UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE
3 1761 07097118 9

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

ST. BASIL'S SEMINARY LIBRARY TRANSFERRED

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE TORONTO LIBRARY

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

Under the Direction of
MOST REV. PATRICK JOHN RYAN, D. D.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS, RT. REV. MGR. J. F. LOUGHLIN D. D., REV. JAMES P. TURNER AND MR. JOHN J. O'SHEA.

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 XXV.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1900.

PHILADELPHIA:
211 SOUTH SIXTH STREET.

Entered according to Act of Congress,
in the year 1899,
By Benjamin H. Whittaker,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at
Washington, D. C.

JAN 3 1962

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE
Alexander VI., The Election of—Right Rev. Mgr. J. F. Loughlin, D. D. 252
Anglican Convents, On—I. S. 47
Anglo-Saxonism and Catholic Progress—B. J. Clinch 723
Arbitration, Industrial—Rev. René Holaind, S. J. 109

Barrett, O. S. B., Dom M. The Story of the Scottish Reformation 350, 584, 738
Besant, S. J., Rev. J. F. The Sacrifice of Masses 548

Campbell, D. D., Right Rev. Mgr. J. A. The Year of Jubilee . . 240
Campbell, D. D., Right Rev. Mgr. J. A. Virgins Consecrated to God in Rome During the First Centuries 766
Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere—Right Rev. Mgr. J. F. Loughlin, D. D. 133
Catholic Church in Its Relation to Material Progress, The—Rev. R. F. Clarke, S. J. 791
Catholic Church in Ontario, The—Thomas O'Hagan, Ph. D. . 15
Catholic Progress, Anglo-Saxonism and—B. J. Clinch 723
Century of Irish Immigration, A—H. J. Desmond 518
Church and the Church Property in the Island of Cuba, The—J. I. Rodriquez 366
Church, Penitential Discipline in the Early—Very Rev. J. Hogan, S. S., D. D. 417
Clarke, S. J., Rev. R. F. The Catholic Church in Its Relation to Material Progress 791
Clinch, Bryan J. Anglo-Saxonism and Catholic Progress 723
Clinch, Bryan J. Imperialism in the Philippines 209
Commission on the Greek Ordinal in the Seventeenth Century, A—Right Rev. Abbot F. A. Gasquet, O. S. B. 625
Constitutio de Iubilæi Indulgentiis 169
Council of Ten System in Irish National Education, The—J. J. O'Shea 565
Cuba, The Church and the Church Property in the Island of—J. I. Rodriquez 366
Cuthbert, O. S. F. C., Rev. F. St. Francis of Assisi and the Religious Revival in the Thirteenth Century 657

De La Salle, Rise of the Christian Schools—C. M. Graham 456
Desmond, H. J. A Century of Irish Immigration 518
Dickinson, Edward. The Modern Musical Mass 264

PAGE
Ecclesiastical Studies, On—Leo XIII.................... 56
Education, The Council of Ten System in Irish National—J. J. O'Shea.................... 565
Education of Catholic Indian Youth, Government Secularization of the—R. R. Elliott.................... 148
Election of Alexander VI., The—Right Rev. Mgr. J. F. Loughlin, D. D.................... 252
Elliott, R. R. Government Secularization of the Education of Catholic Indian Youth.................... 148
Essay in Physiological Psychology, An—J. J. Walsh, M. D.... 497

Faith, Imagination and—Rev. Vincent McNabb, O. P........ 106
Fate of Historical Falsification, The—Rev. H. G. Ganss....... 72
Francis of Assisi and the Religious Revival in the Thirteenth Century, St.—Rev. F. Cuthbert, O. S. F. C.............. 657

Ganss, Rev. H. G. Sir Thomas More and the Persecution of Heretics.................... 531
Ganss, Rev. H. G. The Fate of Historical Falsification....... 72
Gasquet, O. S. B., Right Rev. Abbot F. A. A Commission on the Greek Ordinal in the Seventeenth Century........... 625
Gildea, D. D., Very Rev. W. L. Canon. The Religion of Shakespeare.................... 229
Government Secularization of the Education of Catholic Indian Youth—R. R. Elliott.................... 148
Graham, C. M. Rise of the Christian Schools: De La Salle... 456
Greek Ordinal in the Seventeenth Century, A Commission on the—Right Rev. Abbot F. A. Gasquet, O. S. B.......... 625

Heretics, Sir Thomas More and the Persecution of—Rev. H. G. Ganss.................... 531
Heterodoxies and Inconsistencies of Russian Orthodoxy, Some—Rev. R. Parsons, D. D.................... 675
Hogan, S. S., D. D., Very Rev. John. Penitential Discipline in the Early Church.................... 417
Holaind, S. J., Rev. René. Industrial Arbitration............ 109

Imagination and Faith—Rev. Vincent McNabb, O. P........ 106
Immigration, A Century of Irish—H. J. Desmond........... 518
Imperialism in the Philippines—B. J. Clinch................ 209
Indian Youth, Government Secularization of the Education of Catholic—R. R. Elliott.................... 148
Indulgences, Suspension of.................... 176
Industrial Arbitration—Rev. René Holaind, S. J............. 109

PAGE
Irish Immigration, A Century of—H. J. Desmond........... 518
Irish National Education, The Council of Ten System in—J. J. O'Shea.. 565

Jubilee, The Year of—Right Rev. Mgr. J. A. Campbell, D. D.. 240

Kenricks: Their Early Environment, The Two—J. J. O'Shea.. 697
Kublai Khan; or, The Popes and the Tartars—L. J. Markoe... 1

Lee, C. S. Sp., Rev. George. Tennyson's Religion........... 119
Loughlin, D. D., Right Rev. Mgr. J. F. Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere.................................... 133
Loughlin, D. D., Right Rev. Mgr. J. F. The Election of Alexander VI.. 252

Making of Religion, The—Rev. Joseph V. Tracey............ 30
Markoe, L. J. Kublai Khan.............................. 1
Masses, The Sacrifice of—Rev. J. F. Besant, S. J............. 548
McDermott, C. S. P., Rev. George. Lord Russell of Killowen. 636
McNabb, O. P., Rev. Vincent. Imagination and Faith....... 106
Modern Musical Mass, The—Edward Dickinson............. 264
More, Sir Thomas and the Persecution of Heretics—Rev. H. G. Ganss.. 531

Negro Demoralization, Race War and—Rev. T. F. Price 89

O'Donovan, S. T. L., Rev. L. Was St. Paul in Spain?....... 391
O'Hagan, Ph. D., Thomas. The Catholic Church in Ontario.. 15
Ontario, The Catholic Church in—Thomas O'Hagan, Ph. D... 15
Ordinal in the Seventeenth Century, A Commission on the Greek—Right Rev. Abbot F. A. Gasquet, O. S. B........ 625
O'Shea, J. J. The Council of Ten System in Irish National Education.. 565
O'Shea, J. J. The Two Kenricks: Their Early Environment.. 697
O'Shea, J. J. University and School in the late Spanish Colonies.. 329
O'Sullivan, D. Proposed Reformation of the Calendar by the Russian Astronomers.................................. 757
O'Sullivan, S. J., Rev. D. T. Scientific Chronicle....394, 604, 812

Parsons, D. D., Rev. R. Some Heterodoxies and Inconsistencies of Russian Orthodoxy.............................. 675
Paul in Spain? Was St.—Rev. L. O'Donovan, S. T. L........ 391

PAGE
Penitential Discipline in the Early Church—Very Rev. J. Hogan, S. S., D. D. 417
Persecution of Heretics, Sir Thomas More and the—Rev. H. G. Ganss 531
Philippines, Imperialism in the—B. J. Clinch 209
Physiological Psychology, An Essay in—J. J. Walsh, M. D. 497
Popes and the Tartars, Kublai Khan; or, The—L. J. Markoe .. 1
Price, Rev. T. F. Race War and Negro Demoralization 89
Proposed Reformation of the Calendar by the Russian Astronomers—D. O'Sullivan 757
Psychology, An Essay in Physiological—J. J. Walsh, M. D. 497

Race War and Negro Demoralization—Rev. T. F. Price 89
Reformation, The Story of the Scottish—Dom. M. Barrett, O. S. B. 350, 584, 738
Religion, The Making of—Rev. Joseph V. Tracey 30
Religion of Shakespeare, The—Very Rev. W. L. Canon Gildea, D. D. 229
Rickaby, S. J., Rev. J. Ritual in the Reign of Maximin 437
Rise of the Christian Schools: De La Salle—C. M. Graham 456
Ritual in the Reign of Maximin—Rev. J. Rickaby, S. J. 437
Rodriquez, J. I. The Church and the Church Property in the Island of Cuba 366
Rome During the First Centuries, Virgins Consecrated to God in—Right Rev. Mgr. J. A. Campbell, D. D. 766
Rovere, Cardinal Giuliano della—Right Rev. Mgr. J. F. Loughlin, D. D. 133
Russell of Killowen, Lord—Rev. George McDermott, C. S. P. .. 636
Russian Orthodoxy, Some Heterodoxies and Inconsistencies of —Rev. R. Parsons, D. D. 675

Sacrifice of Masses, The—Rev. J. F. Besant, S. J. 548
Scientific Chronicle 184, 394, 604, 812
Shakespeare, The Religion of—Very Rev. W. L. Canon Gildea, D. D. 229
Sicily, A Summer in—A. E. P. R. Dowling 477
Story of the Scottish Reformation, The—Dom M. Barrett, O. S. B. 350, 584, 738
Summer in Sicily, A—A. E. P. R. Dowling 477
Suspension of Indulgences 176

Taunton, Rev. E. L. Thomas, Cardinal Wolsey, Archbishop of York 289
Tennyson's Religion—Rev. George Lee, C. S. Sp. 119

PAGE
Thomas, Cardinal Wolsey, Archbishop of York—Rev. E. L. Taunton 289
Tracey, Rev. Joseph V. The Making of Religion 30
Two Kenricks: Their Early Environment, The—J. J. O'Shea .. 697

University and School in the late Spanish Colonies—J. J. O'Shea 329

Virgins Consecrated to God in Rome During the First Centuries—Right Rev. Mgr. J. A. Campbell, D. D 766

Walsh, M. D., James J. An Essay in Physiological Psychology 497
Was St. Paul in Spain?—Rev. L. O'Donovan, S. T. L 391
Wolsey, Thomas Cardinal, Archbishop of York—Rev. E. L. Taunton 289

Year of Jubilee, The—Right Rev. Mgr. J. A. Campbell, D. D .. 240

BOOKS REVIEWED.

PAGE
Altchristlichen Kunst und Liturgie in Italien—Beissel 412
Autobiography of St. Ignatius—O'Conor 619
Biblical Treasury of the Catechism—Cox 622
Biblische Studien—Bardenhewer 624
Brownson's Middle Life—Brownson 415
Carmel in England—Zimmerman 206
Catechism Explained, The—Spirago 200
Catholic Church in the New England States, The 620
Christian Philosophy: God—Driscoll 621
Codification des Canonischen Rechts—Laemmer 623
Compendium Juris Canonici—Meehan 623
Daily Thoughts for Priests—Hogan 201
Dante Allighieri, The Life and Works of—Hogan 204
Dawn of a New Era—Carus 192
Ecclesiastical Dictionary—Thein 617
Enarratio in Canticum Canticorum—D. Dionysius Cartusianus 203
Eve of the Reformation—Gasquet 409, 820

PAGE
Father Anthony—Buchanan.......... 828
Forschungen zur Christlichen Litteratur—Ehrhard.......... 614
Francis of Sales, St.—DeMargerie.......... 618
Geschichte der Weltliteratur—Baumgartner.......... 831
History of Modern Philosophy in France—Levy-Bruhl.......... 192
History of the Devil—Carus.......... 830
Holy Bible, The.......... 207
Jesuit Relations, The..........415, 616
Julien l'Apostat—Allard.......... 615
Kirchen Lexicon—Wetzer & Welte.......... 623
Leaves from St. Augustine—Allies.......... 411
Life of St. Mary Magdalen de Pazzi—Isoleri.......... 831
My New Curate—Sheehan.......... 414
New Footsteps in Well-Trodden Ways—Conway.......... 414
Oxford and Cambridge Conferences—Rickaby.......... 413
Peter in Rome, St.—Barnes.......... 830
Sacerdos Rite Institutus—Petit.......... 202
Savonarola, Fra Girolamo—Lucas.......... 199
Science and Faith—Topinard.......... 192
Sibylline Oracles, The—Terry.......... 205
Studies in Church History—Parsons.......... 613
Studies in Literature—Egan.......... 207
Souvenir of Loretto Centenary.......... 412
Testament of Ignatius Loyola, The.......... 619
Theologia Moralis—Sporer.......... 622
Tractatus de Rubricis Missalis—Van der Stappen.......... 207
Via Crucis—Crawford.......... 405
Was Savonarola Really Excommunicated?—O'Neil.......... 407
What is Liberalism?—Pallen.......... 205

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XXV.—JANUARY, 1900.—No. 97.

KUBLAI KHAN: OR, THE POPES AND THE TARTARS.

FROM the nineteenth century back to the thirteenth is decidedly a long leap to take, covering a distance of six hundred years. In the eyes of many of us, in these latter days of enlightenment, it is a step backwards from an age of progress and refinement to a time of darkness, ignorance and barbarism. Many, even amongst Catholics, carried away by history falsely so-called, consider the thirteenth century as suffering from an effete ecclesiasticism, and lacking that vigor, civilizing energy and spirit of advancement which are said to characterize our own glorious times. For the benefit of all such persons, as well as for our own consolation and encouragement, and in the interests of truth and justice, we propose to give a brief, though necessarily very superficial, sketch of the remarkable reign of a Tartar chief of the thirteenth century, and of his relations with the Popes who reigned successively during his own long occupation of the imperial throne in his vast Asiatic empire.

We have all heard, in a general way, of the Tartar hordes of Asia, and have a somewhat vague idea of their savagery and cruelty towards any who dared to oppose their progress or to dispute their despotic sway. These strange people may be said to have reached the zenith of their power and the utmost extent of their conquests during Kublai Khan's long reign of thirty-five years. They will, therefore, be seen at their best, and in all the flush of triumph during that period.

On the other hand, the Papal power was then recognized amongst Christians as supreme in Western Christendom, and in the Second

---

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1899, by Benjamin H. Whittaker, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

Council of Lyons it was again acknowledged by the Greek Christians of the Orient, thus reuniting all Christendom under one central authority as a grand Christian Commonwealth. This Commonwealth was threatened on one side by the Saracens, under the sway of Mahometanism; on the other by the Tartars, composed of a strange medley of all religions or of none.

Kublai Khan, or Chi Tsou, as he is called in China, was born in the year 1216 of the Christian era. In the year 1251 Mangu Khan, whose father was the fourth son of the great Genghis Khan, was proclaimed Grand Khan, or Emperor, of all the Tartars. He gave the general command of Oriental Tartary and of those provinces of China which were already conquered by the Tartars to Kublai, who was his brother; the territory from the river Gihon, or Oxus, to China he entrusted to another chieftain named Ilwadi and a son of the latter named Massoud, and to Argoun Aga he gave command of Khorasan, Hindostan, Persia and all the provinces which the Tartars had already wrested from the grasp of the Mahometans, extending to Syria and Asia Minor. This distribution of territory gives us some insight into the vast extent of the Tartar Empire at this time. We shall find it still further extended under the approaching reign of Kublai Khan. In the same year Mangu Khan sent a general named Holotai to subjugate Thibet. This country was devastated with fire and sword, and its cities and strongholds were razed to the ground.

In 1253 the King of Armenia, whose people had just been reconciled to the Holy See, came to Mangu's court and acknowledged the latter's suzerainty over his kingdom, securing for the churches of Armenia exemption from taxation by the Tartars. Whilst at the Tartar court the Armenian King submitted certain plans for conquering various countries and especially the Mahometans. Mangu Khan was generally reported to be himself a Christian, but the truth of this report could never be definitely ascertained. But, however this may be, he entered zealously into the enterprise of subjugating or exterminating the Mahometans, and, in pursuance of this purpose, he decided to organize simultaneously three great armies: one to be sent against Corea, another into Hindostan by way of Cashmere and the third against the Ismaelians or Assassins of Persia and the Caliph of Bagdad. We will confine ourselves chiefly to the fortunes of the Great Khan's brother, Kublai.

Having, as stated, been named by his brother as Governor of the eastern portion of the immense Tartar Empire, Kublai entered Northern China, penetrated into the province of Tse Chuen, subjugated the kingdom of Tali in the province of Yun Nan and completed the conquest of Thibet. Having successfully accomplished this herculean task, he now set himself to the achievement of a far more difficult undertaking, namely, the civilizing and refining of his own people, the Tartars or Mongols. He became imbued with a great desire to arouse and cultivate in them a taste for the sciences and, as we shall see presently, to turn their minds to literature and commerce. In this undertaking he had almost insuperable obstacles to overcome. Up to this time these hordes had merely made transitory and predatory incursions into China. Lack of subsistence and scarcity of military strongholds rendered their existence there still precarious. With characteristic energy and foresight the great general set himself to work to overcome these immense difficulties in the way of accomplishing his noble scheme.

