain conditions may act as the transmitter of yellow fever, and has repeatedly since that time written in support of this belief. Quite recently Dr. Patrick Manson, who for many years has held the belief that the mosquito may ‘act as the intermediary host of *filaria sanguinis hominis*,’ has stated his opinion that the mosquito plays the part of the extracorporeal host of the *plasmodium malariz*. Koch, who has just returned from East Africa, where he has been studying the clinical and etiological aspects of malaria under peculiarly favorable circumstances, is in agreement with these views. He bases this agreement on the ground that mosquitoes are always prevalent wherever malaria prevails, and he mentions one locality in which, mosquitoes being absent, there is no malaria, although the conditions are otherwise favorable to its production. Big-nami last year published a paper in which almost identical conclusions were drawn. Referring to the observations of Smith and Kilborne, he drew attention to an example of a disease of the blood due to an intracorpuseular parasite and inoculated into cattle by a suctorial insect, and went on to say: ‘Malaria behaves itself with regard to man as if the malarial germs were inoculated by mosquitoes.’ As long ago as 1893 Marchiafava repeatedly asserted in private his belief in this mode of transmission of malaria, but he did not publish this view, as what he regarded as a positive demonstration was wanting.” It may be remarked that many sound medical men have held that much of our summer sickness is due to the prevalence of a pest not quite so commonly

objurgated as the mosquito—the ordinary house-fly. It takes no scientific observer to remark that this omnipresent pest battens upon every form of accessible filth, and the ordinary “man in the street,” who is no scientist at all, may easily conclude that nothing but poison is procurable from such sources, and that that poison must somehow get into the human system, since there is no escaping the contact of the agency by which it is carried about.

THE X-RAY AS A SCIENTIFIC DETECTIVE.

Every fresh case of a conflict between fraud and the law strengthens the conviction that the law ought to depend upon Science more than it does just now in support of the objects of justice. The X-rays, it is apparent to everybody, are instruments for truths as valuable as the phonograph, and when one considers the immense importance of securing truth in all *post-mortem* or *post-factum* questions, it is a matter for regret that the value of this aid to the determination of disputed questions has not been recognized by the law. The value of the X-rays in surgery has been abundantly demonstrated; but while we feel no surprise at the ability of the powerful searchlight to detect the presence of dense substances in semi-transparent fibre, we were not prepared to hear that it would enable us to distinguish between wholesome and unwholesome constituents in food products. But that the X-rays must prove of immense service to human health in this way is now placed beyond the pale of doubt. Practical experiment has been made regarding the detection of the adulteration of flour, as we learn from the *American X-Ray Journal*. How the proof was arrived at is thus told:

“Drs. La Besse and Bleunard placed on an ordinary photographic plate of gelatin-bromid a small pasteboard box, of rectangular shape, from which the top and bottom were removed, retaining, consequently, only the lateral walls, of about one centimeter in height. They divided the box into two equal parts, by means of a small rectangle of convenient dimensions, cut from a visiting-card. This done, they then filled one of the compartments with pure flour, the other with adulterated flour, removed with precaution the separating partition, and lightly tapped the box with a finger, so as to fill up the small empty space, which fills with flour without sensible mixture. The whole was covered with a sheet of tinfoil, with a very narrow rectangular slit cut in it, and placed perpendicularly to the section of separation between the two flours. Exposed to the action of the X-rays, the adulteration was disclosed.

“The presence of 3 per cent. of foreign mineral matter in flour, com-

posed of equal weights of very fine sand and chalk, was ascertained. The adulteration can be detected much easier when the proportion of mineral matter is greater."

The experimentalists say: "It is possible, once the fraud is known, to tell with considerable exactness the quantity of mineral matter introduced. It suffices to compare the tint obtained with an increasing scale of tints, obtained by introducing into pure flour known quantities of foreign mineral matter. Tints vary with the nature of the mineral matter employed in the adulteration, and this method of quantitative analysis can only be approximate."

CABLE-CUTTING IN WAR-TIMES.

We may leave to international jurists the ethical question involved in the severance of ocean cables, as a war measure, by the power able to effect it, but the technical aspect of the subject is of more general interest. This is well set forth by a writer on electricity :

"The grappling for and cutting of a submarine cable are by no means a simple matter unless the ship undertaking this work is provided with all the necessary apparatus. A ship of war usually relies upon what is known as the cutting grapnel to destroy a cable unless it is desired to utilize one section of a cut cable for communicating purposes. In such an event the cable, after being caught in an ordinary grapnel, is brought on board the ship, where it is severed, the end in control of the enemy being securely fastened to a buoy and dropped overboard. Through the other end messages may be transmitted wherever desired, providing the vessel is equipped with suitable transmitting and receiving apparatus. When it is merely desired to part a cable in deep water, a cutting grapnel is lowered and the vessel steams slowly backward and forward at right angles to the line of cable. As soon as the latter is hooked it slips, by means of pulleys, between two heavy knives or teeth, and the strain in lifting causes the teeth to close and bite off the cable."

Book Notices.

THE SACRED BOOKS OF THE EAST, translated by various Oriental Scholars, and edited by the Rt. Hon. F. Max Muller. American Edition. Vol. I.—The Upanishads; translated by Rt. Hon. F. Max Muller. Part I., pp. ci. 320. Part II., pp. lii. 350. Vol. II.—The Sacred Laws of the Aryas. Translated by George Buhler. Part I. Apastaua and Gautama. Second edition, revised, pp. lxiii. 314. Vasistha and Bandhayana, pp. xlv. 360. The Christian Literature Company, New York, 1898. Price, \$2.50 per vol.

In this our day and generation, when the human mind, the *curiosum ingenium* of which Seneca speaks, athirst to know the *what* and the *whence* of things—the *why* and the *whither* are too often neglected—leaves nothing unsearched or unquestioned, from the tiniest microbe to the boundless universe, it were to be expected, to be hoped for, that religion, the relation of man to his Maker, should form one of the first and most absorbing subjects of inquiry. Though one may deprecate the errors and misleading theories into which so much of what is termed the study of comparative religion has fallen, it must be allowed that much good has come of it on the whole, and the cause of truth, historical, philosophical and religious, has been thereby advanced. Foremost on the side of gain has been the bringing to light the original documents on which the ancient ethnical religions are historically and speculatively based; and, next to this, the placing those documents, by translation, within the reach of students not themselves specialists in the original languages. For, as Professor Max Müller has aptly said, “how people might or could or should have elaborated religious ideas is a topic most warmly discussed among psychologists and theologians, but a study of the documents, in which alone the actual growth of religious thought can be traced, is much neglected.” To have removed reasonable grounds for such neglect by a modernized yet faithful rendering of those documents stands to the credit of scholars like the one just mentioned and his colleagues.