This would seem to have been in line with the policy of Mangu Khan, Kublai's superior, who sought to consolidate his conquests in China and to attach the conquered people to himself. With this object in view, Mangu had caused large stores of provisions to be established in the conquered territory and rebuilt several of their cities which had been destroyed during the war of conquest. He had forbidden his troops to ravage the country, paid damages for the devastations which had already been committed and pushed his severity so far as to punish with death some of his higher officers who had transgressed his orders in this respect, and chastised one of his own sons who had crossed over some cultivated fields. Meanwhile he became impatient for the completion of the conquest of China, and, after regulating his affairs at home, he set out for that country in person. Having heard certain reports which made him suspicious of his brother Kublai, who had made himself loved and respected by the Chinese, he deposed him from the Governorship. Acting on the wise counsel of his Minister, Kublai came to meet his brother alone and without protection, cast himself at his feet and offered him his wives, his children, all his possessions, and his life itself. Mangu was moved to tears by this scene, raised up his brother and embraced him weeping, restored to him his entire confidence and instructed him to go forth with a yet stronger army to make further conquests. Not long afterwards, as Mangu was himself advancing with three army corps, he was killed in an assault upon a city on the 10th of August, 1259, at the age of fifty-two and in the ninth year of his reign.

In the following year, 1260, Kublai was solemnly proclaimed Emperor in a general assembly of the Tartars, thus succeeding his brother in the highest office at the disposal of his people. Mangu had founded in 1256 the new city of Kai-ping-fou, peopled with

Chinese and Tartars or Mongols, which was nearer to China and more conveniently situated for holding the general assemblies and for hunting and fishing.

The Tartars were now masters of Pekin, which they had conquered from the King dynasty—other Eastern Tartars whom the Mantchus of the present day acknowledge as their ancestors. These people had already driven the Song dynasty across the Kiang or Blue river, where they had now taken refuge. Kublai, far from yielding to a natural ambition to conquer the remainder of China, of which he already ruled more than one-half, made peace proposals to these people, who had established their court at Nankin. But, after several ineffectual attempts to induce them to acknowledge his suzerainty by the payment of a light tribute, one of his ambassadors having been imprisoned and another assassinated, he finally resolved upon the destruction of the Song dynasty and the conquest of all China.

In 1267 his generals crossed the Kiang river. The war that was thus begun lasted for twelve years, the Tartars constantly gaining ground and the Chinese resisting with a determination and valor that have won for them the highest encomiums from historians of that epoch. But finally their Emperor—a child of only seven years—and his mother, who was regent of the Empire, with the entire court, were captured and brought in triumph to Pekin, where Kublai treated them with all the honors and consideration due to their rank. Two brothers of the defeated Emperor, who had made their escape, held out for some time longer, but finally died miserable deaths. This brought to an end the Song dynasty, which historians tell us had governed China for 319 years under eighteen emperors, and had been celebrated for its protection of and taste for the arts and sciences.

Kublai was now master of all China. He took the name of Chi Tsou, and, like Alexander of old, began to seek for new territory to conquer. He first turned his attention to Japan. He prepared a fleet to transport thither one hundred thousand men. His fleet became the sport of the winds and waves, and its remnants were set upon by the men of the Japanese fleet, who massacred or took prisoners a prodigious number of Mongols and Chinese. Kublai seems never to have renewed his efforts in that direction. His generals brought under his dominion the kingdom of Pegu, and his fleets sought out and subjugated ten islands in the seas south of China. which were dignified with the title of kingdoms and amongst which was the large island of Sumatra.

As a result of all these conquests Kublai now found himself the direct ruler of China and Chinese Tartary, Pegu, Thibet, Tong King and Cochin China. Other kingdoms to the west and south of China and Leaotong and Corea to the north furnished tribute and troops. Furthermore, all the members of his family who reigned in Persia, Assyria, Turkestan, Great and Little Tartary, from the Dnieper to the Sea of Japan, and from the Indies to the frozen sea in the North, were his lieutenants and vassals and paid him annual tribute as the Emperor of the Mongols. A glance at the map will help us to form some adequate idea of this immense empire. No prince in history ever ruled over so vast a monarchy or governed so large a population. His empire exceeded in extent that of Alexander, of Rome, or of Genghis Khan himself.

But still more wonderful is the use that Kublai seems to have made of this great power. He resumed his design of civilizing and advancing his people. His generals had sold thirty thousand captives into slavery. He ransomed them. He devoted himself to the books of the Chinese, drawing thence wise maxims of government. He welcomed the learned, regardless of nationality or religion. He adopted the manners of the Chinese, which he found far superior to the barbarism and rough manners of his own people. Chinese historians speak disparagingly of him, but the historians of his own people sound his praises without stint.

He desired that the learned and men of science should be exempt from taxes and subsidies, and bestowed special honors upon them. He established the college of the Hanlin, the first literary tribunal of China. He spread abroad a taste for mathematics and encouraged the development of a new astronomy which was very superior to the system then in vogue amongst the Chinese. He established public schools in the principal cities of the Empire, and caused to be translated for the use and instruction of the public all the good Chinese books and a quantity of foreign works of India, Persia and Thibet.

He gave similar encouragement to agriculture. Two hundred Niutches or Oriental Tartars came to offer him the fish of their country. Fishing was their only occupation. He received them with kindness, but urged them to cultivate the soil, allotted lands to them and supplied them with oxen and all the necessary agricultural implements. He further ordered a commission to return with them to their own country and to furnish the same assistance to their fellow-countrymen.

Manufactures and commerce received from him a like patronage. Canals were dug in all the provinces. A multitude of vessels and sailing craft issued from the dockyards. He opened his ports to foreigners and established free trade, and merchants from Arabia, Persia and India carried on in the ports of Fo-Kien an extensive commerce with all China. And finally Kublai crowned all these great benefits by establishing for the Chinese a new code of laws far more humane and wise than they had been subjected to under other Tartars who had governed them.

Let us now look into the condition of Christianity amongst these people and study for a few moments the relations existing between these Tartar chiefs and the Holy See. The territory assigned by Mangu in 1251 to Ilwadi for conquest was intended eventually for his other brother, Hublagu, also, of course, a brother of Kublai. Hulagu's principal wife was a granddaughter of Wang Khan, more commonly known in Europe as Prester John. Better still, she was herself a Christian. Under her husband Hulagu the Christians enjoyed great consideration at court; their churches and monasteries were exempt from tribute or taxes, and they even had chapels and oratories in the camps of the Mongol prince. This prince annihilated the Assassins of Persia, sparing neither age nor sex. He in like manner destroyed the caliphate of Bagdad, sparing no one, his soldiers being gorged with blood and committing the most horrible atrocities in the conquered city. Thus perished on February 10, 1258, the last of the successors of Mahomet, six hundred and fifty-six years after this false prophet had begun his great seduction. About the year 1263 Hulagu received a new patent of investure from his brother Kublai, who had succeeded Mangu as Grand Khan of all the Tartars. In 1264 he held a general assembly at Tauris, at which were present the Mongol princes and generals and many Musselman and Christian princes—the two Davids, Kings of Georgia; Haton, King of Armenia; Bohemond VI., prince of Antioch, who was under the domination of the Mongols, and a large number of Georgian and Armenian princes. Hulagu died at the age of forty-eight years, in the month of January, 1265. He was succeeded by his eldest son, Abaka, who figures conspicuously in subsequent dealings with the Holy See. At the time of Hulagu's death, the natural daughter of Michael Paleologus, the Greek Emperor, was on her way to become his bride. The Tartars compelled her to remain and Abaka the son took her to wife.

The Tartars were now threatening Europe itself. Poland and Hungary seemed about to fall victims to their conquering spirit. Pope Alexander IV. wrote to the Christian princes and prelates urging a crusade against these hordes. Urban IV. urged on the same crusade in defense of Hungary and all Europe. Clement IV. pursued the same course. Preparations were begun for holding an œcumenical council to bring about a reunion with the Greeks, to press forward the crusade and, amongst other things, to protect Europe from the incursions of the Tartars who were threatening her borders.

During this time two Venetian merchants, the Polo brothers, had arrived in the dominions of Kublai. They were well received by the Emperor himself and resided in his dominions for seventeen years. Here we find the strange fact recorded in history that this great monarch, with the advice of his princes, selected these Venetian merchants and a lord of the Chinese Empire named Gogak to be sent on a special embassy to Clement IV., with instructions to ask that Pontiff to send to Kublai one hundred men learned and well instructed in the Christian religion, who could demonstrate that the faith of the Christians was to be preferred to all the diverse sects, that it is the only way of salvation and that the gods of the Tartars were demons who imposed upon the Orientals. For the Emperor, having heard much said of the Catholic faith, but seeing with what boldness the learned men of Tartary and China upheld their belief, knew not to which side to lean, nor which path to embrace as the true one. He requested, moreover, the ambassadors to bring back to him a little of the oil from the lamp that burned at Jerusalem before the Lord, persuaded that it would be not a little useful to him if Christ was the Saviour of the world.

After three years spent in the journey, the Tartar lord having remained on the way on account of illness, the other two ambassadors arrived at St. John d'Acre. Clement IV. having died meanwhile, they applied to Theobald, Archdeacon of Liege, who was then Apostolic Internuncio in Palestine. Acting upon his advice to await the election of a new Pope, they returned to Venice, their native city, where they waited for two years more, and then returned to St. John d'Acre, to Theobald the Archdeacon, who gave them letters for the Emperor, together with an exposition of the Christian faith.

Thus armed they set out upon their return to Kublai, but were immediately recalled with the information that Archdeacon Theobald had just been elected Pope under the title of Gregory X. The new Pope gave them other letters for the Emperor of the Tartars, and also added to their number two friars preachers, Nicholas and William Tripoli. The friars had instructions to enlighten the Tartars as to the truth of the Gospel. Marco Polo, son of one of the Polo brothers, states that their embassy was received with extreme benevolence by the Emperor, to whom they presented the Pope's letters and also the oil from the lamp of the Holy Sepulchre, which he caused to be kept in an honorable place.

One of the earliest acts of Gregory X. upon his arrival in Rome was to issue a circular letter convoking an œcumenical council, to be held in the city of Lyons, in France. The Holy Father arranged the objects of this council under three general heads, viz.: the Greek schism, the evil condition of the Holy Land, of which he himself had been an eye witness, and the vices and errors that were multiplying within the true fold.

The first session of the Second Council of Lyons was held on May 7, 1274. Between the third and fourth sessions our old acquaintances the Tartars again appeared upon the scene. It had been said of them by an eminent writer shortly before the opening of the council that they now persecuted only Hungary of all the Christian nations, and that they were aiding the Christians against the Saracens. Prince Edward of England had been led to rely upon their assistance in the Holy Land, and his return to England was in part due to their failure to furnish the expected help.

But now, on July 4, 1274, sixteen ambassadors from the Tartar chief Abaka, great-grandson of Genghis Khan, arrived to attend the council. Gregory X., desiring to show them special honors, directed the attendants of the Cardinals and prelates to go forth to meet them, and they were thus conducted into the presence of the Pope and the Cardinals in an apartment where they had assembled to discuss the affairs of the council. This embassy was sent to urge the old project of an alliance with the Christians against the Mahometans. The Khan's letter was read to the council at its fourth session, and later the Pope replied that he would send legates into Tartary to treat with the Khan, not only concerning the propositions that he had submitted to the council, but also other matters affecting his welfare.

The fourth session of the council presented a striking spectacle. The Pope was seated on his throne on a raised tribune, attended by a Cardinal as assistant priest, one as deacon, four other Cardinal Deacons and several chaplains in surplices. Near the Pope, upon the same tribune, was seated James, King of Aragon. In the nave of the church, in the centre upon raised seats, were two Latin patriarchs, Pantaleon of Constantinople and Opizon of Antioch; beside them the Cardinal Bishops, amongst whom was St. Bonaventure, and on the other side the Cardinal priests; then came the primates, archbishops, bishops, abbots, priors and other prelates in large numbers. Lower down were William, Master of the Hospital; Robert, Master of the Temple, with several brothers of their orders; the ambassadors of the Kings of France, Germany, England, Sicily and of several other princes. And last of all came the deputies of the chapters and churches. This had been the regular order in all the sessions. But on this occasion the Greek ambassadors were placed to the right of the Pope, beyond the Cardinals, and facing him were the Tartars composing the embassy sent by Abaka.

Here we behold the whole earth represented at the States-General of Christendom; the Holy Father seated amongst the representatives of the Christian Commonwealth as arbitrator of all their differences and common father of all, regardless of color or nationality. In vain has our boasted nineteenth century sought to produce such a scene as this. In our day we behold the scattered and warring remnants of this once united republic seeking in vain for some common arbiter acceptable to all and trusted by all. A lame attempt at something of the sort was recently made in the peace congress at The Hague, but from its sessions was carefully excluded the only person who was ever successful as arbiter of the world, the venerated Bishop of Rome, representative on earth of the Prince of Peace! Could we have a more striking and startling illustration of our deterioration as a family of States supposed to be united in a common brotherhood since the days of the so-called Dark Ages?

Still another strikingly picturesque scene was to mark the period of this council. One of the Khan's ambassadors and two other Tartars, perhaps moved by this wonderful spectacle of Christian unity, embraced the true faith, and on the 16th of July, 1274, the day of the fifth session of the council, they were solemnly baptized by the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia in the presence of the assembled prelates. The Holy Father caused the newly converted Tartars to be clothed in scarlet, after the manner of the Latins. After the close of the council the Pope dismissed the Tartar ambassadors with letters for the Khan. The Protestant historian Sismondi tells us that there were present at this council five hundred bishops, seventy mitred abbots and a thousand other religious and theologians.

Rohrbacher thus alludes to this great council: "The Second General Council of Lyons offered a spectacle unknown to profane antiquity: a great and holy Pontiff presiding over the States-General of the Christian race, to sanctify it within and to defend it without; around him his counsellors, superiors of the princes, equals of the kings; at his feet before him, to the number of more than a thousand, the ambassadors, the deputies of emperors, kings and princes and of the churches of God. Franks, Burgundians, Huns, Vandals, Goths, Herules, Lombards, Sarmatians, English, Normans, Slavs, the Barbarians and Scythians of other times are seated at the feet of the same father and Pontiff, with the descendants of the Gauls, Romans and Greeks as sheep and lambs reposing at the feet of the same shepherd; the Greeks come to abjure their spirit of division and to sing with all the world the same creed in the same words; the Tartars, masters of Asia, from Persia to China and Corea, are there represented by their ambassadors, one of whom by his example announces their future but distant conversion. . . . . Before, during and after the council the holy Pope Gregory X. labors to reconcile amongst themselves peoples and kings in Italy, in Spain, in France, in Germany, and everywhere hearts yield themselves to his gentle firmness, and he himself prepares to conduct Europe in arms to the assistance of the Christians of the Orient and to await heaven in the Holy Land, but heaven claims him in Italy and much sooner."

But the relations of the Popes with the Tartars did not end with the death of this saintly Pontiff. His successor, John XXI., had also a great desire to liberate the Holy Land from the yoke of the infidels. To urge on this project he sent nuncios all over the world, amongst others to the great Khan of the Tartars. Several Popes were elected and died in rapid succession after Gregory X. One of these, Nicholas III., during a short reign of about two years and eight months, manifested a deep and fatherly interest in the peoples of Europe, the Greeks and even the Tartars. Honorius IV. also had special relations with them. Finally, Nicholas IV. continued the chain of friendly intercourse that had been fostered under each succeeding Pontiff. Let us note in their proper order a few of the most important of these events.

Soon after the Second Council of Lyons, Abaka, Khan of Persia, sent a second delegation to the Holy See. They found John XXI. then reigning, by whom they were received in Rome. They passed into France in 1276, and finding Philip the Bold had taken the cross in the crusade, they promised him the assistance of the Tartars in the rescue of the Holy Land, if he would lead an expedition into Syria against the Saracens. But these ambassadors were not themselves Tartars, but Christians of Georgia, a country known to be subject to the Tartars, and for this reason the French seemed divided in opinion as to whether these men were real ambassadors or spies. They assured the Holy Father in the name of Abaka that he was inclined to receive baptism, and that his uncle, Kublai, was already baptized.

In consequence of this the next Pope, Nicholas III., sent five Friars Minor—Gerard of Prato, Antony of Parma, John of St. Agatha, Andrew of Florence and Matthew of Arezzo—to whom he gave special powers, principally for raising censures and granting absolutions and dispensations. They were the bearers of two letters—one of April 1, 1278, to King Abaka, whom the Pope exhorts to follow the example of his uncle, Kublai, in abandoning the worship of idols to embrace the Christian faith. He thanks him for his offers of assistance against the Saracens and earnestly commends to him his nuncios.

The second letter, dated from St. Peter's, but on April 12, bears the inscription: "To our very dear son in Jesus Christ, Kublai, Great Khan, Emperor and Moderator of all the Tartars, health and the apostolic benediction." Supposing the ambassador's story to be true and that he was a Christian, the Holy Father instructs him in the mysteries of the Incarnation and the Redemption, and upon the mission and divine authority of St. Peter and his successors to govern the universal Church and to lead into it all the peoples of the earth. He praises him—if the account of his conversion be true—for his excellence and wisdom as a leader of his people, and urges him to cherish and cause to fructify in himself the wonderful grace thus received from on high. In conclusion, he recommends to him the five missionaries whom he sends in compliance with his request to instruct him more deeply in the Christian religion.

All these remarkable facts of history would seem to place beyond question the kindly feelings of Kublai towards the Christians; but it is not so clearly established that he was himself baptized. And even in his letter to Kublai, Nicholas III. is careful to preface his eulogiums with the words "if it be true," or "if this be so," seeming to imply that he is not certain of the truth of the report, but rather hopes that it may indeed be true.

But this favorable disposition upon the part of the great Khan and his subordinates towards the Holy See afforded an excellent opportunity for zealous missionaries to penetrate into the immense camps of the warlike Tartars, and their labors bore abundant fruits in conversions to the faith. Other Franciscan missionaries converted so large a number of the Tartars upon the frontiers of Hungary that Nicholas III. ordered Philip, Bishop of Fermo, his Apostolic Legate in that portion of the North, to establish a bishop upon those frontiers in order to care properly for these newly converted people.

In 1285 Kublai and Argoun, Khan of Persia and son of Abaka, again sent ambassadors with new letters to Honorius IV. and to the Kings of France and Sicily to press upon them their favorite project of a concerted attack upon the Mahometans. Here let us go back a little.

Abaka, who had sent the sixteen ambassadors to present this scheme before the Council of Lyons, had been defeated in 1277 by the Sultan Bibars. In 1282 Abaka suffered another defeat before Edessa, which place he had besieged. He then retired to Hamadan (Ecbatana), where he celebrated the feast of Easter with the Christians. He died the following day, March 30, after a repast to which he had been invited. His vizier was suspected of having poisoned him. He left two sons, Argoun and Kandgiatu.

A brother of Abaka, Nikoudar, succeeded to the throne, to the exclusion of his two nephews just mentioned. He had been baptized in childhood by the name of Nicholas. Upon his accession to the throne he embraced Mahomedanism and took the name of Ahmed Khan. He worked zealously for the utter extermination of Christianity in his domains, destroying churches and exiling the Christians. His own relatives, however, even though not themselves Christians, held his apostasy in horror. In 1288 his nephew, Argoun, whom he had superseded upon the throne, rose in rebellion. He was defeated and placed in a close prison. In 1284 an emir named Bogha, who was sent to kill him, liberated him out of hatred to Ahmed, whose excesses had brought upon him the execration of his own subjects. Argoun again took the field with an army of determined men, defeated his uncle, made him a prisoner and delivered him to his mother-in-law, who caused him to be put to death.

Argoun now applied to Kublai for his investiture as King of Persia. Kublai granted the request promptly and seems to have been delighted to hear of the complete downfall of the apostate Ahmed. The new Khan treated the Christians with marked honor and repaired the churches which Ahmed had destroyed. The Kings of Armenia and Georgia, seeing him thus well disposed towards the Christians, prayed him to aid them in the recovery of the Holy Land. Argoun graciously replied that he would gladly do all in his power for the honor of God and the Christian religion. From that time he sought to establish an alliance with his neighbors for the accomplishment of this purpose.

It is stated that Argoun was chiefly indebted to the Christians for his triumph over Ahmed; that he had even decorated his standards and his arms with the cross, and that he had issued coin having on one side the Holy Sepulchre and on the other the words: "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." It was thus it came about that the great and powerful Emperor of all the Tartars and his grandnephew, Argoun of Persia, wrote to Honorius IV. and to the Christian princes again urging an alliance against the Mahometans: the Tartars to make the attack by way of Syria, while the Franks were to descend upon them simultaneously by way of Egypt.

Seemingly all things were now ready for the realization of the long-cherished project of the Holy See for the rescue of the Holy Land. How long does the reader suppose that the Saracens would have withstood the combined attacks of the terrible Tartars on the one side and the brave Franks on the other? The whole world seemed united for one grand triumph of Christianity. How, then, did it happen that this splendid design was never executed? Alas for human calculations! Just at this critical moment occurred those horrible massacres known in history as "The Sicilian Vespers," secretly instigated by the double-dealing Greeks in order to save their own prestige by dividing the Latins amongst themselves and setting Christian against Christian. And too well the infamous design was accomplished! Charles of Sicily was at once too busily occupied in counteracting the mischief thus done in his dominions to think further of a crusade in the Holy Land; Michael Paleologus, the perfidious Greek, plainly could not be counted on for support; all Christendom was for the moment disrupted and thrown into division, and once again the patient efforts of the Holy See so long continued were rendered null and fruitless.

In the following year Kublai had a revolution of his own to deal with. An uncle of the Emperor, only thirty years of age, who was intrusted by him with great power and a vast dominion, revolted, and sought to supersede Kublai himself in the general command. Marco Polo tells us that Nayam, the rebellious uncle, professed Christianity, but did not lead a Christian life. He had, however, adopted the cross as his standard and had drawn quite a goodly number of Christians into his revolt. He was promptly attacked by Kublai, who, after a stubborn resistance lasting from morning until noon, utterly defeated Nayam, took him prisoner and had him put to death by suffocation. Upon the death of their leader, the rebellious Christians and others submitted to Kublai Khan, who thus added four more provinces to his own immediate dominions.

The Jews and the Saracens in Kublai's army were not slow to turn the rebellion of a portion of his Christian subjects to account. They loaded them with reproaches and declared that Christ, whose emblem had been placed on Nayam's standards, had proved powerless to succor them. This continued from day to day, until the Christians deemed it unworthy of their religion to maintain silence, and they boldly appealed to the Emperor for protection. Kublai, having assembled the Jews, Saracens and Christians, said to the latter: "Your God and His cross have not wished to assist Nayam; but be not ashamed of that fact, for a good and just God would never protect injustice and iniquity. Nayam betrayed his master and excited a rebellion, contrary to all equity. In his malice he implored the assistance of your God, but being a good and just God, He was unwilling to favor his crimes." Kublai then forbade the Jews, Saracens and all others ever again to utter a blasphemy against the God of the Christians or His cross.

Two years later, in 1288, Pope Nicholas IV. made use of both the Franciscans and Dominicans to carry the light of the Gospel to the most distant nations, and amongst the long list of those to whom he sent letters and missionaries we find the Tartars, the Christians held as captives amongst the Tartars and many countries which acknowledged the suzerainty of Kublai Khan. We find at this time pious men, especially among the Friars Minor, working zealously and with much success amongst the Oriental Tartars.

But space forbids us to follow this fascinating study any further. Many other interesting facts could be cited to show the prosperous condition of Christianity amongst the Tartars. And in all this we make full allowance for the existence and influence of the Nestorians, who were counted in immense numbers throughout their territory. We speak only of those Christians who were in communion with the Holy See. Nor have we time to speak at length of the good work accomplished in protecting and propagating the true faith amongst these warlike people by prominent laymen such as the Polos, John Bonakias, who devoted his wealth and influence to advancing the cause of religion, and the interpreters of the Emperor, who used their position and influence for the same purpose. Two Tartar Queens were numbered amongst the really fervent converts. Of the ambassadors who were sent to the Holy See, Sabadin Arkaon, a man of great nobility amongst the Tartars, embraced the true faith. Nor can we dwell upon the good effected by Julius, a noble Pisan, who penetrated amongst the Tartars and devoted his wealth to the spread of Christianity.

Argoun's wife was a very pious Christian. His son Carbagand was baptized, receiving the name of Nicholas. Kublai sent still other embassies to the Holy See for various purposes. Letters were written at different times by the Pope to Tagharsar, general of the Tartar army; John of Bonestra; Xanctus, prefect of the pretorium of Persia; Suffrid, Argoun's physician; the Pisan Ozolius and others to congratulate them upon their zeal for the conversion of the Tartars and to encourage them to continue their efforts.

Nor can we speak at length of John of Monte Corvino, the courageous and indomitable Franciscan, who penetrated to the very court of Kublai, was sent back on a special embassy to the Pope, returned again with several companions and whom we find at last installed as Archbishop of Pekin, with seven suffragan bishops, caring zealously for the great Christian community then established amongst the Tartars. But meanwhile Kublai, the great conqueror, had succumbed to the cold touch of death and departed this life in the year 1294, being 79 years of age and having reigned as Great Khan of all the Tartars thirty-four years.

This brief glance at the reign of one of the greatest Emperors that China ever possessed may aid us to feel a yet deeper interest in the welcome news that has recently reached this country of the imperial decree that has been issued by the present Chinese Emperor, without solicitation, extending his especial protection to the Catholics throughout his dominions. Verily the Church, like her Blessed Founder, is "the same yesterday, to-day and forever;" but the Christendom that could assemble such a parliament of the nations as made up the Second General Council of Lyons can certainly compare favorably, to say the least, with the Christendom of the nineteenth century.

LORENZO J. MARKOE.

White Bear, Minnesota.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN ONTARIO.

THE most marvelous fact in the history of the province of Ontario during the past half century is the wonderful growth and development of the Catholic Church. Fifty years ago it was but a mustard seed; to-day it is a great cedar of Lebanon. Fifty years ago there were but three dioceses in Ontario; to-day there are eight, three of which are metropolitan sees. Fifty years ago there were not more than sixty priests scattered throughout the province from Sandwich to Ottawa and from Lake Erie to the Manitoulin Islands to minister to the spiritual needs of about one hundred and thirty thousand Catholics. To-day there are four hundred and fifty priests who have spiritual charge of four hundred thousand Catholics; yet these facts constitute but a segment in the great circle of progress which marks the history of the Catholic Church in Ontario during the past fifty years. What shall be said of the multiplication of churches, of colleges, of convents, of hospitals which tell of Catholic faith, Catholic toil, Catholic generosity? The Irish Catholic immigrant who came to this country, as the Hon. Thomas D'Arcy McGee says, "with much poverty, great faith and willing hands," not only felled the forests, built bridges and constructed railroads and canals, but reared temples to God which bear testimony to his faith in tower, and turret, and spire, and cross melting away into immortal light.

The first two Catholic settlements in Ontario (Upper Canada) were at Sandwich, on the Detroit river, and St. Raphaels, in the county of Glengarry, in the eastern part of the province. The settlement at Sandwich was French and was, together with Malden (now Amherstburg), an offshoot of the old Detroit mission founded by the Jesuits in the beginning of the eighteenth century. The Glengarry settlement was made up of Highlanders—some of them descendants of the clans who fatefully escaped the terrible massacre of Glencoe. These stalwart Celts brought with them a robust faith and were most loyally attached to the British Crown. They came to Glengarry from Orange (Albany), N. Y., about the year 1776.

The earliest name found in connection with the Niagara mission is that of Vicar General Burke, who afterwards became Vicar Apostolic of Nova Scotia. This great pioneer missionary was stationed at historic Niagara from 1796 to 1798. Father Burke and Father McKenna, it appears, were the pioneer Irish priests in Ontario. Of course, during the French régime there was a chapel and a Recollect Father in charge at Niagara as early as the year 1720.

In 1804 Bishop Plessis, of Quebec, confided the spiritual care of the province of Ontario to the Rev. Alexander MacDonell, who had one assistant, and these two did all the missionary work between Glengarry and Sandwich. By the year 1816 the number of priests had increased to six, stationed as follows: Fathers Alexander MacDonell and John MacDonell, at St. Raphael's, in Glengarry; Father Delamothe, at Perth; Father Perenault, at Kingston, and Fathers Marchand and Crevier, at Sandwich.

In 1819 the Diocese of Quebec was erected into an archdiocese, and the following year Father Alexander MacDonell was consecrated Vicar Apostolic of Upper Canada. Kingston was named as the episcopal see, and in the year 1826 it was erected into a diocese. This is said to be the first diocese established in a British colony since the so-called Reformation.

The first Catholic church in the city of Toronto (called York till 1834) was St. Paul's, and was erected in 1826. Father Crowley appears to have been the first resident priest in Toronto, having received his appointment to this mission in 1825. There is little doubt but that for many years previous to this French priests from the Sandwich mission were accustomed to celebrate Mass in Toronto while on their way to and from Kingston and Glengarry.

Father John Macdonald was the first resident priest in the Perth mission. Father Macdonald was a remarkable man, considered either physically or mentally. Here is a pen picture of him by a writer who had visited him not long before his death: "The great object of interest, love and pride of all classes throughout the country was the 'vicar,' old Father John Macdonald, who had held their spiritual rule for over half a century and was still living, hale and hearty, in a pleasant cottage in Glengarry. . . . This fine old priest was without exception the most venerable and patriarchal figure the writer ever looked upon. He was nearing his hundredth year of age. His massive head and trunk were unbent by years and sound in every function. Only the limbs that had traveled so many a weary mile in days when the whole country was but an untracked wilderness had yielded to time and fatigue and could not longer bear up the colossal frame. Wallace himself had not passed through more bold adventures than this old highland chief. . . . The reverence and love that centred in him in his old age gave proof of his benign and salutary use of his mighty sway."

The years 1828 and 1829 were marked by the rise of parishes in Peterborough, Belleville, Prescott and Bytown (Ottawa), the parish of Richmond, on the Ottawa, of which Father Patrick Haran was pastor from 1826 to 1830, being amalgamated with Bytown in 1830.

The first church in Kingston was the old French church built in 1808, the Rev. Angus Macdonald, V. G., being in charge. When Bishop Plessis paid his pastoral visit to Kingston in his itinerary of Upper Canada in 1816 the Catholic population was said to number seventy-five families, of which more than two-thirds were French Canadians.

The first resident priest at Belleville was Father Michael Brennan, and the first resident pastor of Prescott Father Timothy O'Meara. Father Crowley appears to have been the first pastor of Peterborough, having been transferred to this parish from Toronto (York) in the year 1828.

Bytown, which in those early days was little more than a hamlet, but destined one day, under the name of Ottawa, to become the capital of the Dominion and the seat of an archbishopric, had for its first pastor Father Angus Macdonell, who remained until about 1831 or 1832, when he was succeeded by Father John Cullen.

The years 1833 and 1834 were marked by the rise of parishes at Cobourg, Port Hope, Dundas, Guelph, St. Thomas, London and St. Catharines. Father Dempsey was given charge of Cobourg and Port Hope, Father John Cassidy of Dundas and Guelph, while Father Daniel Downie looked after St. Thomas and London.

The first church built in London was on the corner of Richmond street and Maple avenue. It was a primitive structure of logs, with an earthen floor, and was dedicated by Father Downie in 1834. The fortunes of London continued to be bound up with St. Thomas until 1845, when Father Mills, formerly at St. Thomas, was placed in charge of the townships of London and Westminster. The Catholics of St. Catharines were also dependent upon the priest at Niagara for the consolations of religion till 1838, when Father J. M. Burke took up his residence among them.

The years 1835 and 1836 saw the organization of a number of new parishes or missions at Waterloo, Cornwall, Raleigh, on Lake Erie, and Penetanguishene. Father J. B. Wirriats became first pastor of Waterloo and Father J. B. Proulx the first resident priest at Penetanguishene. Father Proulx was for many years one of the most stalwart and conspicuous figures in the priesthood of Toronto diocese. Well does the writer of this sketch remember, when a boy at school back in the seventies, Father Proulx's visits to St. Michael's College, Toronto. The great and simple-hearted monsignor—for he had been created a domestic prelate—would mingle with the boys on the playground and entertain them by giving them the Indian warwhoop, which this self-sacrificing and zealous missionary had so often heard when he lived among the Indians of the Manitoulin Islands.

When the Honorable and Right Rev. Alexander MacDonell, Bishop of Kingston (the title honorable because the Bishop was a member of the Legislative Council of Upper Canada), left on a trip to Europe in 1839 there were in all thirty-four priests in the province ministering to the spiritual wants of the Catholic people from the Ottawa river to the Detroit.

It had long been the cherished desire of Bishop MacDonell to found and endow a seminary for the education of his clergy. The college which the Bishop had largely maintained for many years at his own expense at St. Raphael's, in Glengarry, had indeed been a nursery of priests, and from its humble class rooms had graduated such zealous, pious and efficient missionaries as Father George Hay, Father Michael Brennan and Father Edward Gordon; but the growing needs of the Catholic Church in Ontario demanded a larger and better equipped seminary of learning. Accordingly the corner-stone of Regiopolis College, in Kingston, was laid on June 11, 1838, Bishop Macdonell officiating, assisted by his coadjutor, Mgr. Gaulin, Vicar General Angus Macdonald and others of the clergy.