Leaving out of consideration the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, it appears that the only great and original religions which profess to be founded on Sacred Books and the manuscripts whereof are extant are:

1. The religion of the Brahmans.
2. The religion of the followers of Buddha.
3. The religion of the followers of Zarathustra.
4. The religion of the followers of Khung-fû-Zze.
5. The religion of the followers of Lao-Zze.
6. The religion of the followers of Mohammed.

Until Professor Max Müller and his colaborers, some twenty years ago,

began the series of English translations since so well known under the general caption, "The Sacred Books of the East," the documents on which these great ethnical religions are based were, on the whole, accessible only to the learned few. Up to the present, moreover, this splendid set of volumes—which have increased, by the way, from the number, twenty-four, originally contemplated, to about forty—having necessarily, from their special character, a limited sale, were beyond the reach of the impecunious. The publishers of the two volumes quoted above have undertaken to bring out an American reprint of the English edition at a price that brings the work within the means of students unfavored by fortune, whilst the typographical and general material excellence of the original are retained. The order of the volumes in the English edition has been improved on in the reprint. In the former the first part of the Upanishads appeared in the first volume, the second part in the fifteenth. In the first of the two volumes above these two parts have been brought together. In the second volume above, Professor Bühler's translation of the Sacred Laws of the Aryas are united. In the original they are divided between the second and the fourteenth volumes.

Readers who have derived their knowledge of the cults of the Far East, especially of Brahmanism and Buddhism, from summaries or lectures in which the gems and pearls of Oriental thought are strung together as though they represented the essence of Indian religion, will have their notions shocked when they come to study the authoritative source by finding themselves obliged to wade through pages of matter which, as Max Müller admits, "is not only unmeaning, artificial and silly, but even hideous and repellent" (p. xii.), before coming across a thought that is beautiful or inspiring. "No doubt," as the same learned authority remarks, "there is much in these old books that is startling by its very simplicity and truth, much that is elevated and elevating, much that is beautiful and sublime; but people who have vague ideas of primeval wisdom and the splendor of Eastern poetry will soon find themselves grievously disappointed. It cannot be too strongly stated that the chief, and in many cases the only interest of the Sacred Books of the East, is historical; that much in them is extremely childish, tedious, if not repulsive." Indeed, though we have the assurance that the present translations are "truthful and unvarnished," yet there are some passages of the original that "could not be rendered into modern language without the appearance of coarseness" (p. xxi.). The translator has felt obliged to leave some of these unrendered, the original being given, when necessary, in a note.

The spirit in which the earnest student should take up the study of comparative religion has been so aptly expressed by Cardinal Newman that we can find no better illustration than his words of the value of the Sacred Books of the East. "We know well enough, for practical purposes, what is meant by Revealed Religion—viz., that it is the doctrine taught

in the Mosaic and Christian Dispensations and contained in the Holy Scriptures, and is from God, in a sense in which no other doctrine can be said to be from Him. Yet if we would speak correctly we must confess, on the authority of the Bible itself, that all knowledge of religion is from Him, and not only that which the Bible has transmitted to us. There never was a time when God had not spoken to man, and told him to a certain extent his duty. We are expressly told in the New Testament that at no time He left Himself without witness in the world, and that in every nation He accepts those who fear and obey Him. It would seem, then, that there is something true and divinely revealed in every religion, all over the earth, overloaded as it may be, and at times even stifled, by the impieties which the corrupt will and understanding of man have incorporated with it ; so that Revelation, properly speaking, is a universal, not a local gift. The Word and the Sacraments are the characteristics of the elect people of God ; but all men have had more or less the guidance of Tradition, in addition to those internal notions of right and wrong which the Spirit has put into the heart of each individual. This vague and uncertain family of religious truths, originally from God, but sojourning without the sanction of miracle, or a definite home, as pilgrims up and down the world, and discernible and separable from the corrupt legends with which they are mixed by the spiritual mind alone, may be called the *Dispensation of Paganism*, after the example of St. Clement of Alexandria. And further, Scripture gives us reason to believe that traditions thus originally delivered to mankind at large have been secretly reanimated and reinforced by the communications from the unseen world ; though these were not of such a nature as to be produced as evidence, or used as criteria and tests, and roused the attention rather than informed the understanding of the heathen. The book of Genesis contains a record of the Dispensation of Natural Religion or Paganism, as well as of the patriarchal. Job was a pagan in the same sense in which the Eastern natives are pagans in the present day. He lived among idolators, yet he and his friends had cleaned themselves from the superstitions with which the true creed was beset ; and while one of them was divinely instructed by dreams, he himself at length heard the voice of God out of the whirlwind, in recompense for his long trial and faithfulness under it. There is nothing unreasonable in the notion that there may have been poets and sages or sibyls again, in a certain extent divinely illuminated, and organs through whom religious and moral truth was conveyed to their countrymen ; though their knowledge of the Power from whom the gift came, nay, and their perception of the gift as existing in themselves, may have been very faint and defective" (The Arians of the Fourth Cent., p. 81).

Those who take the enlightened view thus vividly reflected by Cardinal Newman from the mind of the early Christian Fathers, have a key to the meaning of the Ethnic religions and to the genius of their mixed charac-

ter—a key unsupplied by the modern evolutionary hypothesis put forth by Professor Max Müller in his very able and interesting Preface to the present series of the Sacred Books. This is not the place to enter on a polemic against that hypothesis in the connection in point, but it may be the place to protest against the following comparison which the learned Professor forces into his text: “There are certainly many passages in the Vedic writings which prohibit the promiscuous communication of the Veda, but those who maintain that the Brahmans, *like Roman Catholic priests, keep their sacred books from the people*, must have forgotten,” etc. (p. xxii.). (Italics ours.) Isn't it marvellous that even in a work of this kind room could be found for such a calumnious slur at Catholicism? Is it possible that Professor Max Müller, who is in other respects justly recognized as one of the most learned of contemporary scholars, believes that the Roman Catholic priests keep their sacred books from the people? Does he not know that the principal of those books exist in modern translations, procurable, together with the originals, at the book-shops, and that the rest of them are open to any one that can read their simple Latin?

Lastly, there is one aspect in the study of comparative religion that ought not to be passed over in the present notice. In alluding to it we may borrow the words of one who has written eloquently on this subject, and to whom, also, we owe the above extract from Cardinal Newman. We refer to Mr. W. S. Lilly. Protesting against a certain suspicion that has fallen in these studies, he says: “No intellectual pursuit is without its dangers. Knowledge in any department into which the mind of man can penetrate is but learned ignorance unless she is conscious of her own imperfection—her need of help from that ‘wisdom which is from above,’”

A higher hand must make her mild,
If all be not in vain, and guide
Her footsteps, moving side by side,
With Wisdom, like the younger child.

True is this of the knowledge made accessible to us by the volumes of which I have been speaking, as of all knowledge. For the rest, it seems to me that the religious mind, while reverently and gladly recognizing in these non-Christian systems such verities, theological and ethical, as they present—remembering, with St. Augustine, ‘*Nec quisquam præter Te alius est Doctor veri ubicumque et undecumque claruerit*’—will be inspired with thoughts of devout thankfulness to the Giver of all good, who, according to the expression of the Prince of the Apostles, has called us into ‘His admirable light.’ An admirable light, indeed! How admirable we shall best understand by comparing it with the surrounding darkness, fitfully relieved by here and there a bright beam of truth, in which so incalculably vast a proportion of the children of men have been shrouded. Why we have thus been distinguished, thus made to differ from others, is of course a mystery—one of the countless mys-

teries which surround us in the order of Grace, as in the order of Nature. Here, as at every step we take in any of the paths of life, all our speculations may well lead us to the conclusion, O altitudo divitiarum sapientiæ Dei! quam incomprehensibilia sunt judicia ejus, et investigabiles viæ ejus." (*Dublin Review*, July, 1883.)

This mental attitude which sees in the Non-Christian Religions the fainter glimmerings of that Divine Light which has shone in a larger fullness in the Christian Dispensation is as far removed from that evolutionary standpoint which looks at all Religions as merely different phases in the development of the religious consciousness, as it plainly is from a pharisaical temper that finds in its own more favored possession of truth an occasion for despising those of the great human family whom the All Father has less richly blessed. Christianity proves itself historically to be a new and distinct revelation—a revelation, too, that is final, never to be superseded by any other—superadding to the ancient religious beliefs and laws a higher order of truths and duties, amongst which the obligation of accepting that revelation as delivered and entrusted to definitely selected messengers for propagation to all men until the end of time. This, however, is a thesis whose development here would carry us too far afield, and, besides, is not essential to our present scope of vindicating the attitude of the Christian mind to the Religions whose documentary bases is given in the present works. A word, however, should be said, in conclusion, as to the special contents of the two volumes at hand. The former contains the more important *Upanishads*. The precise meaning of this term is uncertain, as the reader of Max Müller's learned discussion will find, but it is used here to designate a treatise in connection with the Sacred Books of the Veda. If we call the Vedic books the ancient Aryan Bible, the *Upanishads* are theological and philosophical treatises speculatively involved therefrom. Their theology is Monotheistic, their philosophy—called the *Vedantic*, because expressing the end of the Vedas—is Monistic or Pantheistic. Of the hundred and eight *Upanishads* now in possession of Sanscrit scholars, Professor Max Müller presents in this volume the translation of the twelve most important. They have special value for the student of philosophy who seeks for the early development of Eastern pantheism. The second volume above gives a translation of the Sacred Laws of the Aryas, that is, the traditional rules of conduct as interpreted in the more celebrated schools of ancient India—*Apastamba*, *Gautama*, etc. The rules, here laid down and explained often at to us tedious length, cover almost every detail of life, private, domestic, public—entering into minutiae that remind us of the Chinese Book of Rites, or the to us trivialities of the ceremonial features of the Talmud. One wanders over page after page without coming across a thought worthy of carrying away. Nevertheless, the collections of these laws of life have their historic value in showing the simple manners of the people they regulated. Higher, however, still is their worth in evoking in the Christian

heart a feeling of gratitude to the Providence that has given us gratuitously the inestimable liberty of the fuller Truth that has made us free.

F. P. S.

LES ORIGINES DE LA PSYCHOLOGIE CONTEMPORAINE, par D. Mercier, Prof. Ord. de la Fac. de Phil. et Lettres, Directeur de l'Institut sup. de philos. a l'Université de Louvain. Louvain, Institut, 1 Rue des Flamands. 1897, pp. xii.-486. Pr. 5 francs.

Amongst those who have labored most earnestly in recent years at the revival of Scholasticism and its adaptation to the present condition of physical science, the author of the work at hand deserves prominent mention. The founder of the Higher Institute of Philosophy at the Louvain University, his work there in empirical psychology has commanded attention far beyond the limits of his own country. The *Revue Neo-scholastique*, a quarterly which he established in 1894 in connection with the Institute, has been of great value in disseminating the results, speculative and experimental, of his own labors and those of his associates at Louvain. Besides this, he has under publication an extended course of philosophy, the Psychology of which has been particularly well received in European circles to which Catholic philosophy had hitherto gained but little access. The comment of the *Revue Scientifique* in this connection is worth quoting as illustrating both the estimation which Neo-scholasticism in general and M. Mercier's endeavors in particular are gaining in quarters not likely to be biased in their favor. "The Neo-Thomistic school has rejuvenated scholastic teaching by imbibing thoroughly the true peripatetic spirit; it abandons all teachings that had been founded on an insufficient knowledge of nature and takes advantage of modern discoveries, studying them according to the Aristotelian method. The vitality of this philosophy is so great that it is able to assimilate the results of contemporary research in psychology and psycho-physics without making any concession, without emasculating science, as is done daily in the ordinary analogous books. Far from fearing the investigations of physiologists, it regrets that their studies on the nervous system, the localization of functions and the senses, are not more developed; for in all these it recognizes indispensable auxiliaries. M. Mercier congratulates the promoters of physiological psychology for having renewed traditions which an interval of several centuries had broken" (Tom. LI. 1893). The fact that M. Mercier's work at filling up and rounding off the more abstract system of sound philosophy with the concrete results of experimental sciences proceeds *sans faire aucune concession*, is likewise emphasized by the reception given to his Psychology by the Catholic press of France and Germany. Passing over the minor opuscula, which the author has published in the same spirit on particular philosophical topics, we come to his latest work in this order, his present history of modern psychology. The purpose and spirit of this work cannot be better indicated than by its opening paragraph. "The point of view we have taken," says Dr. Mercier, "is that of the philosophy of Aristotle and of the masters of

Scholasticism. But whilst and because we are penetrated with the genuine peripatetic spirit, we would hold ourselves in constant relation with the science and the thought of our contemporaries. The Middle Ages excelled in the contemplation of general truths; but seekers in the modern age are marvellously equipped for the work of analysis, in which they show no less patience than sagacity. Is it not the task, plainly indicated, of a philosophy already ancient that would live again in the actual world, to confront the wisdom of the ages passed with the new scientific conquests and with the teaching accepted to-day? From the faithful accomplishment of this task is it not lawful to augur progress?"