Bishop Macdonell sailed for Europe in the summer of 1839, and in due time landed at Liverpool, whence he went to London, where he communicated with the Colonial Office regarding emigration and other matters. From England he crossed over to Ireland, where he visited several of the Irish prelates. While in the west of Ireland he was stricken down with an attack of inflammation of the lungs, but rallied sufficiently to set out for Scotland to visit his friend, Father William Reid, parish priest at Dumfries. Here the Bishop had a second attack of inflammation, and after having received the last rites of the Church passed quietly away on the morning of the 14th of January, 1840. His funeral took place in St. Mary's Cathedral, in Edinburgh, and was attended by Bishop Gillis, coadjutor to the eastern district of Scotland; Bishops Carruthers, of Edinburgh; Murdoch, of Glasgow, and Scott, of Greenock, and a large number of priests. In 1861 the remains of the dead prelate were brought to Canada and placed in the vaults of Notre Dame Church, Montreal, where they remained for a short time, when they were transferred to Kingston.

Bishop MacDonell was the pioneer Bishop of Ontario, a prelate of wonderful force of character—unquestionably one of the greatest and most commanding figures in the history of the Catholic Church in Canada.

In 1841, at the representation of Mgr. Gaulin, who had succeeded Bishop MacDonell, the western portion of Kingston Diocese was erected into a new diocese, with the city of Toronto as the seat of the new episcopal see. Very Rev. Michael Power, vicar general of the Diocese of Montreal, was chosen as Bishop of the newly erected diocese. The limits of the new diocese were officially defined as follows: West of Newcastle, from Lake Ontario to Lake Muskoka; from thence by a line directed northwest through Lakes Moon and Muskoka, to western branch of two rivers emptying into the Ottawa; all west of that, including Lake Superior districts.

Bishop Power had in his new and extensive diocese nineteen priests, sixteen of whom attended his first diocesan synod, which met in the month of October in St. Paul's Church, Toronto.

Here are the priests and their respective charges: Very Rev. W. P. Macdonald, V. G., Hamilton; Rev. M. R. Mills, Brantford, Indiana and Dumfries; James O'Flynn, Dundas, Oakville and Trafalgar; James Bennet, Tecumseth and Adjala; Edward Gordon, Niagara and Niagara Falls; Patrick O'Dwyer, London and St. Thomas; Eugene O'Reilly, Toronto and Albion; J. B. Proulx, Manitoulin and the Upper Lakes; Michael McDonnell, Maidstone and Rochester; Thomas Gibney, Guelph and Stratford; Peter Schneider, Waterloo, Wilmot and Goderich; James Quinlan, New-market and Barrie; Amable Charest, Penetanguishene; Very Rev. Æneas Macdonell, V. G., Sandwich; Rev. J. B. Morin, Raleigh; Rev. Augustine Vervais, Amherstburg, and Rev. W. P. McDonagh, Stephen Fergus and J. J. Hay (secretary of the diocese), Toronto.

The work of Bishop Power during the seven years that he wore the mitre in Toronto was full of goodly and pious fruitage. From the very beginning of his episcopate Bishop Power felt the need of a suitable Cathedral Church. He finally succeeded in purchasing the block of land on Church street, on which the Cathedral Palace and Loretto Convent now stand, and on May 8, 1845, the corner-stone of St. Michael's Cathedral was laid by the Bishop in person, assisted by Fathers Macdonald, V. G., McDonagh, Gordon, O'Reilly, Timlin, Carroll, Hay, Quinlan and Nightingale.

Soon after Bishop Power's advent to the diocese he made formal application to Very Rev. Father Roothaan, general of the Society of Jesus, for priests of that society to aid him in the missions of his diocese. His appeal to Father Roothaan met with a favorable response. In 1843 two Jesuits, Fathers Peter Point and John Peter Chone, came to the diocese and were placed in charge of the parish of Assumption at Sandwich. The new church commenced by Father Macdonell, V. G., was completed by them and dedicated in 1846, and some ten years later they founded the College of Assumption. Besides the mission at Sandwich the Jesuit Fathers had at one time charge also of Chatham and of Wilmot, in the county of Waterloo. At present the Jesuit Fathers have charge of Guelph and the Lake Superior and Georgian Bay missions.

The year 1847 will be forever marked for its blood and tear-stained story of the Irish emigrants who, flying from persecution and famine, contracted the deadly ship fever and died—some on their way across the ocean, others at Grosse Isle, and still others at Quebec, Montreal, Kingston and Toronto. It was while ministering to a poor woman who lay dying at the immigrant sheds in Toronto that Bishop Power contracted the dread malady, which terminated his saintly and heroic career and plunged the citizens of Toronto, irrespective of creed, into the most heartfelt and profound grief. The *British Colonist,* the leading newspaper of the day, referring to the sad event, said: "It is not for us to pronounce his eulogy. The sorrow of his flock, the regret of the community, the members of which have learned to appreciate his exertions to promote peace and brotherly love among us, the tears that moisten the cheeks of many persons not within the pale of his Church, to whom we have spoken of his untimely decease, are the best evidences of the loss sustained in his death. May it be our lot to see a successor appointed to the episcopate whom all may learn to love as well." Bishop Power lies entombed beneath the great Cathedral which he planned, but did not live to see completed.

In 1847 the ancient see of Kingston—the pioneer diocese of Ontario—was shorn of a portion of its eastern territory to constitute a new diocese to be known as Ottawa. Right Rev. Bishop Guigues became the first Bishop of this newly created diocese and selected Ottawa as the seat of his episcopal see.

We have now touched, by way of introduction, the threshold of the history of the Catholic Church in Ontario during the past fifty years. Pope Pius IX. had just ascended the Papal Throne. Europe had been rocked by the upheaval of 1848. Poor, unhappy Ireland lay "like a corpse on a dissecting table." Canada had lately passed through the throes of a rebellion and was now peacefully enjoying the fruits of responsible government. Irish Catholic immigrants were hewing out homes for themselves in the wilderness massed together in settlements in well nigh every county of the province, while the pioneer priest, true to the spirit of his holy calling, was piercing the virgin forests, fording angry streams, threading impassable roads to minister to his scattered flock—to strengthen them with the Bread of Life and prepare them for the agony of death.

"It was," says a writer, "reserved for France, so closely connected with the earlier history of this country and so renowned for the missionary spirit of her children, to give Toronto its second Bishop in the person of Armand Francis Marie, Comte de Charbonnel."

Dr. de Charbonnel was consecrated Bishop of Toronto by His Holiness Pope Pius IX. in the Sistine Chapel on May 26, 1850, in presence of a large assembly, amongst whom were the French Ambassador and the general of the French troops at Rome. As a souvenir of consecration the Holy Father presented the Bishop with a well filled purse and a chasuble of gold, upon which were embroidered the Papal arms. In addition to these His Holiness offered him his choice between a fine ciborium and a rich chalice. His Lordship chose the ciborium; then, taking the chalice in the other hand, he turned towards Pius IX., saying: *"Quid retribuam Domino pro omnibus quæ retribuit mihi,"* and finishing the quotation said: *"Calicem salutaris accipiam et nomen Domini invocabo."* ("I shall take the chalice of salvation and call upon the name of the Lord.") The Pope with a smile appreciated the ready answer, and the Bishop withdrew, happy possessor of all three.

Bishop de Charbonnel, accompanied by Mgr. Prince, coadjutor Bishop of Montreal, arrived in Toronto September 21, 1850, and took formal possession of his see the following Sunday. To liquidate the debt on the Cathedral, which amounted to about sixty thousand dollars, was the first thought and care of the newly consecrated Bishop. For the purpose of raising funds His Lordship visited every Catholic mission—nay, it is said, every Catholic family—in his vast diocese. He also early turned his attention to the needs of Catholic education and entered the arena of discussion as an uncompromising champion of separate schools. Indeed, as a well-known Catholic writer avers, "His whole episcopate was one continual struggle against an autocratic Superintendent of Education (Dr. Ryerson), against wily politicians and against popular bigotry upon this vital subject." His battling was not without good results. It taught bigotry that it cannot hold out against justice—that the sacred right of educating the child is a matter of conscience, and that no law framed in a commonwealth of freedom should attempt to violate or clash with the sacred and inalienable rights of the parent with respect to the education of the child.

Let us now for a moment glance at the beginning of Catholic education in the city of Toronto. When Bishop Power visited Europe in 1847 he made arrangements with the Loretto Community to send a colony of their nuns to Toronto to assist in the work of Catholic education. Accordingly in September five members of the order arrived in the city and were joyfully received by the Catholic people. This was the beginning of the Loretto foundations in Ontario which have conferred such inestimable benefits upon our people. On October 7, 1851, Mother Delphine, of the Sisters of St. Joseph, accompanied by Sister M. Martha, Sister M. Alphonsus and Sister M. Bernard, arrived in Toronto. The Christian Brothers came to Toronto the same year and were first introduced and established there by Brother Patrick, who afterwards became one of the assistants to the superior general of the whole order.

In 1848 there were thirty-two Catholic schools in the province, and in 1850 this number had increased to forty-six. In 1852 there were in the Catholic schools of Toronto seven hundred and six pupils under the care of twelve teachers, of whom two were Sisters of Loretto and five were Christian Brothers.

In August, 1852, four Basilians, with the Very Rev. Father Soulerin as superior, came, at the invitation of Bishop de Charbonnel, to Toronto to found a Catholic college. This was the origin and beginning of St. Michael's College. The next few years saw a number of churches erected in Toronto—St. Mary's, in 1851; St. Basil's, in 1856, and St. Patrick's, about the year 1859.

In 1856, in accordance with representations made to Rome, Bulls were issued dividing the Diocese of Toronto and establishing two new sees—that of Hamilton and London. The Right Rev. John

Farrell, of Peterborough, was consecrated Bishop of Hamilton and the Right Rev. Peter Adolphe Pinsonneault, of Montreal, Bishop of London. Thus within thirty-six years did the Catholic Church in Ontario expand from a single diocese, with a handful of spiritual workmen, into five dioceses.

The returns for 1859 give thirty-three priests in Toronto Diocese. Amongst the new parishes recently organized were Barrie, Brock, Orillia and Adjala. The late revered and beloved Archbishop Walsh, of Toronto, was the first parish priest of Brock, and the late Bishop Jamot, saintly and zealous, the first parish priest of Barrie.

In 1859 Bishop de Charbonnel obtained a coadjutor in the person of the Right Rev. John Joseph Lynch, president of the College of Holy Angels, Niagara Falls, N. Y., whose name is inseparably connected with the history of the Catholic Church in Ontario for nearly thirty years. In April, 1860, Bishop de Charbonnel resigned his see and returned to France, where he became a Capuchin and died a saintly death, venerable and beloved, at the ripe age of 89, on Easter Sunday, March 29, 1891. The Catholic Church in Ontario owes this great prelate much—it will assuredly hold his name forever in benediction.

Meanwhile in the eastern part of the province the Catholic Church was making rapid strides, too. Mgr. Gaulin, Bishop of Kingston, having passed away, his coadjutor, Bishop Phelan, succeeded him, but survived him only a month. The fourth Bishop of Kingston, the mother diocese of Ontario, was Right Rev. Dr. Horan, for a number of years professor in Laval University, Quebec. During Bishop Horan's episcopal reign the Catholic Church in Kingston made great progress. His Lordship took a deep interest in Catholic education, and the work in Regiopolis College gained from His Lordship a new and fuller impetus. Mgr. Horan was a great church builder, and under his guidance some of the finest ecclesiastical structures in the diocese took shape and form.

In the Diocese of Ottawa, which had been set apart in 1847, the Catholic Church, under the benign and saintly rule of its first Bishop, Right Rev. J. E. Guigues, was attaining wonderful growth and development. Mgr. Guigues, like Bishop de Charbonnel, saw early the necessity of making provision for the establishing of a Catholic college or seminary for the education and training of the Catholic priesthood of his vast diocese, and accordingly, in 1848, this good Bishop, aided by a number of gifted and zealous Oblate Fathers, at the head of whom was Dr. Tabaret, established the College of Ottawa, which from its modest beginning half a century ago has grown into a great Catholic University that has attracted the attention and won the commendation of the ablest scholars in the land.

Bishop Lynch, whose career as a Lazarist Father—whether in missionary work upon the prairies of Texas or as president of the College of Holy Angels—was one of marvelous activity, now entered upon the performance of his episcopal duties with renewed energy and ardor. The work of his busy crozier—large heart and throbbing brain—is best summed up in the inscriptions on the shields with which St. Michael's Cathedral was adorned on the occasion of his silver jubilee in 1884: "Loretto Convent, established in 1862; St. Joseph's Convent, established in 1863; St. Michael's tower and spire, built in 1865; Loretto Abbey, Wellington Place, extended in 1867; St. Nicholas' Home, established in 1869; attended Ecumenical Council in 1870; De La Salle Institute, established in 1871; consecrated Bishop O'Brien, Kingston, in 1873; consecrated Bishop Crinnon, Hamilton, in 1874; consecrated Archbishop Taschereau, Quebec, in 1874; Convent of the Precious Blood, established in 1874; Magdalen Asylum, established in 1875; Convents of St. Joseph established in St. Catharine's, Thorold, Barrie and Oshawa; forty parish churches and thirty presbyteries established; seventy priests ordained for the diocese and St. John's Grove and House established." To these may be added the establishing of the Carmelite Monastery at Niagara Falls, Ontario.

In 1870 Toronto was made an archiepiscopal see, with Mgr. Lynch its first Archbishop and the sees of London and Hamilton suffragans. In 1873 the northern part of Ontario was erected into a vicariate and Bishop Jamot appointed Vicar Apostolic. This was afterwards merged in the Diocese of Peterborough, Mgr. Jamot becoming its first Bishop. In 1874 Right Rev. Dr. O'Mahony was appointed auxiliary Bishop of Toronto.

Bishop Farrell bore the crozier in Hamilton for seventeen years—from 1856 till 1873. His rule was benign and fatherly. No priest in his diocese toiled harder than the Bishop. He attended sick calls, visited the poor and heard confessions every week and every day when required.

During his episcopate churches multiplied in his diocese, while there was a steady advancement along the lines of Catholic education. It was under his fostering care and guidance, too, that the beautiful Cathedral Church of the diocese rose and convents conducted by the Sisters of Loretto established in Hamilton and Guelph. Bishop Farrell was a man of imposing and courtly bearing, standing six feet four inches in height and possessing a most handsome countenance. He was the tallest and grandest looking personage of all the Bishops and patriarchs assembled at the Vatican Council in Rome in 1870. Hamilton Diocese was bereft of its good and zealous first Bishop in the autumn of 1873, when death carried away Right Rev. John Farrell, one of the kindest, noblest and most courteous of the prelates that have ever worn the mitre or graced the sees of Ontario.

A venerable priest who did the work of a great apostle in the Catholic pioneer days of Ontario and was for many years associated with Bishop Farrell was Very Rev. Edward Gordon, V. G. Father Gordon was a convert and was educated in St. Raphael's Seminary, in Glengarry. Soon after his ordination, in 1830, he began his mission work, the field of his labors extending from Toronto to Niagara Falls, including Adjala, Trafalgar, Toronto, Gore, Dundas and Niagara Falls. At Niagara he built the first church, St. Vincent de Paul's, in 1835. Upon the division of the Diocese of Kingston he remained in charge at Niagara and subsequently became vicar general of the Diocese of Toronto under Bishop de Charbonnel and resided in Hamilton. When Bishop Farrell took possession of the See of Hamilton he made Father Gordon his vicar general, in the enjoyment of which dignity this good and venerable priest continued till his death, which took place early in the seventies.

The health of Mgr. Pinsonneault, Bishop of London, becoming impaired, it was necessary to select a successor, and on November 10, 1867, Vicar General Walsh, who had been rector of St. Michael's Cathedral for a number of years and was the present pastor of St. Mary's Church, Toronto, was consecrated Bishop of London, in succession to Dr. Pinsonneault. Bishop Walsh was born in Kilkenny, Ireland, and received his education in the College of Waterford and the Sulpitian Seminary in Montreal.

On taking up the crozier laid down by Bishop Pinsonneault in his retirement from London, Dr. Walsh applied himself with zeal to the episcopal duties of his diocese, carrying into his work the same good judgment, prudence and tact which had so favorably marked his priestly labors for so many years in the Diocese of Toronto. He became endeared to his clergy at the very outset, and this bond of affection and love remained intact during the two and twenty years that he continued as chief pastor of the London Diocese. When Bishop Walsh came to the diocese he found it heavily encumbered with debt and sorely in the need of additional convents, churches, schools and hospitals. When, in response to the voice of Rome, he bade adieu to London—with all its tender memories and associations—on November 27, 1889, to take up the crozier in succession to Archbishop Lynch in Toronto, he left a diocese well provided with churches, schools and hospitals and a body of Catholic priests devoted and loyal—as faithful as could be found in any diocese of Canada. Among the many beautiful ecclesiastical edifices erected in the diocese during his episcopal régime St. Peter's Cathedral, in London, will ever remain a monument to the faith and zeal of this great and good Bishop.