From this view point the author takes up the study of the contemporary psychology. The beginnings he finds in the psychology of Descartes. The Father of modern philosophy brought about a revolution in fundamental thought by his excessive dualism—his sundering of human nature into two principles, body and soul, not united in the union of entity, substance and personality, as the old philosophy taught, but accidentally conjoined, the body being organized independently of the soul, and the latter located in the pineal gland of the brain as the extrinsic mover of the corporal mechanism. The author follows the result of this dualism. On the one hand the excessive Spiritualism worked itself out in a short time into the Occasionalism and Ontologism of Malebranche, the Pantheism of Spinoza and the excessive Idealism and consequent Scepticism of Locke, Berkeley, Hume and Kant. The other side of the Cartesian Dualism mingling with the Idealism just mentioned, and developing another phase of thought, the Sensism of Locke and Hume in England and of Conillac in France, resulted, through the mediation of Kantism, in Positivism and Agnosticism.

The fundamental problem of psychology is to give an adequate explanation of the relation between body and soul, between the physical and the psychical in human consciousness. M. Mercier examines the theories of the avowed masters of contemporary psychology as to this problem—Herbert Spencer in England, Alfred Fouillée in France, Wilhelm Wundt in Germany—and shows wherein they fall short of a satisfying solution. In each of these representative thinkers he traces the influences of the Cartesian philosophy. The same influences are discernible generally in the modern intellectual world. Descartes restricted psychology to the study of *thought*. At present the *facts* of consciousness are held to constitute the sole sphere of psychology. Metaphysics, and consequently what was formerly known as *rational psychology*, is almost universally abandoned. In its stead is given *idealistic criticism*, whose one object is to determine the limits of thought. Under this influence psychology tends evidently to Idealistic or Subjective Monism. On the other hand, the excessive Mechanicism of Descartes manifests itself in that phase of experimental psychology which considers psychic phenomena on its purely quantitative side.

Having thus far set forth the characteristics and evolution of Cartesian psychology, the author exposes, in opposition to its one-sided *rationalistic* aspect, the scholastic totality of *anthropology*. To the excessive empiricism resulting from Cartesianism he opposes the tempered empiricism of the traditional philosophy. The first four chapters in which the matter is thus unfolded are mainly expository. With the fifth the more critical side of the work begins. First the Idealism that sprang from the Cartesian psychology is criticised. Then the other extreme, the excessive "mechanicism," and thirdly the blended result of the two extremes, agnostic-positivism, are similarly handled. The eighth and closing chapter studies the Neo-Thomistic movement within the Catholic schools, narrating its history, and demonstrating how the old philosophy, with its reasonable conception of human nature as one entity coalescing from the substantial union of the material and spiritual co-principles, adapts itself perfectly both to the rational and the experimental sides of psychology, and can therefore only profit by the results of modern scientific research.

As an appendix to the work is given a table showing the present state of psycho-physiological studies in America—the Institutions, courses, equipments and resulting works. One who takes a general survey of these indications of intense devotion to what is known in physiological psychology may be skeptical as to the net advantage of it all, and may even suspect that more skepticism and materialism are likely to result. It may fairly be questioned whether the minds of the young men and women of our generation are sufficiently strengthened by sound philosophy and supernatural faith to withstand the natural, even though not essential, effects of a psychology that either ignores or denies the existence of a spiritual soul. But be this as it may, rather if this suspicion be really a judgment confirmed by experience, for this very reason it is imperative on Catholic philosophers to be masters of the "new psychology," that they may be able both to point out its errors and excesses and to assimilate its facts and legitimate inferences to their own system. Dr. Mercier is one of those philosophers who is alive to this duty and is performing it in a way that deserves praise. His present work, by setting forth the good and the bad in contemporary psychology, and by showing how the former lends itself readily to Catholic philosophy, whilst the latter finds therein its antidote, commends itself as a strong auxiliary to the cause he advocates.

PRACTICEONES DOGMATICÆ QUAS IN COLLEGIO DITTON-HALL HABEBAT CHRISTIANUS PESCH, S. J. Tom. VIII. Tractatus I de Virtutibus in genere. II de Virtutibus Theologicis. Friburgi, Herder (St. Louis, Mo.), 1898, pp. x.-314. Price, \$1.85.

With the present volume Father Pesch's course of Dogmatics comes within one step of completion. Another volume, promised for next year, treating of Sin and the Consummation of the Universe, is still

needed to conclude the series. The present volume unfolds the dogmatic science of the supernatural virtues in general, and of Faith, Hope and Charity in particular. By way of illustration of the author's method of treating these abstruse subjects, we select almost at random his analysis of the Act of Faith (p. 126).

An analysis of the Act of Faith is the logical resolution of that act into its component principles or causes, just as chemical analysis is the chemical resolution of a compound into its simple elements. Philosophy distinguishes four classes of causes—material, formal, efficient, final. The final cause of the act of faith, like that of any supernatural virtue, is, of course, the beatific vision. The material cause is the human intellect. The formal cause (internal) is the free, firm assent to a revealed truth, motivated by authority of God, the revealer. The efficient cause is the intellect as eliciting the act, the will as commanding the act; Divine grace is the stimulating and assisting principle. This seems simple enough, but the analysis does not touch sufficiently the influence, which is partly efficient and partly externally formal, of the object of faith. The object here is understood to be the formal, not the material object. The formal object or motive of faith is, of course, the divine authority. But here is the difficulty. The divine authority and the fact of revelation are not immediate truths, but rest on rational proofs; and this would seem to relegate the act of faith ultimately to human reasoning, and thus to destroy its character as divine and supernatural faith and reduce it to an act of science. The answer is that the preambles to faith—the knowledge of the veracity and infallibility of God, and the fact of His revelation—are not the formal motive of faith, but conditions previous to faith, and hence the analysis of faith does not touch them as constituent elements. But still the question arises, How can the certitude of the act of faith be greater than the certitude of assent to the preambles of faith? The answer is, Because the certitude of the act of faith is not produced by the preambles, but by other causes. There is a twofold certitude in faith—that, namely, of infallibility, and that of adhesion to the truth revealed. The absolute infallibility of faith is produced by supernatural grace, which essentially excludes all error from the act of faith. The certitude of adhesion, which excludes all voluntary doubt, is produced by the command of the will, aided by grace. Hence the certitude of faith comes partly from the aid of grace, partly from the determination of the will; whilst the motives of credibility affect this certitude only by applying the formal motive, without whose presence in thought the will could not command the firm assent of the intellect. Father Pesch, after drawing out various aspects of this objection and its solutions, thus summarizes the analysis of the act of faith, using the first person: “I believe, for instance, the Trinity, because God has revealed it. I believe God's revelation, because He is the *prima veritas*, and the revelation made by the *prima veritas* I believe, *quia prima veritas est*. Here

the matter ends as regards the objective side of faith. As to its subjective aspect, the cause of faith is the will elevated by grace. I believe because I wish to believe, and I wish to believe because I have realized that it is reasonable and right to believe. Inquiry as to the *motive* can go back no further. Yet it might be asked, How do I know that God is the *prima veritas* , and that he has revealed the truth proposed, so that I have made up my mind that it is reasonable and right to accept that truth? The answer is, I know all this through the motives of credibility, which are various—external and internal, objective and subjective. These motives, however, do not enter into the specification of the act of faith, but precede it and only prove its reasonableness." Hence they do not reduce faith to the category of science.