Turning to the Diocese of Ottawa, we find that the progress of Catholicity there has been in the meantime very marked. Bishop Guigues having died in 1874, Right Rev. J. T. Duhamel was appointed his successor. Bishop Duhamel soon proved himself a prelate of great executive ability—full of tact, wisdom and energy. He is a true friend of Catholic education—ever encouraging, aiding and directing it. In 1887 the Diocese of Ottawa was erected into a metropolitan see, Dr. Duhamel becoming its first Archbishop. The Catholic population in the archdiocese is 120,000 and the number of priests 166. In 1882 the Vicariate of Pontiac was established, with Right Rev. N. Z. Lorrain its Vicar Apostolic. This year the vicariate has been erected into the Diocese of Pembroke, with Dr. Lorrain as its first Bishop and suffragan of the metropolitan of Ottawa. Mgr. Lorrain is a man of great zeal, piety, earnestness and simplicity of character. In addition to administering successfully the affairs of his large and scattered diocese he does an amount of parochial work equal to that of any parish priest in Ontario. Under his benign and watchful care the Catholic Church has made marvelous progress in his vast diocese, which includes the county of Renfrew, in Ontario, and the county of Pontiac, in Quebec, the territory between 88 and 72 degrees, the height of land at the south, Hudson's Bay, James' Bay and the Great Whale river at the north. The Catholic population of the diocese is 36,171, spiritually cared for by thirty-three priests.

Bishop O'Brien, who succeeded Right Rev. Dr. Horan as Bishop of Kingston in 1875, wore the mitre for four years, and during that time labored most assiduouly as chief pastor of the diocese. He was a remarkable financier, and did much to liquidate the debt which weighed upon the diocese. Dr. O'Brien dying in 1879, Right Rev. James Vincent Cleary, of Waterford, Ireland, was appointed to the vacant see. The work of this great prelate is so well and widely known that to chronicle his episcopal activities is but to review what is already fresh in the mind of every Catholic in Canada.

There is not a doubt but that Dr. Cleary was one of the most scholarly, if not the most scholarly, prelate who ever wore the mitre in the Catholic Church in America. He was indeed a man of rare endowments—a most gifted and eloquent speaker—the Cicero of the Catholic Church in Canada. He had a great mind, lofty ideals and the fervor and zeal of the earliest apostleship of the Church. The pastorals which he issued from time to time during his episcopal rule were models—in the depth, clearness, fullness and beauty of the thought which they embodied. If there was one quality more than another which Dr. Cleary possessed it was courage. He stood upon the ramparts of the Church of God, asking no quarter, giving no quarter, ready to defend its every right and principle to the death.

During the seventeen years that this great and gifted prelate ruled the Diocese of Kingston the progress of the Catholic Church in the mother see of Ontario was most notable. A profound scholar himself, Dr. Cleary lent his episcopal influence to the establishing of Catholic schools in every part of his diocese. He revived Regiopolis College, which was obliged to close its doors through financial embarrassment in 1869, and this institution to-day promises to do a great and good work. The Catholic population of the diocese is 35,000, and the number of priests 44.

In 1889 Kingston was erected into a metropolitan see, with Mgr. Cleary its first Archbishop. At the same time a new diocese was created in the eastern part of the province, which in days gone by had been the cradle of Catholic faith in Ontario. This new diocese, whose Bishop is the Right Rev. Alex MacDonell, embraces the counties of Stormont and Glengarry, and is known as the Diocese of Alexandria. It has a Catholic population of 18,000, spiritually attended by twelve priests. Mgr. MacDonell is a prudent and zealous prelate worthy in every way of the distinguished name which he bears.

The mitre worn with so much lustre for a period of seventeen years in the mother see of Ontario by Most Rev. Dr. Cleary found worthy succession in the person of Vicar General Gauthier, of Brockville, who was consecrated Archbishop of Kingston in St. Mary's Cathedral October 18, 1898.

Dr. Gauthier brings to his work great executive power, tact and the burning zeal of the early apostleship. He has a precise knowledge of the conditions and wants of his diocese and possesses the prudence and wisdom to administer its affairs in the very best interests of Holy Church.

Already is Dr. Gauthier's episcopal régime bearing goodly fruit. Under his wise guidance Catholic education, which had been so dear to the heart of his gifted predecessor, is breaking into richer blossoms and gives promise of a return worthy of those who hold it in sacred keeping.

Between 1873 and 1889 two Bishops ruled in succession the See of Hamilton—Dr. Crinnon and Dr. Carberry. Bishop Crinnon had been parish priest of Stratford, and he brought to the performance of his episcopal duties a zeal and self-sacrifice which did not fail to bear the richest fruit. Bishop Carberry, his successor, came from Ireland, where he had been famed among his Dominican Brothers for his culture and scholarship and his deep but unostentatious piety. Both these good Bishops died martyrs to the toils entailed in bearing the crozier.

The Diocese of Hamilton becoming widowed by the death of Dr. Carberry in 1889, Right Rev. T. J. Dowling, who had succeeded Bishop Jamot in the See of Peterborough in 1887, was translated to fill the vacant see. During the ten years that Bishop Dowling has borne the crozier the progress of the Catholic Church in the Diocese of Hamilton has been most marked. Dr. Dowling is possessed of an ability most practical and an untiring energy. He thoroughly understands the needs of his diocese and is unwearied in his efforts to promote the spiritual and temporal welfare of his people. During his spiritual régime as chief pastor of the diocese new schools, new convents, new hospitals and new churches have marked the years of his episcopal toil. The Catholic population of Hamilton Diocese is 50,000 and the number of priests 55.

When Bishop Dowling was translated to Hamilton in 1889 Right Rev. R. A. O'Connor was appointed to the vacant See of Peterborough. Bishop O'Connor had been for many years parish priest of Barrie and was recognized as one of the most successful priests in Ontario. His diocese is a very extensive one, comprising the counties of Durham, Northumberland, Peterboro, Victoria and the districts of Algoma, Muskoka, Parry Sound and the western portion of Nipissing. The Catholic population in the diocese is 36,500 and the number of priests 48. Mgr. O'Connor is known as an eminently prudent and practical Bishop, whose episcopal régime will not likely be marked by many mistakes.

On Bishop Walsh's retirement from London to become Archbishop of Toronto in 1889 Dr. O'Connor, president of Assumption College, Sandwich, was chosen to succeed him. Bishop O'Connor's episcopal rule in London bore happy spiritual fruit.

The sudden death of Most Rev. John Walsh, Archbishop of Toronto, on the 31st of July, 1898, closed the life work and career of one of the most beautiful characters, wise and gifted prelates that have ever adorned the Catholic Church in Canada. His wise counsel, gentle rule, warm sympathy and noble charity had blessed the priests and people of Toronto for nine years—renewing the ardor of faith in each heart and home, bringing consolation to the poor and afflicted and giving spiritual health and joy where before had reigned sorrow and suffering. His death has indeed been a blow which the Catholic Church in Toronto has keenly felt. It may be with surety said that no other prelate has filled such a place in the Catholic Church in Canada, and it is now a well accepted fact that had the great and beloved Archbishop of Toronto lived a few weeks longer Rome would have honored him with an enrollment in her College of Cardinals.

But the great Archdiocese of Toronto, with its 60,000 Catholics and 79 priests, did not remain long widowed. The happy choice of succession fell upon Dr. O'Connor, Bishop of London, whose devotedness to episcopal duties and ardent zeal for the Church of God marked him out as a chief among the Catholic prelates of Ontario.

On the translation of Mgr. O'Connor from London to Toronto Right Rev. Monsignor F. P. McEvay, rector of St. Mary's Cathedral, Hamilton, became Bishop of London. Mgr. McEvay possesses great administrative gifts, and his advent to London has been hailed with delight by its priests and people. London is perhaps the richest diocese in Ontario and has a population of 60,000, spiritually cared for by 71 priests.

In the annals of Catholic education in Ontario there are three names which will be always held in grateful memory and benediction—that of Rev. Dr. Louis Funcken, founder of St. Jerome's College, Berlin, Ontario; that of Very Rev. Charles Vincent, late president of St. Michael's College, Toronto, and that of Rev. Dr. Tabaret, founder and for many years president of Ottawa University, Ottawa.

Among the venerable priests in Ontario still laboring in the vineyard of the Master who are nearing their golden jubilee and worthy of our special love and esteem are Rev. Dr. Kilroy, of Stratford; Rev. Dr. Flannery, of Windsor; Right Rev. Mgr. Heenan, of Dundas, and Right Rev. Mgr. Farrelly, of Belleville.

The following religious orders have houses in Ontario: Men—Society of Jesus, Congregation of St. Basil, Congregation of the Resurrection, Oblates of Mary Immaculate, Order of Calced Carmelites, Order of St. Francis, Order of Minor Capuchins, Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, Company of Mary and Brothers of the Christian Schools. Women—Sisters of the Congregation of Notre Dame, Religious Hospitalers of the Hotel Dieu, Gray Nuns of the Cross, Ladies of Loretto, Sisters of the Congregation of St. Joseph, Ursuline Nuns, Ladies of the Sacred Heart, Sisters of the Holy Cross and Seven Dolors, Sisters of Charity, Sisters of Our Lady of the Refuge, Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, Sisters Adorers of the Precious Blood, Daughters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, School Sisters of Notre Dame, Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of Wisdom, Sisters of Mary and Faithful Companions of Jesus.

Nor has Catholic literary thought and achievement been wanting to those who have tended the altar fires of faith during the past fifty years in Ontario. Such works as Father Northgraves' "Mistakes of Modern Infidels," Rev. Dr. Harris' "History of the Early Missions in Western Canada" and "The Catholic Church in the Niagara Peninsula" and the late Rev. Dr. Dawson's "Life of Pope Pius the Ninth" have a permanent place and value not only in the history of the Catholic Church, but in the history of our country.

Truly the garden of the Catholic Church in Ontario tilled by the faithful spiritual laborer during the past half century has blossomed and borne goodly increment which, may we not hope, the next fifty years will increase and multiply a hundred fold!

THOMAS O'HAGAN, A. M., PH. D.

Toronto, Ont.

"THE MAKING OF RELIGION."—II.

THE book of Mr. Andrew Lang, published under the above title, naturally falls, as noted in a previous article, into two parts: the first weighs the current scientific explanation of the origin of the idea of "soul" or "spirit," and finds this explanation, to say the least, wanting; this section of the book has already been reviewed; the second part of the work examines the conclusions Science promulgates in regard to the origin of the idea of "gods" and "God," and with these chapters the present article deals.

At the very outset of the book the author is careful to draw attention to the fact that his two theses are entirely independent the one of the other. Thus he concedes that the position he maintains upon the reality of such supernormal phenomena as clairvoyance, fetichism, haunted houses, etc., and the bearing of this question upon the origin of the idea of "spirit" may be regarded as fantastic, or improbable, or merely left on one side; still, the strength of his second position about the origin of the idea of "God," derived from evidence of a different character, will not, therefore, be in any way impaired.

With the conclusion to which Science has come in this latter instance, Mr. Lang can no more agree than with her solution of the previous problem. "For whatever reasons, ma'am, I differed with you before," he may be interpreted as saying to Science, "for even stronger ones I must part company with you now. It is easy enough for you to theorize thus: 'Worshiping first the departed souls of his kindred, man later extended the doctrine of spiritual beings in many directions. Ghosts or other spiritual existences fashioned on the same line prospered until they became gods. Finally, as the result of a variety of processes, one of these gods became supreme, and at last was regarded as the one only God;' it is easy enough to say this, but an all important preliminary question is, do the *facts* fit in with this very simple system? They don't, ma'am; emphatically they do not, and therefore, out of devotion to your own cause and fidelity to your methods, I am forced to expose the fallacy of your argument and the unwarrantness of your conclusions," and this the author does without mincing matters. He feels himself on ground sure to appear more solid in the esteem of scientific men than that he occupied in the defense of the reality of visions and the acquisition of knowledge apparently not attainable through the normal channels of sense. His words, consequently, are more trenchant, his attack more direct and his own position stated with greater positiveness. It is well worth while to follow him at his self-appointed task, though it be only to glean stray ears of the good grain from the sheaves he carries.

I.

The idea of "God," the origin of which Science undertakes to elucidate, is this: "A primal eternal Being, the author of all things, the Father and friend of man, the invisible, omniscient guardian of morality." Science declares: First. That this idea is a comparatively recent acquisition in the history of human kind; it was born of civilization; and as, from the scientific standpoint, civilization betokens the maturity of a race and supposes rudimentary ages of savagery, superstition and ignorance, it follows that during these preliminary times there was no such notion of "God" as later generations have come to know. Second. The "civilized" idea of God, although thus recent, still has its roots in those earlier days of darkness—the "roots" are primitive ideas about "spirit," the practice of "ancestor-worship," the analogy between living chiefs and "chiefs" among the dead, the gradual acknowledgment of differing degrees among the latter, some coming to be esteemed greater than others and the final endowment of one dead chief with powers placing him above the rest, he thus becoming a "supreme being." Third. Hence the essential differences between the present idea of "God" among us and that idea as held by our ancestors, or by people at the present day in circumstances such as theirs. "God" for them meant, and means, no more than an ancestral "spirit" endowed with enlarged prerogatives of power or passion, who falls under no law but the mood of his lawless whims, whose service takes the form of sacrificial bribes to appease His anger or buy His aid, and into whose religious code no ethical idea enters. Fourth. Science goes a step farther and declares the really primordial condition of man to have been absolutely godless, and finds evidence of the fact in the like condition of certain savage tribes at the present day.

Evidently this catena of statements leaves no room for an early Revelation and knocks down like a child's house of cards the fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

And is this the last word of Science upon the origin of religion? Is religion, as now understood among men, the latest evolutionary form of a series of mistakes, fallacies and illusions? Is its germ a blunder and its present form only the result of progressive but unessential refinements on that blunder? Is the inference this, that religion is untrue, that nothing actual corresponds to its hypothesis? "The inference," quietly observes Mr. Lang, granting for the nonce its basis, "is not perhaps logical, for all our science itself is the result of progressive refinements upon hypotheses originally erroneous, fashioned to explain facts misconceived. Yet our science is true within its limits, though very far from being exhaustive of the truth. In the same way, it might be argued, our religion, even granting that it arose out of primitive fallacies and false hypotheses, may yet have been refined, as science has been, through a multitude of causes into an approximate truth." The shrewd comment is but one of many passing remarks whose sharp points prick conclusions arrived at injudiciously, even though the author grants the premises behind them a respect they do not deserve. Mr. Lang, however, goes at the premises themselves; one by one he tears them open, exhibits the shoddiness of their texture and sets off against it the well-woven material of actual fact and sound deduction.

In reviewing his work place is claimed for a suggestion not without relevancy and moment. The word "science" is easy on the author's pen to designate what in good sooth is, at its best, but the teaching of a group of those who follow Science. True, this group is one to conjure with; the names of Huxley and Spencer alone are in common belief an army by themselves. These men being of the noble company of pioneers in modern methods of research and thought have, after the wont of pioneers, laid claim to excessively large preserves. Mr. Huxley did indeed give years to developing, and with success, biology, and therein much of his work will endure; but in the field of ethnology, not to speak of Biblical criticism, with its essential philological apparatus, Mr. Huxley never completed a course of even "first lessons," yet in both branches he has had somewhat to say, and he has given to his views the authoritative weight of a past master.

Mr. Herbert Spencer undertook to "civil engineer" the whole domain of man and his institutions, civil, religious, social and moral, carrying out the survey on the supposedly accurate lines of the new method, Evolution. Evolution, however, is all too extensive to be held in control, or exhausted by one or two men, or by a school made up of their disciples and popularizers. If evolution be the new "philosopher's stone," the universal solvent of Truth, then has it office in every branch of Knowledge. But in each branch its application, the methods and progress of the evolutionary process, is determined by the facts of actual development in that branch with which only the specialist can be acquainted. In view of the comparative recentness of the evolutionary hypothesis and of the tremendous extent of its application, it follows that Mr. Spencer's work must be, to speak with moderation, premature, largely subjective, and wanting in that complete and exact exploration of separate subjects which alone could justify its generalizations. Mr. Huxley's work, on the same grounds, cannot be given weight from the standpoint of the scientific evolutionists, except within that single sphere of research which study and experimentation had made his own; and even his biological work is subject to the correction and augmentation of other workers whose equipment and research equal or will equal his. Although the great labors of these men and their co-workers do give a dominant tone of materialism to scientific thought at the present day, it is unfair to Science as long as there are serious workers in her various branches whose views are not materialistic to speak of the former set of teachers and their results, no matter what their vogue, as "science" without any discriminating or limiting term. You cannot thus exclude Mivart and Pasteur or a hundred others whose work and views represent evolutionary research just as truly as do the labors of Huxley or Spencer.

A superficial view of Mr. Lang's phraseology might lead one to think his use of the term "science" open to this objection; the careful reader, however, will rather believe his manner of expressing himself intended to serve more effectively his own purpose by leaving the reader to infer for himself that the "popular" results of "science," as well as the "popular" use of the term itself, are both mistakes equally adverse to the best interests of Science in its true sense. Yet all readers are not careful readers, and there is certainly room and reason to call attention to a distinction as real and important as it is often overlooked.

It would be altogether too lengthy a process to take up statement by statement the catena of scientific deductions expressed above and offset each by the numerous facts and legitimate inferences which take the supports from under them and leave naught but a tumbled mass of surmise, assumption and illogical inference. It must suffice to present some examples of savage beliefs in "God" and "Gods" which contradict the elaborate thesis of Huxley, Spencer, Tylor and others in all its essential elements.