The analysis of the act of faith thus extracted from the author's text suffers, of course, by our condensation and rendition into English, which is a medium less pliable to abstruse subjects than scholastic Latin. The philosophical mind, moreover, would push the analysis further and deeper. To do so, however, would carry the matter from the province of theology into that of critics, psychology and ontology, just as physical analysis of a material compound carries the process from the domain of chemistry to that of pure physics. The author analyzes within the theologian's sphere, and therein thoroughly and satisfactorily. Indeed, when one takes up any of the splendid volumes of Father Pesch's course one feels like congratulating students of theology in this generation on the possession of such a broad, solid, scholarly help in the pursuit of their studies. The number of works of this class is considerable, but the present is certainly amongst the very best; and besides, what should not be overlooked in this connection is, in view of its excellent typography, paper and binding, it is procurable at a reasonable price.

F. P. S.

THE HISTORY OF THE POPES, from the close of the Middle Ages, drawn from the secret archives of the Vatican and other original sources. From the German of Dr. Ludwig Pastor, Professor of History in the University of Innsbruck. Edited by Frederick Ignatius Antrobus, of the Oratory. Volume V. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd.; received from Benziger Brothers, New York. Price, \$3.00 net.

In accordance with his praiseworthy custom of dividing the bulky volumes of the German edition into two of his own, Father Antrobus has given us, in this fifth volume, the first half of Pastor's third volume. The disadvantage of leaving the Borgian Pope in the middle of his wretched career is compensated for by the convenience of handling the book. Probably it was just as well to give us the unsavory record on the plan of instalments. This volume, taken in conjunction with the four preceding, teaches us by what steps it became possible for the sacred office of the Papacy to fall a prey to the base greed of a Borgian. How that unprincipled man abused his powers and how the Church of God succeeded in ridding herself of his baneful dynasty can be related in the volumes still to appear.

The Pontificate of Alexander VI. may well be termed the nadir of the Papacy. The few unworthy Pontiffs who had occupied the Throne of the Fisherman before the time of Alexander had risen to power by means external to the Church ; for the most part, had been thrust into the sublime office by the secular arm. Alexander, on the contrary, was the free choice of a venal College of Cardinals, who openly sold their votes for place and money. It was the will of God that His Church, which had survived every other trial in the course of ages, should now prove her ability to survive the sorest of all, the domination of the Borgias during thirteen wretched years. Having come forth from this trial unscathed, it is difficult to foresee what new instrument of torture the infernal powers can bring to bear upon her.

Those who gloat over the crimes and misfortunes of the human race, those who seek to palliate their own sins, or their apostasy, by dwelling upon the delinquencies of Christ's ministers, will find ample material for the satisfaction of their perverse instincts in the too well founded admission of "Rome's Official Historian" that "the rehabilitation of Alexander VI. is a hopeless task." No doubt the changes will be rung upon this theme during the next few years by all the enemies of the Catholic Church. This skeleton in the Papal closet will be repeatedly brought forth to frighten poor unsophisticated souls in search of truth. People who never heard of the immortal Alexander III., or of the other illustrious Pontiffs who have deserved well of the Christian religion and of humanity, will be made thoroughly familiar with the painful fact that once upon a time there was a Pope whom even good Catholic writers admit to have lived and died a carnal sinner.

But every lover of the truth must give even the Borgia his due. When we have deplored the elevation of a man of loose morals to the saintliest office in the world, when we have acknowledged that Alexander was far more solicitous for his temporal dominion and for the advancement of his children than for the vastly more important spiritual interests of the Church, we have made admissions to the full extent of our historical warrant. The darker charges against him (the true charges are serious enough) are being relegated to the limbo of exploded myths.

We have only to repeat the remark we made upon the appearance of the German edition : Dr. Pastor is chiefly concerned with the personal history of the Popes. In his pages we can catch but faint and dubious glimpses of the real work of the Church, which possesses as many centres of activity as there are souls to be sanctified by her teachings and sacraments. An unworthy Pope can no more retard the progress of the Catholic Church than a President elected by fraud and governed by self-seeking politicians can stop the wheels of industry of our great Republic. As well the Church as the solidly founded commonwealth possesses abundant resources for self-regeneration, without having recourse to unlawful revolutions. An unworthy ruler now and then is of invalu-

able benefit to a community by emphasizing the necessity of perpetual vigilance.

Father Antrobus, as might have been expected, has performed his work of translating and editing with consummate skill and fidelity. The translation has all the ease and grace of an original composition. The typographical setting is attractive and free from mistakes. We are proud to possess so valuable a work in our language.

A MANUAL OF CATHOLIC THEOLOGY. Based on Scheeben's "Dogmatik." By *Joseph Wilhelm, D. D., Ph. D.,* and *Thomas B. Scannell, B. D.* Vol. ii. Large 8vo, pp. 566. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Until quite recently we had few or no works of Catholic Theology in English. We do not know the reason. No doubt several reasons could be brought forward, but we doubt very much if any of them, or all of them together, would be sufficient. With the exception of Moral Theology, which, for prudent reasons, it might not be well to print in the vernacular, lest the weak and ignorant should be scandalized or misled, well-read churchmen contend that the books of the Church should be published in the language of the people. This would apply to Church History, Canon Law, Introductions to the Sacred Scriptures and Commentaries on them, Liturgy, Philosophy and Dogmatic Theology. Those who make this assertion point to the practice of other countries, and particularly Italy, France and Germany. They call attention also to the help which theological students and priests would derive from such publications, while they assert that the educated members of the laity would use them for their own great benefit and the advancement of holy religion. We shall not enter into the controversy concerning the relative merits of Latin and English text-books for theological students, but the practice of other countries and the publication of the present work and others of a like character should be considered in deciding that controversy. We believe that theological students and priests will welcome their old friends in a new dress, and we know that the laity are pleased beyond measure at the wealth of knowledge that is now being laid at their feet. And how abundantly this wealth has been poured out in recent years by author and publisher is evident to any one who reads the announcements of new publications. The Stonyhurst Series of Manuals of Philosophy, Father Hunter's "Outlines of Dogmatic Theology," a'Lapide and Piconio on the Gospels and Epistles, Schanz's "Christian Apology," Hettinger's "Revealed Religion," and many other similar works give some faint idea of what has been done in this direction.