II.

Example Number One: The Savages of Terra del Fuego. Admiral Fitzroy, whose account of the visit made to this people by Her Majesty's ship Beagle is our chief source of information, describes their idea of the Deity thus: "A great black man is supposed to be always wandering about the woods and mountains, who is certain of knowing every word and action, who cannot be escaped and who influences the weather according to men's conduct."

This Deity has the following "unscientific" characteristics: First. He is a moral being who makes for righteousness and searches the heart. "His morality is so much above the ordinary savage level that he regards the slaying of a stranger and an enemy caught red-handed in robbery as a sin. York's brother (York was a Fuegian brought to England by Fitzroy) killed a 'wold man' who was stealing his birds. 'Rain came down, snow came down, hail came down, wind blow, blow, very much blow. Very bad to kill man. Big man in the woods no like it; He very much angry.'" Here be ethics in savage religion. Second. "This big man is not a deified chief, for the Fuegians have no superiority of one over another, but the doctor wizard of each party has much influence. Mr. Spencer disposes of this moral 'big man' of the Fuegians as 'evidently a deceased weather-doctor.' But first there is no evidence that the being is regarded as ever having died. Again, it is not shown that Fuegians are ancestor-worshipers. Lastly, were mere medicine men such moralists? The worst spirits among the neighboring Patagonians are those of dead medicine-men. As a rule everywhere the ghost of a 'doctor-wizard,' shaman or whatever he may be called, is the worst and wickedest of all ghosts. How, then, the Fuegians, who are not proved to be ancestor-worshipers, evolved out of the malignant ghost of an ancestor a being whose strong point is morality one does not easily conceive. The adjacent Chonos 'have great faith in a good spirit, whom they call Yerri Yuppon, and consider to be the author of all good; him they invoke in distress or danger.' However starved, they do not touch food till a short prayer has been muttered over each portion, 'the praying man looking upward.' They have magicians, but no details are given as to spirits or ghosts. If Fuegian and Chono religion is on this level, and if this be the earliest, then the theology of many other higher savages (as of the Zulus) is decidedly degenerate." It may strike the reader inexperienced in ethnological studies that the conception of God as a big, black, non-natural man takes force out of this example; so thought Mathew Arnold in regard to another savage people: the Lippeland tribes, he wrote, "have no knowledge of God. They believe the Creator was a gigantic black, living among the stars." Mr. Lang effectively answers: "Mr. Mathew Arnold might as well have said 'The British Philistine has no knowledge of God. He believes that the Creator is a magnified, non-natural man, living in the sky.' " However, at the foundation of the inexperienced reader's impression there lies a mistake, to which attention may well be called, for it is also at the bottom of the "scientific" explanation of the origin of the idea of "God." The reader finds fault with the savage's conception because God is conceived of as a "magnified" human being rather than a "spirit;" and the scientist declares that out of the idea of "spirit" developed the idea of "God." Now, as a matter of fact savages had and have the idea of "God" before they had or have the idea of His *specific nature,* and the only term by which they can express this idea is one that implies the presence in it of what is best in man raised to a still greater degree of perfection. Their language is anthropomorphic: "God" is a "man," but an eternal, omniscient, all-powerful, highly moral man, who punishes wrongdoing. What more can be expected of them? As for the scientist, out of short-sighted devotion to a theory he has simply neglected the evidence that goes to show how men in savage conditions thought of a "God" long before they had come to think upon or theorize about the nature of this being. "The question of 'spirit or non-spirit' was not raised at all. We have indeed from childhood been taught that God is a 'spirit.' We now can only conceive of an eternal being as a spirit. We have never remarked that there is no reason why we should take it for granted that the earliest deities of these earliest men were supposd by them to be 'spirits' at all. These gods might be most judiciously spoken of as 'undefined eternal beings.' To us such a being is necessarily a spirit, but he was by no means necessarily such to an early thinker. The savage Supreme Being, with added power, omniscience and morality, is the idealization of the savage, *minus* fleshly body (as a rule) and *minus* Death." Death, anthropologists tell us, is unknown to the savage as a universal ordinance. It came into the world by a blunder, an accident, an error in ritual, a decision of a god who was before death. So the savage god is not necessarily conceived of as being a ghost or developing from one; he was not originally differentiated as "spirit" or "non-spirit." "When we call the Supreme Being of savages a 'spirit,' we introduce our own animistic ideas into a conception where it may not have originally existed."

This subject is of importance and may be borne in mind with advantage in considering what is to follow.

III.

Example Number Two: The Bushmen of Australia. "Of all the races now extant the Australians are probably lowest in culture, and, like the fauna of the continent, are nearest to the primitive model. They have neither metals, bows, pottery, agriculture nor fixed habitations, and no traces of higher culture have anywhere been found above or in the soil of the continent." Among them, if anywhere, popular "science" will find material in support of its thesis; hence their appearance in Mr. Huxley's bold statement that "in its simplest condition *such as may be met with among the Australian blacks,* theology is a mere belief in the existence, powers and dispositions (usually malignant) of ghost-like entities who may be propitiated or scared away; but no cult can properly be said to exist. And in this stage theology is wholly independent of ethics."

"Remarks more crudely in defiance of known facts," comments Mr. Lang, "could not be made," and then he proceeds to give the facts as they come from men who have lived among the Australians.

"The Australians assuredly believe in 'spirits,' often malicious and probably in most cases regarded as ghosts of men; these aid the wizard and occasionally inspire him. That these ghosts are worshiped does not appear and *is denied* by Waitz. Again, in the matter of cult 'there is none' in the way of *sacrifice* to higher Gods," as there should be according to "scientific" theory if these gods were hungry ghosts. "The cult among the Australians is the worship of the heart, expressed in moral teaching supposed to be in conformity with the institutes of their God. Worship takes the form, as at Eleusis, of tribal mysteries originally instituted, as at Eleusis, by the God. The young men are initiated with many ceremonies, some of which are cruel and farcical, but the initiation includes ethical instruction in conformity with the supposed commands of a God who reads the heart. As among ourselves, the ethical idea, with its theological sanction, is probably rather above the moral standard of ordinary practice. What conclusion we should draw from these facts is uncertain, but the facts at least cannot be disputed, and precisely contradict the statement of Mr. Huxley. He was wholly in the wrong when he said: 'The moral code, such as is implied by public opinion, derives no sanction on such dogmas.' "

One of the most reliable sources of information is a Mr. Howitt, who lived in Australia and whose reports appear in the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute.* This gentleman, as most "scientific" investigators, starts into his work influenced by the accepted anthropological bias. Hence when he finds a universal belief in a Supreme Being, especially if this belief views Him as a source of punishment, he is all too ready to infer that its origin may be found in the ghost of a "defunct headman." Now, the traces of "headmanship," i. e., acknowledgment of a tribal leader, are extremely faint among these races; "even when found, no such headman rules large areas of country, and so, even living, claims no service from a number of tribes; nor is any such a one known to be worshiped after death; and Mr. Howitt's own statements illustrate not a 'malevolent Being,' but *one who punishes trespasses committed against tribal ordinances and customs,* whose first institution is ascribed to Him;" *Darumulun* is the native appellation of this Supreme Being. The elements of the religion as gathered from Mr. Howitt's experience may be summed up as follows: "Darumulun 'watched the youths from the sky, prompt to punish, by disease or death, the breach of his ordinances,' moral or ritual. His name is too sacred to be spoken except in whispers, and the anthropologist will observe that the names of the human dead are also often tabooed. But the divine name is not thus tabooed and sacred when the mere folklore about him is narrated. The informants of Mr. Howitt instinctively distinguished between the mythology and the religion of Darumulun. This distinction, the secrecy about the religion, the candor about the mythology, is essential, and accounts for our ignorance about the inner religious beliefs of early races. Mr. Howitt himself knew little till he was initiated. Mr. Howitt mentions, among moral lessons divinely sanctioned, respect for old age, abstinence from lawless love and avoidance of the sins so popular, poetic, and sanctioned by the example of gods in classical Greece. A representation is made of the Master, Biamban, and to make such idols, except at the Mysteries, is forbidden 'under pain of death.' Those which are made are destroyed as soon as the rites are ended. The future life (apparently) is then illustrated by the burial of the living elder, who rises from a grave. This may, however, symbolize the 'new life' of the Mystæ, 'Worse have I fled; better have I found,' as was sung in an Athenian rite. The whole result is, by what Mr. Howitt calls 'a quasi-religious element,' to 'impress upon the mind of the youth, in an indelible manner, those rules of conduct which form the moral law of the tribe.'

"Many other authorities could be adduced for the religious sanction of morals in Australia. An all-knowing being observes and rewards the conduct of men; he is named with reverence, if named at all; his abode is the heavens; he is the Maker and Lord of things; his lessons 'soften the heart.' "

Surely in presence of these facts there is excuse for the author's quaint quotation:

> "What wants this knave
> That a *God* should have?"

The effect of this outline of Australian religion is heightened by the author's report that its mysteries are actually used "to counteract the immoral character which natives acquire by associating with Anglo-Saxon Christians. Mr. Howitt gives an account of the Jeræil, or Mysteries of the Kurnai. The old men deemed that through intercourse with the whites 'the lads had become selfish and no longer inclined to share that which they obtained by their own exertions or had given them with their friends.' One need not say that selflessness is the very essence of goodness and the central moral doctrine of Christianity. So it is in the religious Mysteries of the African Yao; a selfish man, we shall see, is spoken of as 'uninitiated.' So it is with the Australian Kurnai, whose mysteries and ethical teaching are under the sanction of their Supreme Being. So much for the anthropological dogma that early theology has no ethics."

After describing the ceremony Mr. Lang summarizes the precepts the young man is expected to observe:

"1. To obey the old. (Fifth Commandment.)

"2. To share with all their friends. (Do to others as you would have others do to you.)

"3. To live peaceably with their friends.

"4. Not to interfere with girls or married women. (Seventh Commandment.)

"5. To obey the food restrictions. (Leviticus, passim.)"

Mr. Howitt concludes: "I venture to assert that it can no longer be maintained that the Australians have no belief which can be called religious, that is, in the sense of beliefs which govern tribal and individual morality under a supernatural sanction." On this topic Mr. Howitt's opinion became more affirmative the more deeply he was initiated.

Truly the religion of those most primitive savages, in which morality and reverence are conspicuous elements, with no propitiation of food or purely magical rites to remotely justify the idea that their God was a ghost; with its prohibition of even making His image except under most solemn circumstances, and then to serve a temporary purpose; truly this actual religion of the Bushmen is out of joint with that which "science" accredits to them; and surely there is something wrong with "scientific" methods that permit Mr. Spencer and Mr. Huxley to ignore facts which throw a light very different from theirs on what they consider "the simplest condition of theology." "In its highest aspect that 'simplest theology' of Australia is free from the faults of popular theology in Greece. The God discourages sin; he does not set the example of sinning. He is almost too sacred to be named (except in mythology), and far too sacred to be represented by idols. He is not moved by sacrifice; he has not the chance; like Death in Greece, 'he only of all Gods, loves not gifts.' Thus the status of theology does not correspond to the status in material and intellectual culture. It would scarcely be a paradox to say that the popular Zeus, or Ares, is degenerate from Darumulun, or the Fuegian being who forbids the slaying of an enemy, and almost literally 'marks the sparrow's fall.'"

An explanation of the mistake fallen into by these scientists is suggested by Mr. Lang, and as his remarks have a universal bearing they deserve attentive consideration:

"If we knew all the mythology of Darumulun, we should probably find it (like much of the myth of Pundjel or Bunjil) on a very different level from the theology. There are two currents, the religious and the mythical, flowing together through religion. The former current, religious, even among very low savages, is pure from the magical ghost propitiating habit. The latter current, mythological, is full of magic, mummery and scandalous legend. Sometimes the latter stream quite pollutes the former, sometimes they flow side by side, perfectly distinguishable, as in Aztec ethical piety, compared with the bloody Aztec ritualism. Anthropology has mainly kept her eyes fixed on the impure stream, the lusts, mummeries, conjurings and frauds of priesthoods, while relatively, or altogether, neglecting (as we have shown) what is honest and of good report.

"The worse side of religion is the less sacred, and therefore the more conspicuous. Both elements are found co-existing in almost all races, and nobody, in our total lack of historical information about the beginnings, can say which, if either, element is the earlier, or which, if either, is derived from the other. To suppose that propitiation of corpses and then of ghosts came first is agreeable and seems logical to some writers who are not without a bias against all religion as an unscientific superstition. But we know so little! The first missionaries in Greenland supposed that there was not there a trace of belief in a Divine Being. 'But when they came to understand their language better they found quite the reverse to be true . . . and not only so, but they could plainly gather from a free dialogue they had with some perfectly wild Greenlanders (avoiding any direct application to their hearts) that their ancestors must have believed in a Supreme Being, and did render Him some service, which their posterity neglected little by little.' . . . Mr. Tylor does not refer to this as a trace of Christian Scandinavian influence on the Eskimo.

"That line, of course, may be taken. But an Eskimo said to a missionary, 'Thou must not imagine that no Greenlander thinks about these things' (theology). He then stated the argument from design. 'Certainly there must be some Being who made all these things. He must be very good, too. . . . Ah, did I but know him, how I would love and honor him.' As St. Paul writes: 'That which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God hath showed it unto them . . . being understood by the things which are made . . . but they became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.' In fact, mythology submerged into religion." People, says St. Paul, "reached the belief in a God from the Argument for Design. Science conceives herself to have annihilated teleological ideas. But they are among the probable origins of religion, and would lead to the belief in a Creator whom the Greenlander thought beneficent, and after whom he yearned. This is a very different initial step in religious development, if initial it was, from the feeding of a corpse or a ghost.

"From all this evidence it does not appear how non-polytheistic, non-monarchical, non-Manes-worshipping savages evolved the idea of a relatively supreme, moral and benevolent Creator, unborn, undying, omniscient and omnipresent. 'He can go everywhere and do everything.' "

SIL'S SEMINARY LIBRARY

IV.

Would you have another illustration of how completely the actual condition of religion among savages belies the "scientific" formulæ? "The case of the Andaman Islanders may be especially recommended to believers in the anthropological science of religion. For long these natives were the joy of emancipated inquirers as the 'godless Andamanese.' They only supply Mr. Spencer's 'Ecclesiastical Institutions' with a few instances of the ghost belief. Yet when the Andamanese are scientifically studied in situ by an educated Englishman, Mr. Man, who knows their language, has lived with them for eleven years and presided over our benevolent efforts 'to reclaim them from their savage state,' the Andamanese turn out to be quite embarrassingly rich in the higher elements of faith. They have not only a profoundly philosophical religion, but an excessively absurd mythology, like the Australian blacks, the Greeks and other peoples. If, on the whole, the student of the Andamanese despairs of the possibility of an ethnological theory of religion, he is hardly to be blamed."

Once more an aspect of anthropological study of religion that has hitherto been entirely overlooked is forced upon us. The esoteric moral and religious teachings of ancient and savage beliefs are nearly unknown to us, save in a few instances. "It is certain that the mysteries of Greece were survivals of savage ceremonies, because we know that they included specific savage rites, such as the use of the rhombos to make a whirring noise, and the custom of ritual daubing with dirt, and the sacred ballets d'action, in which, as Lucian and Qing say, mystic facts are 'danced out.' But, while Greece retained these relics of savagery, there was something taught at Eleusis which filled minds like Plato's and Pindar's with a happy religious awe. Now, similar 'softening of the heart' was the result of the teaching in the Australian Bora: The Yao mysteries inculcate the victory over self; and, till we are admitted to the secrets of all other savage mysteries throughout the world, we cannot tell whether, among mummeries, frivolities and even license, high ethical doctrines are not presented under the sanction of religion. The new life, and perhaps the future life, are undeniably indicated in the Australian mysteries by the simulated resurrection.

"I would therefore no longer say, as in 1887, that the Hellenic genius must have added to 'an old medicine dance' all that the Eleusinian mysteries possessed of beauty, counsel and consolation. These elements, as well as the barbaric factors in the rites, may have been developed out of such savage doctrine as softens the hearts of Australians and Yaos. That this kind of doctrine receives religious sanction is certain, where we know the secret of savage mysteries. It is therefore quite incorrect and strangely presumptuous to deny, with almost all anthropologists, the alliance of ethics with religion among the most backward races. We must always remember their secrecy about their inner religion, their frankness about their mythological tales. These we know: the inner religion we ought to begin to recognize that we do not know."

Examples of uncouth peoples, in whose beliefs marked distinctions are drawn between "gods" who were once men and "gods" who were never in ordinary human conditions and could not have been developed from "ghosts" are not wanting in Mr. Lang's book. Neither may the scientist retort that "if savages did not invent gods in consequence of a fallacious belief in spirit and soul, still, in some other equally illogical way they came to indulge the hypothesis that they had a Judge and Father in heaven. But, if the ghost theory of the high gods is wrong, as it is conspicuously superfluous, that does make some difference. It proves that a widely preached scientific conclusion may be as spectral as Bathybius." And the same conclusions must be arrived at in regard to each and all of the other pronouncements with which "science" has cumbered investigation and hindered accurate knowledge in a field of research, where, if anywhere, there was eminent need of the utmost exactness and conservatism in sifting premises and arriving at conclusions.

Much as Mr. Lang's work deserves commendation from certain points of view, it has withal its weaker aspects, and these may not escape criticism.

The problem of "spirit" or "soul;" its existence, the original idea of it, etc.: this problem demands for anything like adequate treatment an educational accoutrement superior to that exhibited by Mr. Lang.

Adequate treatment is possible only to him who has exhausted the resources of science in this field of study. What are these resources?

First. One should have a specialist's acquaintance with that body of thought which first attempted an exact definition of the soul, its nature, powers and manner of action, namely, the philosophy of Greece, particularly the systems of Aristotle and Plato, and their later development under the efforts of the scholastics. Through this knowledge one becomes familiar with the philosophic idea of soul and the essential qualities which are supposed to differentiate it and its acts from matter and the various forms of material activity.

Secondly. Having thus realized the conception of spirit, reached by the learned Past, the authoritative teacher of the Present should know how the Past's conclusions have been upset, modified or confirmed by that sphere of psychological research, which approaches the soul and its operations through its tenement or machine of clay, the body; he should, in other words, have served his apprenticeship in the laboratory. He must have realized from personal observation and legitimate experiment how in the actual human compound (in its various stages of growth, modification and metamorphosis, through nerves and muscles, brain and blood) that which is in man, mental and moral as well as physical, makes evident its action and its complicated diversity of nature. Thus acquainted with the facts of man's composition from its fleshly manifestation, the method and course of the soul's operation through its material accompaniment can be diagnosed, and that in human action which eludes the grip of laboratory, experiment and explanation, can be entered in a column by itself, thence to be taken into account when a statement is prepared of just what Science and Metaphysics, apart from Revelation, can or cannot authoritatively state as to the existence and nature of a two-fold element in man's constitution.

Thirdly. With the results achieved from this two-fold previous investigation well in hand, another step can be taken. The authenticated actual abnormal and preternormal manifestations of the "spirit" element in man: second-sight, telepathy, crystal-gazing, the facts of fetichism, spiritualism, demoniacal possession, etc.; this latest territory added to the scientific domain, psychical research, can be explored; rather the exploration may be inaugurated, for, because of its vastness, it must remain for years in a rudimentary stage. The new results thus gathered should be added to those previously arrived at; and those previous ones corrected or interpreted, as the case may be, in the light of the additional knowledge gleaned.

Fourthly. Before a categorical word can be said, defining the origin and progress of the idea of "spirit" in the case of any primitive people, the teacher who would speak with authority must possess an accurate and also a comprehensive acquaintance with the general laws of philology, besides being familiar with one or two of the languages of that section of the human family whose psychology he professes to explain; this requirement is absolute, for as words express thought, so a language is the record of thought's development and change. You cannot know the primitive views of a people, after scientific standards, about "soul," "God" or anything else, without understanding by what analogies and through what word formations these notions found abiding place among them. Let it be added that a necessary element of this language study, through which you get at a nation's thought-concept, is historical appreciation of the conditions, environment and changes in which the destiny of the people was, or is being, accomplished.

A work characterized by a combination of the knowledge just described, metaphysical, biological, psychical and historico-philological, with this knowledge carefully digested, judiciously arranged, and kept entirely clear of prejudice, special pleading or misstatement, such a work may be conceived of as an ideal of scientific attainment, and one may, naturally and reasonably, expect it to be characterized by a certain degree of categorical enunciation of general law; its conclusions, moreover, within the sphere it covers, may not be lightly questioned. By so much, however, as a scientific work lacks one or more of the elements of this essential and varied information, by that much is its treatment of necessity inadequate and its authority doubtful.

Applying this test to the work of Mr. Lang, or if you will to that of Huxley, Spencer, Tylor and their popular exponents, the limited reliability of their results is apparent at a glance. Not one of them, if true to the accepted principles of correct Science, had either right or title to promulgate a final and categorical conclusion about the origin and development of the idea of "spirit;" Science is not at present in possession of the requisite facts; it is a problem if she ever will be.

Of Mr. Lang's work in particular it needs be said that its dicta have been formulated without any special familiarity with either biology, philology, or the history of the nations whose religions are reviewed, and with only a superficial acquaintance with the systems of philosophy whose methods are rather speculative than experimental. The author is, indeed, a writer of rare finish, a past master in literary criticism, gifted with that accomplishment of hard sense and dialectic acuteness peculiarly characteristic of the Celt; withal his ken of the methods and results of the Society for Psychical Research plus a general course of reading in that restricted field of ethnology covered by the reports and narratives of travelers, discoverers and students of "primitive" peoples, do not constitute him an authoritative guide in the "Science of Religion." He is fitted to pick out, and this he has done effectually, some of the more evident flaws in the efforts of others, but he is sure to make and overlook his own. His work must be rated accordingly: that of a moderately equipped amateur.

Illustrating Mr. Lang's shortcomings is his very unsatisfactory treatment of "sacrifice." To his mind the fundamental notion of sacrifice was to feed ravenous "spirits;" it originated with ancestor or "ghost" worship; came late into religion, and its application to the Supreme Being was a result of degeneration in the primal savage concept of Him. If people had not come to getting the idea of "spirit" mixed up with the idea of "God," they would never have thought of sacrifices to the latter.

What ground has he for the view he so positively iterates and reiterates? No better than that the satisfactoriness of which in previous instances he unreservedly rejects.

1. He notes the omission of explicit testimony to sacrifice offerings by savages to the Being they conceive of as Supreme, in the imperfect accounts of some travelers; he accepts this omission as tantamount to a proof that among these people there was no sacrificial worship. "There are no traces of propitiation by food, or sacrifice, or anything but conduct" in Admiral Fitzroy's account of Fuegian religion; therefore, concludes Mr. Lang, no such worship exists in it. The conclusion is too big for the premises. Fitzroy's limited knowledge of the Fuegian religion is one thing, the nonexistence of sacrifice in it another, and you may not logically conclude from the former to the latter. Fitzroy's knowledge of this savage cult was certainly small and his logic in commenting upon it unreliable. For example, he thought the Fuegians had no idea of a future state, "because, among other reasons given, 'the evil spirit torments them in this world, if they do wrong, by storms, hail, snow, etc.' " Because a man fears punishment for evil deeds in this life, must it inexorably follow that he has no belief in a future one?

2. He limits the word sacrifice to suit his own thesis; he assumes that sacrifice means a food offering; yet investigators know that among "primitive" peoples offerings are frequently made of things that in nowise may be conceived of as "food;" for example, of clippings of the hair, parings of the nails, etc.

3. Facts presented by Mr. Lang are against his theory. In certain instances Supreme Beings do receive sacrificial worship from savages among whom no trace of ancestor worship is to be found. "It is notable that in this religion," that of the Pawnees, "we hear nothing of ancestor worship; we find the cult of an all-powerful being, in whose ritual sacrifice is the only feature that suggests ghost worship." You see the author's assumption: sacrifice must suggest ghost worship! In other heathen religions where a distinct line is drawn between "ghosts," souls of ancestors and "beings" who never were in human flesh, sacrifice is offered to the latter as well as to the former. This fact is exemplified among the Banks Islanders and the Fijis. Mr. Lang's explanation is that the worship originally given to the former was, in the course of time, transferred to the latter; but he presents no historical evidence to

show either that sacrifice originated with the worship of ghosts or that the transference assumed ever took place.

The author's general thesis would have been strengthened had he adopted another view: one more in harmony with his premise maintaining the degeneration of the original idea of God: the view that not only did this latter idea degenerate, but *also the concept of sacrifice.* He would thus have been brought more into harmony with scholars who maintain that the basis of the sacrificial system was, in some instances, a recognition of the Divine ownership of human life, and in others an act of communion or union with the tribal Divinity. Once and again, moreover, Mr. Lang harps on our ignorance of the "mysteries" of barbarian beliefs. What a pity he did not let this ignorance mitigate his positiveness about the origin of sacrifice.

A like criticism applies to his views upon priesthood, the origin and development of which he seems to attribute solely to greed and craft. These instincts have, indeed, in too many instances played sad havoc with priestly institutions; but to attribute to them the production of this universal characteristic of religious life is absurd. The assumption makes little of the natural shrewdness of even "primitive" races, and makes us ask why the men reputed to have originated these institutions, men so keen in duping their fellows, were not clever enough to cast the priest's life in pleasanter lines. How comes it that in "primitive" beliefs the priest is quite generally cut off from ordinary comforts, leads a life of hardship, endures fasting and physical torture, and is, all in all, one of the saddest-lived men, from a popular point of view, that you can well conceive of?

Other points, and not a few, in Mr. Lang's work would justify further criticism and dissent. Thus he writes: "On the hypothesis here offered to criticism there are two chief sources of Religion, (1) the belief, how attained we know not, in a powerful, moral, eternal, omniscient Father and Judge of men; (2) the belief (probably developed out of experiences normal and supernormal) in somewhat of man which may survive the grave." Would it be unreasonable to mention explicitly a third element, the possible direct revelation of Himself by a Supreme Being? True, there is room for such a supposition in explaining the given terms of the two previous propositions; but in view of the fact that religions as a general thing lay stress on such a revelation as explaining their own origin, in view of this fact, would it not be more logical to make the claim a subject of separate inquiry?

And now we have done with this rather ambitious volume. All in all the book, notwithstanding its burden of accurate information and trenchant observation and comment, is one of such manifest imperfection that its effect is apt to be neither deep nor lasting. The name of the author will, no doubt, give it a vogue among some who follow with interest his efforts in behalf of Psychical Research and who admire his literary talent; but for the mass of readers its contents are too scientific, while for specialists it is not scientific enough. In these pages it has served the useful purpose of bringing to clerical attention aspects of theological problems infrequently dealt with at any length in text books of theology, but which, more and more, are beginning to occupy the investigations of serious and learned men. Besides, its study justifies, from a natural point of view, the very helpful conclusion that "science" as ordinarily understood is not near so sure of its apodictical utterances as at first sight might appear; and that, under Providence, the times may dawn—and this not so remotely—when Religion will begin to come into its own again.

REV. JOSEPH V. TRACY.

Boston, Mass.

ON ANGLICAN CONVENTS.

THIS is written chiefly with a view to enable Catholics to better understand, sympathize with, and if occasion offer, help those who to the Catholic mind seem the strangest of strange anomalies—Anglican sisters or nuns. Catholics frequently think and say: "When they have come so far, how can they be in good faith where they are? Obviously they are engaged in copying our systems and adopting our methods; why cannot they give up imitation and seek the reality, which they so evidently admire? Why do they attempt to graft shoots plucked from our living vine on to their barren and lifeless branch, lopped off three centuries ago from the parent stem? Can they expect these to bear good fruit for God when separated from their source and life? What folly it all seems, so illogical and inconsistent!"

Well, perhaps when it is considered that in nearly all cases the Anglican "sister" has been born and bred in a system given to compromise, indefiniteness and a latitudinarianism which it styles "comprehensiveness," they will cease to regard *her* as an illogical sham, although her *position* is certainly of that nature. It is quite another thing to see one's position clearly when one has been brought up in it from seeing it from an outside and independent quarter. In her eclecticism, spirit, belief and practice she is but the legitimate and logical outcome of the human institution to which she belongs.

Beginning in a very humble way about the middle of this century, these sisterhooods rapidly increased in numbers and prosperity until at this present day they form a very considerable and prominent section of the Anglican body. Primarily the object of all of them is the sanctification of the individual members; and in nearly all cases secondarily, the salvation and charitable aid of the poor, the sinful and the suffering. They profess one principal intention in all they do, and to use the very words of one of their handbooks, it is this: "All for God; His greater glory and more perfect love." An intention which it would be impossible to improve upon.

Those who enter these sisterhoods are for the most part devout women, taken from every class of society, ardently desirous of serving and glorifying God through the sanctification of their own souls and the benefaction of their neighbor. They have been nurtured in the distinct prejudices and vague beliefs and teachings of Anglicanism, and, therefore, whilst they recoil with horror from the thought of joining the church which all along the ages has provided her children with abundant means of holiness, and of serving God in evangelical perfection, they do not hesitate to borrow, adopt and adapt the rules, customs and organization framed by Catholic saints for the institutions and children of the Catholic Church. And they do this in perfect good faith, thinking they are choosing what is good from all and rejecting the "corruptions." They do not even attempt to conceal that they are forever borrowing from the church, their garb being one outward token of it, but in the instructions given to their novices they take a singular pleasure in relating how this part of their constitutions is taken from the rule of this old Catholic order, and another part from that Catholic congregation, and various customs chosen at random from many scattered convents, wherever the wanderings of the particular founder have led him. The result is, of course, somewhat incongruous, but that is to them a mere detail, and by no means interferes with their pleasure in carrying out their rule, which they consider is bound to be very good, since it is taken from so many holy sources. There are some few among the sisterhoods more original than this, but they unfortunately are more distinguished in customs, dress, etc., for eccentricity than good sense.

Also the books put into the hands of novices to instruct them in the life they are to lead—as far as our experience goes—are entirely Catholic: the works—lives of Catholic saints—writings of Jesuits, Benedictines, Franciscans, etc. The books of devotion used by the higher Church Sisters are nearly all Catholic, or adaptations of Catholic manuals. The offices, which most of them recite in English, are translations (with some omissions) from the Church's breviary, either according to the Sarum or Roman use. In some of their chapels they have discarded the "communion service" of the Anglican "Prayer Book" and have adopted the "Scotch office," as containing higher doctrine, and in a few instances even that does not satisfy, so they use a translation of the beautiful Sarum rite. One of the High-church convents has also been "trying and praying for years to obtain the privilege of reservation of the Blessed Sacrament in our chapel," as the "reverend prioress" writes; whilst others, more determined or perhaps diplomatic, have already had this (as they believe) for many years. This, however, is kept as a sort of open secret, and a curtain screens off the eastern chapel, where the Sisters take it in turn to watch before it. Others, more openly regardless of the powers that be, make no attempt at concealment, burning the lamp before the tabernacle in full view of any one who chooses to go in to look. In some points several of them even outdo their model, as they reserve in both kinds, and not content with using incense at "high celebrations," Lauds, Vespers and on festivals at Solemn Matins, they also have it at Low Mass, offered by a server during the elevation. Vestments, banners and processions in honor of the Blessed Sacrament, Our Lady and the saints they have, too; confessionals and holy water, and in a few cases even holy oils. There is hardly any outward point of Catholic practice that some of them have not adopted.

It is true that the tenets of the whole Anglican body, as found in the thirty-nine articles, and also the opinions of a large and influential section of its living members utterly condemn these practices, as well as the doctrines of which they are the outcome and exponent. The Twenty-second Article pronounces the doctrines of purgatory, invocation of saints, etc., to be "A fond thing, vainly invented, with no warranty of Scripture;" the Twenty-fifth declares that "The doctrine of seven sacraments is a corrupt following of the Apostles;" the Thirty-first asserts that "The Sacrifice of Masses is a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit." Yet, marvelous as it seems in the face of this, there are thousands of Anglicans who daily pray for the dead and have Masses (as they imagine) said for them; who invoke the saints, believe in seven sacraments, offer the holy sacrifice as they say and think and keep watch before their God (as they fancy) in the Blessed Sacrament.

There is even an Anglican convent where it is customary for the reverend mother to say: "Let us pray for our Holy Father"—if any one present were so deluded as to imagine her filial devotion to be meant for "Archbishop" Temple, she would be presently enlightened by the next exhortation: "My dear Sisters, let us try to gain all the indulgences which our Holy Father has attached to this devotion!" Then would follow the Rosary, or Stations of the Cross.