But let us turn our attention to the latest addition to this noteworthy group.

In 1890 the first volume of "Scheeben's Dogmatik" in English came from the press. The work was already famous in the original German,

and Cardinal Manning introduced it to English readers with words of the highest praise. He said: "Dr. Wilhelm and Father Scannell have conferred upon the faithful in England a signal boon in publishing Scheeben's scientific *Dogmatik* in English, and condensing it for careful and conscientious study. . . . The great value of Scheeben's work is in its scientific method, its terminology, definitions, procedure and writing. It requires not only reading, but study, and study with patient care and conscientious desire to understand. Readers overrun truths which they have not mastered; students leave nothing behind them until it is understood. This work needs much conscientious treatment from those who take it in hand."

We feel sure that if the Cardinal were living to-day, he would speak as highly of the second volume as he did of the first, and he would add the same words of warning in regard to its use. The work is now complete. It is not a mere outline, but a complete technical course of Dogmatic Theology such as students for the priesthood generally follow. For that reason it will hardly appeal to lay persons. For such Father Hunter's "Outlines of Dogmatic Theology" would be more suitable. But for those who have taken a course of Philosophy and Theology, or who are engaged in those studies, and who wish to read or study Dogmatic Theology in English, we can safely say there is nothing better than this book.

It is excellent even from a mechanical point of view. The paper, the type, the arrangement of headings and subheadings, the marginal guides to the text—all are admirable, and add not a little to the attractiveness and usefulness of the work.

We understand that eight years were allowed to elapse between the publication of the first volume and the second, because the demand for the first did not warrant the bringing out of its companion. It must have been because the work was not sufficiently well known. It is to be hoped that the complete work will receive the patronage which it deserves, and which will encourage author and publisher to continue to labor on the same lines.

PASSION FLOWERS; poems by Father Edmund, of the Heart of Mary, C.P. (Benjamin D. Hill), author of "A Short Cut to the True Church; or, The Fact and the Word." 12 mo., pp. 210. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This volume contains poems published by Father Edmund twenty years ago under the title "Poems, Devotional and Otherwise." The author republishes some of them now in the present volume at the request of friends, readers of the *Ave Maria*, and *litterateurs* of well-merited reputation. He has revised and improved them, and added to them a narrative poem in two parts, entitled "Hermenegild; a Passion Flower of Spain." This collection is called "Passion Flowers" because it contains lyrics and sonnets either in honor of the Passion of Christ or in some way connected with it. Two other volumes are to follow, called

“A Wreath for Mary,” containing pieces in her honor, and “Poems of Affection and Friendship.” It is clear, then, that Father Edmund is not a new nor an untried poet. For thirty years he has been studying and writing poetry with the firm belief that he can teach men in verse. His great model is Horace, the faultless master of poetic form. He has chosen him because there is neither affectation nor obscenity in him. These are cultivated by modern profane poets without exception, and even by some sacred ones; but they were not fashionable in the classic age, when accuracy and strength marked the productions of the Greeks and Latins.

We ought to be profoundly grateful to Father Edmund for having the courage to say to youthful versifiers, “Poetic form was not invented in order to conceal thought, but to express it.” What would be thought of a man who expressed himself so obscurely in prose that his fellows would have to form themselves into organizations to search for his meaning? And yet that is exactly what many of our modern poets have done, and are doing, and no doubt will go on doing as long as they can find persons silly enough to try to understand them. Such poems remind one of the advertisements of worthless articles which are printed upside-down in the papers in order to draw attention to them.

Father Edmund does not belong to that class. He wishes to teach in his poems the same truths he preaches from the pulpit. He makes poetry the handmaid of religion, as all the fine arts should be. He does this, not by sacrificing anything of art, because he follows the examples of the best ancient and modern poets as far as they are worthy of imitation, but he Christianizes them. They sing of human passions, he sings of the Divine Passion; they adore Jupiter, he worships Jehovah; they sound the promises of Venus, he honors Mary.

We owe much, very much, to our modern Christian poets, and especially to our poet priests, for bringing back this handmaid of religion to her true mistress. She never went away willingly—she was stolen. She was never happy in the service of Paganism. She sang perforce, but there was always a false ring to her song. Now, however, in the home of the mistress of her heart, she sings divinely.

Father Edmund's poems are all good, but we quite agree with him that the gem of the collection is the “Sonnets On the Way of the Cross.” They are truly poetic and devotional.

The book is handsomely made in every respect, and both in material and form is worthy of unlimited patronage.

HISTORY OF THE ROMAN BREVIARY. By *Pierre Batiffol, Litt.D.* Translated by Atwell M. Y. Baylay, M.A. 12mo, pp. 392. London: Longmans, Green & Co. Received from Benziger Brothers.

This is one of the most interesting books of the year for clerics and all who are interested in Church history. We learn the history of the Church not only from the lives of her Divine Founder, his apostles and

their successors, but also from her liturgy in regard to the Mass, the Sacraments and the Divine Office. Nor is the account of the institution, gradual development, modification and final perfection of this great public prayer the least important chapter in that grand history. This truth has been realized long before the present day, and the subject has been well treated by able men on many occasions. Hence we have the works of Cardinal Bona, Cardinal Tommasi, Thomassin, Dom Guéranger, and Monsignor de Roskovany. More recently the "Manual" of M. Batiffol has been placed before the French reader, and the English translation of this book is now before us.

The author says that although he calls his manual a "History of the Roman Breviary," he does not pretend to treat so great a subject exhaustively in so few pages. His object has been rather to summarize, and on some points to state more precisely, and as clearly as possible, the results of the labors of the learned writers who have preceded him. In summarizing these results, however, he has in every case verified them by reference to original sources, and corrected them wherever he found them at fault. A full history of the Breviary is not possible, because the necessary books and documents have not been preserved. But an exhaustive use of the material which we have would produce a work far exceeding the bounds of many such manuals as this one.

In this instance the author has attempted to popularize the subject without detracting from it. His aim has been to meet it principally from the standpoint of the Christian archæologist and the history of Christian literature. Hence he has avoided those practical questions of ritual which depend either on moral theology or on the decisions of the Congregation of Rites. He has endeavored, while tracing back the history of the Breviary to its beginning, to express the beauty and excellence of the Roman office, and those who are best fitted to judge concede that he has succeeded.

The translator has worked in conjunction with the author, and has produced not a mere translation of the original, but a new, revised and enlarged edition of the former work. He seems to have done his part of the work well, although we have not the French book for comparison. In its English dress the work is very attractively gotten up, and it should have the effect of making the Breviary better known to persons not already familiar with it, and of increasing the love of those who already know it.

THE CHURCH AND THE LAW, with special reference to Ecclesiastical Law in the United States. By Humphrey J. Desmond, of the Michigan Bar. Chicago; Callaghan Co., 1898, pp. 132.

Mr. Desmond, as an author, has an eye for the practical. His "Mooted Questions of History" supplied just what a large number of inquirers, especially among Catholics, were looking for: that is, clear and succinct answers to historical objections that have unfortunately be-

come part of the heritage of non-Catholic minds, and seem to cling to their lodgment with all the pertinacity that associates itself with religious prejudice. To that eminently useful little book he now adds another, no less—in some ways even more—serviceable. In the development of the two orders—religious and civil—the inter-relations, of one to the other, and of individuals, organizations and institutions in one to the correspondents in the other, have given rise to various laws and legal decisions regulating such relations. Mr. Desmond has gathered together these regulations so far as they bear upon the status of things in our country. A brief statement of the subjects thus concerned will suffice to indicate the value of a summary of this kind. There is, for instance, the attitude of the Federal Constitution and the individual State Constitutions in regard to the origin of Civil Authority, Religious Liberty, Sectarian Instruction. These subjects are surely of universal interest. Still more practically important, however, is a knowledge of the decisions of the courts in the various States in respect to the Seal of the Confessional, Bequests to Charity, Parental Rights as regards Schools, Custody of Children, etc.; the laws and enactments concerning Marriage and Divorce, Church Property, its Tenure and Taxation, the Church Pew, the Pulpit, the Cemetery, etc. On these and other kindred questions of a like complex character the author furnishes the reader with compact and exact information. The value of such a manual for the clergy is self-evident. For the lawyers its importance is equally manifest. To the general reader, especially the Catholic, for whom the book is principally intended, it offers a convenient digest of just such knowledge as he frequently looks for yet has hitherto been unable to find except by consulting a thoroughly informed lawyer or by hunting through many out-of-the-way volumes.

BUDDHA'S TOOTH, worshipped by the Buddhists of Ceylon in the Pagoda called Dalada-Maligawa at Kandy. Printed by L. Doneda, Codialbail Press, Mangalore, 1898, pp. 82.

The thoroughly experienced naturalist can reconstruct, with the suggestion given him by a small fossil fragment, the entire framework of the original, even though now extinct, organism. It were interesting to know what a Cuvier would build up on "Buddha's Tooth." The "Tooth" is now a bit of yellow ivory, about two inches long by half an inch in diameter. Fancy Buddha's oral cavity if it accommodated such a tooth! And what must the Buddha himself have been if built in proportion! The origin of the cultus paid at Kandy in Ceylon to this famous relic of Gautama is lost in the twilight of fable. The story, however, of its political and financial fate and import is a matter of history which is clearly narrated in the present booklet. Whether the Buddha ever possessed such a mammoth-like dental instrument or not history does not record, but what it does say is that the present bit of ivory is utterly spurious. The original "tooth" described by

Marco Polo in 1284 as *great and thick*, and which the Mahomedans associated with Adam, was doubtless itself a fraud; it certainly was ground in a mortar, burnt, and the ashes strewn in the running waters by the Portugese Archbishop, Dom. Gaspar, in 1560. A fraudulent substitute was, however, imposed on the superstitious natives by the cupidity of the prince, Don Francis, and the native king, Wickrama-Bahu. The fortunes of this spurious relic have been of political and commercial significance, but it is sad to think of it as an object of the religious pomp and reverence bestowed on it in the Kandyan pagoda.

DE PROHIBITIONE ET CENSURA LIBRORUM CONSTIT. "OFFICIORUM ET MANERUM" LEONIS, PP. XIII. ET DISSERTATIO CANONICO-MORALIS. Arthuri Vermeersch, S. J. Altera editio, aucta et recognita. Desclee, Lefebvre et Soc., Tornace et Romæ, 1898, pp. 125. Pr. 1½ francs.

So comprehensive and succinct a document as the recent Constitution of Leo XIII. on the *Index*, that is, on the prohibition and censuring of books contrary to faith and morals, must of necessity give rise to many canonical and moral questions demanding interpretation in accordance with the teaching of Ecclesiastical jurisprudence and the principles of Ethical science. The author of the present little work, a member of the Society of Jesus and professor of Moral Theology and Canon Law at Louvain, has supplied such an interpretation. He gives first the Constitution in full, then some general notions as to its scope, obligatory power, etc. The three succeeding chapters deal (1) with the books and other works proscribed—those that are absolutely, those that are conditionally forbidden, those that are *de se suspecti*, yet legally allowed, etc.; (2) with the laws of censure of works proscribed; (3) with the sanction of the prohibitory measures and with the faculties accorded to individuals of reading and retaining forbidden works. On each of these subjects a large number of details demand elucidation and development. These the author supplies, relying, of course, not simply on his own judgment, but using judiciously the arguments and opinions of reliable authorities. The work appeals mainly to the clergy, who, in their capacity as guides of souls and as interpreters and defenders of ecclesiastical discipline, must have exact information on the matter, scope and obligation, interior and exterior, of the Church's laws. Such information, pithily expressed, conveniently disposed and excellently printed, they will find in this pamphlet.

GIRLHOOD'S HANDBOOK OF WOMAN. A Compendium of the Views of Eliza Allen Starr, Madeleine V. Dahlgren, Eleanor C. Donnelly, F. M. Edselas, Elizabeth Budd Smith, Mary Josephine Onahan, Anna T. Sadlier, Katherine E. Conway, Rose Hawthorne Lathrop, Helen Grace Smith, Mary Elizabeth Cronyn, Jane Campbell, on Woman's Work—Woman's Sphere—Woman's Influence and Responsibilities. Revised and edited by Eleanor C. Donnelly. St. Louis, Mo.: 1898. Published by B. Herder, 17 South Broadway. 203 pp. Price (retail), 80 cents.

The complete list of eminent authors included in the title will assure

the reader of the excellence of this little volume. This is "Woman's Age"; and Catholic girls can scarce afford to be careless watchers of an aggressive movement in which they themselves should mingle, in order both to shape its plans and to profit by its progress. Their modesty, purity, piety, culture, are all needed as sweet influences that may at once restrain and stimulate—for the movement is begetting vagaries as well as virtues. The little book contains essays on the influence and place of Women in Literature, Art, Philanthropy, Society, Finance, Politics, the Middle Ages, the Religious Orders; on Wifehood and Motherhood; on "The Liberties of our Daughters"; on "The Normal Christian Woman"; on "The Apostolate of the Convent Alumna"; and a sonnet on "Motherhood's Responsibilities." What better equipped or more sympathetic writers on such topics could be found?

STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY. By *Rev. Reuben Parsons, D.D.* Vol. IV. Centuries XVII.—XVIII. Royal 8vo. Pp. 623. New York: J. Pusted & Co. 1897.

The third volume of Dr. Parsons' "Studies in Church History" was reviewed at length in the *QUARTERLY* for July, 1896. The writer on that occasion spoke of the author, his qualifications, methods and work in the highest terms. The latest volume of his history justifies all that was then said. It is the only book in the English language treating exhaustively of controverted points of Catholic Church history. It has no rival, and probably it never will have one. It is a good work well done, and it should be appreciated.

The present volume brings the work down to the close of the eighteenth century, and the next volume will complete it.

The student will find here many interesting subjects. Among them are Galileo, Jansenism, Gallicanism, Freemasonry, Voltaire, and the "Constitutional Clergy" of France.

COMMENTARIUM IN FACULTATES APOSTOLICAS EPISCOPIS necnon Vicariis et Præfecti-
Apostolicis per modum Formularum concedi solitas ad usum venerabilis cleri, imprimis Americani concinnatum ab *Antonio Konings, C. SS. R.* Editio Quarta, recognita, in pluribus emendata et aucta, curante *Joseph Putzer, C. SS. R.* New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1897. Price, \$2.25 net.

This latest and possibly most valuable work of the lamented Father Konings, the ripe fruit of his long years of study and experience, comes to us in a fourth edition, so thoroughly revised and rewritten by Father Putzer as almost to make us doubt whom we should designate as the chief author. The subjects discussed are the most difficult and important that confront our clergy in the course of their spiritual ministrations, and regarding which it is perilous and disgraceful to be misinformed. We consider it the duty of every priest in charge of

souls to possess himself of Father Putzer's admirable Commentary, and to become intimately acquainted with its contents. An occasional hour spent in perusing it may prevent many a serious mistake.

KATHOLISCHES EHERECHT, mit Beruecksichtigung derim Deutschen Reich, in Oesterreich, der Schweiz und im Gebiete des Code Civil geltenden staatlichen Bestimmungen. Von *Dr. Joseph Schnitzer*. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, \$2.75 net.

This is a complete reworking of Weber's treatise on Matrimonial Impediments, which is indeed so revolutionized as to form an entirely new work. It would be difficult to conceive anything more perfect of its kind, being at the same time eminently practical, and, through the running commentary of its foot-notes, backing up every statement in the text by setting forth the authorities upon which they are based. A similar book, with special reference to our local legislation, is a crying need; for there is no subject on which modern statecraft has more widely departed from the injunctions of the Gospel than that of the Sacrament of Matrimony. All the more need of inculcating those Catholic principles which form the very pillars of society.

L'INDEX. COMMENTAIRE DE LA CONSTITUTION APOSTOLIQUE "OFFICIORUM."
Par *M. L'Abbe G. Peries*. Paris. 1898.

This is a succinct exposition, by the late Professor of Canon Law in the Catholic University at Washington, of the legislation of the Church on the important subject of the supervision of printing. The learned author throws his treatise into the shape of a running commentary on the recent pontifical constitution in which the ancient laws of the Index have been revised to suit the circumstances of modern life. The author's aim is eminently a practical one, and a copy of the valuable little book ought to be found in every episcopal curia.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

HYPNOTISM EXPLAINED. By *Rev. Louis F. Schlathoelter*, pastor of the Immaculate Conception Church, Moberly, Mo. For sale by the author, Rev. L. F. Schlathoelter, Moberly, Mo. Price, in fancy cloth, \$1.00, postpaid.

LIFE OF THE VERY REVEREND FATHER DOMINIC, of the Mother of God (Barberi), Passionist, Founder of the Congregation of the Passion in England and Belgium. By *Rev. Piers Devine*, Passionist. 12 mo, pp. 297. London: R. Washburne. New York: Benziger Brothers.

- CHARACTERISTICS FROM THE WRITINGS OF CARDINAL WISEMAN. By *Rev. T. E. Bridgett, C.S.S.R.* 12mo, pp. 302. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- SISTER ANNE KATHARINE EMMERICH, of the Order of St. Augustine. Translated from the French by *Rev. Francis X. McGowan, O.S.A.* Originally written in German by *Rev. Thomas Wegener, O.S.A., Postulator Causa.* 12mo, pp. 317. Price, \$1.50.
- THE MISTAKES OF INGERSOLL. By *Rev. Thomas McGrady*, St. Anthony's Church, Bellevue, Ky. 12mo, pp. 344. Price, \$1.00. Cincinnati: Curts & Jennings.
- BEYOND THE GRAVE. From the French of *Rev. E. Hamon, S.J.* By *Anna T. Sadlier.* 12mo, pp. 300. Price, \$1.00. St. Louis: B. Herder.
- EPOCHS OF LITERATURE. By *Conde B. Pallen, Ph.D., LL.D.* 12mo, pp. 200. Price, 75 cents. St. Louis: B. Herder.
- INSTRUCTIONS FOR FIRST COMMUNICANTS. From the German of *Rev. Dr. J. Schmitt.* 12mo, pp. 288. Price, 50 cents. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- SHORT LIVES OF FRANCISCAN SAINTS. 12 mo, pp. 205. London: R. Washburne. Received from Benziger Brothers.
- SONGS AND SONNETS, and Other Poems. By *Maurice Francis Egan.* New enlarged edition. 12mo, pp. 220. Price, \$1.00. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- BEFORE THE DAWN. A Book of Poems, Songs and Sonnets. By *Joseph Leiser.* 12mo, pp. 145. Buffalo: Peter Paul Book Co.
- SONGS OF TWO PEOPLES. By *James Riley.* 12mo, pp. 131. Boston: Estes & Lauriat.
- FACTS ABOUT BOOKWORMS, Their History in Literature and Work in Libraries. By *Rev. J. F. X. O'Connor, S.J.* Illustrated. 12mo, pp. 87. New York: Francis P. Harper.
- MARIOLATRY; New Phases of an Old Fallacy. By *Rev. Henry G. Ganss*, of Carlisle, Pa. 12mo, pp. 308. Paper, 25 cents. Notre Dame: Ave Maria.
- CANON SCHMID'S TALES. 3 vols., 16mo. Each, 25 cents. New York: Benziger Brothers.