If we have not experienced some such state of mind ourselves, we shall probably say that it is morally impossible for people to come so far towards Catholicism and yet be in good faith as Anglicans. But those who have come through it know that it is often so. It is true that as far as externals are concerned they are near, but the whole inward principle of their belief and practice is totally opposed to that of the Catholic. They believe certain Catholic doctrines, or almost all of them, as the case may be, because their individual judgment has approved and chosen them as right and worthy of belief; the Catholic by virtue of divine faith accepts *all* that the mouthpiece of the Holy Ghost proposes to him for belief, because he knows that God can neither deceive nor be deceived, since He is truth essential and uncreate. With the Anglicans the habitual effort to reconcile the mind's natural ideas of truth and unity with the presence of a host of antagonistic doctrines and contrarieties of practice, existing and tolerated side by side within the pale of Anglicanism (to say nothing of the rank infidelity therein rife) produces bewilderment, and gradually dulls the perceptions so that it is very hard to see how untenable and inconsistent is the position. Anglican Sisters have been brought up to regard the *State Establishment* as a "branch" or "continuation" of Christ's Church, and therefore they feel bound as loyal children to whitewash its contradictions by attributing them to its "comprehensiveness and Catholicity." But they do not really feel satisfied with this excuse, and make further efforts to resolve the discord into harmony by the theory that it is the result of the indefinite teaching of the Broad and Low-church parties so long in ascendency, and they imagine that in time *their* teaching will counterbalance this evil. They do not and—unless God show it them—they *cannot* see that this is equal to saying: "God is a teacher of falsehood as well as truth, but *we* hope in time to make truth prevail." Yet so obviously is this their proposition that one lucid moment would suffice to show it them. Christ commands us to hear His Church, saying: "He that heareth you, heareth Me." God cannot err; therefore, if we say: "The Church can err," we make Him a liar, when He says to her: "He that heareth *you*, heareth Me." In the office of *teaching*, God here by His almighty word identifies Himself with His Church; therefore, if we say the Church can and has erred, we make God a teacher of false doctrine. Also, if the Church *can* err, God might just as well have told us to "hear ourselves." These and other such blasphemies, embodied in practice and masquerading in the garb and spoils of Christ's Church, do not look quite so wolfish as they are, more especially to those who have been brought up to respect them. So, generally speaking, these Anglican Sisters are not only in "good faith," but we might even call it sublime faith, so high does it rise above all the contradictions, inconsistencies and turmoils of this city of confusion, and with perfect confidence they live on in a state of waiting and watching for "everything to come right!" Yes, these devout but mistaken souls expect that if they only pray and have patience enough, chaos will miraculously resolve itself into order, and the shifting sands of Anglicanism consolidate themselves into the rock of the unity and Catholicism of Christ's visible Church. They wait for it, they work for it, they expect it, and so they will go on till the bitter end, unless, as happened to some of them, by God's special mercy a ray of divine light pierce the mists of gloom and confusion surrounding them and enable them to see how preposterous is their position, and how hopeless, and direct them, as by the Star of Bethlehem, to the one true fold. This ray is the *gift* of faith, and this it is, and nothing else, that makes all the difference. It is not given to some, so we can never judge those who remain behind, as if they had rejected it. And those who have been vouchsafed it do not receive it till a certain point or crisis in their soul's life, when suddenly all things are seen in a new and supernatural light, obscure, yet certain, so that they believe without any doubt that the Catholic Church is the one only divine teacher of truth to all nations, as appointed by Christ. This accepted, all, of course, follows. Up to that moment all was vagueness and confusion; no certitude to give security to belief, no point of rest on which to stay the soul. Nothing but the endless torture of seeking for truth and the awful responsibility of personally deciding for or against it. But now, by God's infinite grace, what a change! All gropings in that horror of darkness over for ever. No more searching, doubting, questioning, comparing, deciding by each individual member his own peculiar tenets, but only a simple, childlike acceptance of creed and doctrine from the mouth of our Holy Mother the Church! "Except ye become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter therein." Why should the poor soul travail in birth with its creed when our Mother has done it all for it already? Has she not—this ancient, glorious Mother—gravely, learnedly and, above all—oh, joy to the poor storm-tossed soul!—*infallibly* searched into, sifted and taught the majestic truths of God for well nigh nineteen centuries? At last it sees and knows that the keystone connecting and sustaining the whole fabric of the arch of theology and doctrine is no other than this divine infallibility. *With* it fitted in the centre all the truths, dogmas and mysteries of faith form a beautiful and symmetrical arch; *without* it, they fall to the ground a shapeless heap of ruins.

To many, however, this wondrous gift and blessing is not granted, and they toil on in their perplexities, hoping against hope for the dawn of better things, until death comes along and hales them to a different arena. It is sad to think of them; but still many of them have been in good faith, and now their day of enlightenment has begun, though in a state where they can no longer merit by correspondence with grace. Some of these souls have had reasonable doubts of their religion, too, which they ought to have followed up, only they foolishly consulted their blind leaders, who, of course, said such doubts were plain temptations and delusions of the devil, and so to be resisted and put down. Others (and there has been a whole community in this case) have come far beyond doubts and have actually reached the certitude of faith; but, alas for them, their chaplain and confessor remained still in the outer darkness and would not permit them to follow their conscience. He was a good man according to his light, and conscientiously did what he thought to be right in hindering them from following that which he believed to be a temptation. The Sisters considered themselves bound to yield to his persuasion and authority, and gave up for the time at least all thoughts of doing what they knew was their duty; and who knows if the moment of grace ever returned? The Anglican labyrinth is indeed dark and full of windings and mazes, and happy is he who, finding the clue, follows it straightway out into the light of day.

The tendency of these Sisterhoods with regard to discipline and works of penance is in most instances towards the side of austerity. Confession is conducted in so rigid and inquisitorial a manner as to become a perfect torture and a chief means of discouragement to conscientious souls. What they pay most attention to is a minute and laborious exactitude in noting down all the memory can gather from an anxious and morbid self-introspection, the confessor adding not a little to the poor soul's already strained scrupulosity by his probings and zest for circumstantial detail. There are exceptions to this, of course, as some men have naturally more wisdom than others; but what I have said is the prevailing tendency, as gathered from our own experience and that of many others.

The enclosed convents only (and they are few) practice corporal austerities, and in one of them at least fasting is greatly overdone, and, at the caprice of the superior, other penitential exercises also. They obtain their instruments of penance from various—often Catholic sources, and Pusey, talking of some he had procured from abroad, calls them "Nice religious-looking things!" They have rather curious ideas as to appropriate occasions for using them, too. Some Anglican nuns being once in a quandary as to where they could get disciplines, sent one of their number out in quest of them. In the course of her search she came to a large convent belonging to one of the Catholic austere orders, and there she confided to the portress with great simplicity that her convent's feast fell on the morrow, and she had been sent out to seek for disciplines, because they were all going to take it in the morning during "Mass!" It was perhaps as well she did not obtain her request there, for Anglicans have not the wisdom and moderation of the Church to guide them in the use of these things, nor yet the teaching of experience to fall back upon, and then the modern constitution is not made of iron.

The active Sisterhoods seek their mortifications chiefly in their work, and certainly they find them there. The charitable works upon which they are engaged are of all kinds and too many to be fully enumerated here. Through these the constant and self-sacrificing labors of the Sisters do much to alleviate the misery and degradation of multitudes of their fellow-creatures. They do these works, as we have already stated, from the very highest motives, and not as mere acts of philanthropy. And that they are unable to do better still is their misfortune and not their fault. As they have not the true faith themselves, of course they cannot successfully instruct the ignorant in the way of life; but as any religion and worship of God is better than none, they can do much to improve the condition of many even in this respect. Apart from their mission school work—which is extensive—they have catechism classes conducted by the Sisters for children of all ages from infants upwards. And they admit children of any creed, provided their parents allow them to attend, so that in any places where indifferentism prevails, as amongst the poor Presbyterians of Scotland, the Anglicans, or, what is the same thing, the Scotch Episcopalians (so-called), make converts in wholesale numbers as soon as the children they have taught arrive at a responsible age. This is a very great boon to these poor neglected ones, as they have some idea of religious duty impressed upon them; a high standard of morality set up among them; and their intercourse with these good Sisters insensibly softens their roughness of character and manner and, in short, generally civilizes them. Then they have homes for girls who, having just left school, are beginning to work for themselves, and thus they get hold of them at the most dangerous ages—from 14 to 21, and even older than this if there be any necessity. There is an effort made to make these homes self-supporting, but that is quite secondary to the main object, which is to prevent as far as possible these young workers from yielding to the many temptations that beset them in the factories, laundries and other places of work in our large cities and manufacturing districts. If it can be managed, they are required to come home for meals, the Sister in charge seeing the employers about it if necessary to arrange it, and their evenings are made as bright and happy for them as can be that they may have no reasonable excuse to seek amusement abroad. Every now and then some special pleasure is planned for them. If it is a dance, each girl is allowed to ask some respectable young man of her acquaintance; the list of those to be invited being inspected and approved by the Sister in charge, who, through the knowledge of one of her Sisters in charge of the youths' classes and amusements, knows very well whether they are admissible or not.

For youths of the same ages they have halls where they hold classes—Bible, church history or secular—for part of the evening, and games, drill, gymnastics, fencing, boxing or what is very attractive to Scotch lads, dancing lessons, afterwards. Of course, the aid of seculars has to be called in for these things, and in England it is not so usual to have dancing for the lads, as English boys have not the inborn love of that exercise that there is in the Scotch. The great object in all that is done being to keep them off the streets after work hours.

The youths' amusements are given gratuitously, but the girls who live in the homes pay a small board in proportion to what they earn, the young half-timers paying a merely nominal sum just to teach them self-respect. The good Sisters are often in sore straits to make ends meet; but when the worst comes to the worst, they beg for their work and always get enough to go on with.

The visiting of the poor in their own homes and in hospitals is done for two ends. Firstly, to keep the people up to their religious duties by showing a kindly interest in them and their welfare, and, secondly, in order to relieve any cases of extreme suffering or misery they may come across as far as may be by counsel, food, clothing, medicine or money, according to the exigencies of the case. The whole district in which they live is divided amongst the Sisters, and each makes a regular round as often as she can, going daily only to such as are sick or helpless. At regular intervals there is a district meeting held, at which each Sister gives a report of her people in presence of the chaplain and his curates, who take note of anything that requires looking into or attention from themselves.

Other Sisterhoods do rescue work, but we do not know their methods, nor what measure of success attends them.

Others nurse in hospitals and try to utilize the time of sickness to benefit the souls of the sick and sad, and then they send them off to convalescent homes, maintained in connection with them, at some country or seaside place.

Some of them have homes for incurables, where all sorts of piteous and loathsome cases are brought to them by the poor, and the good Sisters spend their lives in nursing, tending and teaching these helpless creatures for the love of God.

Some have homes for poor children, who, having been taken before the Magistrate for small delinquencies, are confided to their care for some years. They have homes, too, for children whose parents are cruel, and thus unfit to have charge of their offspring.

Others keep crêches in poor districts for the babies and tiny children of working people, and not infrequently have them left on their hands, when after a time they are drafted off to one of their orphanages and there brought up, taught and trained for domestic service or other useful work.

In all these and other works their noble disinterestedness, self-sacrifice and patience are beyond all praise. And what they accomplish in spite of discouragement, difficulties and failures, and without the special aids and graces of the sacraments, is a noteworthy monument to the glory of the grace of God, which overflows so abundantly His own appointed channels. They have so great a zeal for God that, although it is not according to knowledge, the blessing of our good God will surely rest on them for it and bring many of them home to the fold of the true Church, where by divine faith He will lead them into the green pastures of sound doctrine and by the living waters of the true sacraments. Oh, dear, blood-bought sheep, *can* there be any other than this one fold? Did not God say, speaking of His *visible* Church: "There shall be one fold and one Shepherd?" Did He not pray: "That they *all* may be one, as thou, Father, in Me and I in Thee; that they also may be one in us; that the *world may believe* that thou hast sent Me?" Shall He speak and His word come to naught? Shall He pray and not effect? God avert the thought. He *has* said, and it *is* done.

J. S.

LEO XIII. ON ECCLESIASTICAL STUDIES.

To Our Venerable Brothers the Archbishops, Bishops and Clergy of France.

Venerable Brothers, Dearly Beloved Sons: Since the day we were raised to the Pontifical Chair France has been ever the object to us of a special solicitude and affection. For from her God, in the unfathomable designs of His mercy over the world, has in the course of ages by preference chosen Apostolic men destined to preach the true faith to the limits of the globe, and to carry the light of the Gospel to the nations yet plunged in the darkness of paganism. He predestined her to be the defender of His Church and the instrument of His great works: *Gesta Dei per Francos.*

Obviously this high mission entails duties many and grave. Wishing, like our predecessors, to see France faithfully fulfil the glorious mandate wherewith she has been entrusted, we have on several occasions during our long pontificate addressed to her our advice, our encouragement, our exhortations. This we did in a special way in our Encyclical Letter of February 8, 1884, *Nobilissima Gallorum Gens,* and in our letter of February 16, 1892, published in French and beginning with the words: "*Au milieu des sollicitudes.*" Our words were not without fruit, and we know from you, Venerable Brothers, that a large portion of the French people ever holds in honor the faith of their ancestors and faithfully observes the obligations it imposes. On the other hand, it could not escape us that the enemies of this holy faith have not been idle and have succeeded in banishing every religious principle from a large number of families, which, in consequence, live in lamentable ignorance of revealed truth, and in complete indifference to all that concerns their spiritual interests and the salvation of their souls.

While therefore with good reason we congratulate France on being a focus of apostolic work among nations destitute of the faith, we are also bound to encourage the efforts of those of her sons who, enrolled in the priesthood of Jesus Christ, are laboring to evangelize their own people, to preserve them from the invasion of naturalism and incredulity, with their fatal and inevitable consequences. Called by the will of God to be the savour of the world, priests must always, and above all things, remember that they are by the very institution of Jesus Christ, "the salt of the earth,"[1] and hence St. Paul, writing to Timothy, justly concluded that "by their charity, their faith and their purity, they must be an example to the faithful in their words and in their relations with their neighbors."[1]

---

[1] Matt. v., 13.

That such is true of the French clergy, taken as a whole, has always been a great consolation to us to learn, Venerable Brothers, from the quadrennial reports you send us concerning the state of your dioceses, conformably to the Constitution of Sixtus V., and from the oral communications we receive from you whenever we have the happiness of conversing with you and receiving your confidences. Yes, dignity of life, ardor of faith, a spirit of devotedness and sacrifice, a zeal characterized by enthusiasm and generosity, an inexhaustible charity toward their neighbor, energy in all noble and fruitful enterprises making for the glory of God, the salvation of souls and the welfare of their country—these are the precious qualities traditional among the French clergy, and we are happy to be able here to render to them a public and fatherly testimony.

Still, precisely on account of the deep and tender affection we have for them, and at the same time to perform a duty of our Apostolic ministry and respond to the keen desire we feel to see them ever acting up to their great mission, we have resolved, Venerable Brothers, to treat in this letter of certain points to which present circumstances peremptorily call the conscientious attention of the chief pastors of the French Church and of the priests who work under their jurisdiction.

And in the first place it is clear that the more important, complex and difficult an office is the longer and more careful should be the preparation undergone by those who are called to fill it. But is there on earth a dignity higher than that of the priesthood or a ministry imposing a heavier responsibility than that whose object is the sanctification of all the free acts of man? Is it not of the government of souls that the Fathers have rightly said that it is "the art of arts;" that is, the most important and most delicate of all tasks to which a man may be applied for the benefit of his kind?—"*Ars artium regimen animarum?*"[2] Nothing must then be neglected to prepare those whom a divine vocation calls to this mission in order that they may fulfill it worthily and fruitfully.

To begin with, from among the young those are to be selected in whom the Most High has sown the seeds of a vocation. We are aware that, thanks to your wise recommendations, in many dioceses of France the priests of the different parishes, especially in country districts, apply themselves with a zeal and self-sacrifice which we cannot sufficiently praise in guiding themselves the studies of children in whom they have observed a marked tendency to piety and an aptitude for intellectual work. The presbyteral schools are thus the first step, as it were, of the stairs which from the junior to the senior seminaries carry up to the priesthood those young men to whom the Saviour repeats the appeal He addressed to Peter and Andrew, to John and James, "Leave your nets; follow Me, I will make you fishers of men."[1]

---

[1] I. Tim. iv., 12.

[2] St. Greg. the Gr. Lib. Regulæ Past, P. I., c. 1.

With regard to the junior seminary, this very valuable institution has been frequently and justly compared to the beds in which are set apart such plants as call for the most particular and assiduous care as the only way to make them bear fruit and produce a recompense for the labors of their cultivation. On this subject, we renew the recommendation addressed by our predecessor, Pius IX., to the Bishops in his Encyclical of December 8, 1849. This is itself based on one of the most important decisions of the Fathers of the Council of Trent. To France belongs the glory of having held it in most account during the present century, for of the ninety-four dioceses in the country there is not one which is not endowed with one or more junior seminaries.

We know, Venerable Brothers, the solicitude which you bestow on these institutions so justly dear to your pastoral zeal, and we congratulate you on it. The priests who labor, under your superintendence, for the formation of the youth called to enroll itself later on in the ranks of the sacerdotal army, cannot too often meditate before God on the exceptional importance of the mission with which you entrust them. They have not simply to instruct their children in the elements of letters and human science, like the general run of masters—that is the least part of their task. Their attention, zeal and devotion must be ever on the watch and active, in order, on the one hand, to study continually, under the eye and in the light of God, the souls of the children and the indications of their vocation to the service of the altar, and, on the other, to help the inexperience and feebleness of their young disciples in order to protect the precious grace of the Divine call against all deadly influences, both from without and from within. They have therefore to exercise a ministry that is humble, laborious and delicate, and requires constant abnegation. To sustain their courage in the fulfillment of their duties, they will take care to temper it in the purest sources of the spirit of faith. They must never lose sight of the fact that the children whose intelligence, heart and character they are engaged in forming are not being prepared for earthly functions, however legitimate or honorable. The Church confides those children to them in order that they may one day be fit to become priests; that is to say, missionaries of the Gospel, continuers of the work of Jesus Christ, distributers of His Grace and His Sacraments. Let this purely supernatural consideration incessantly imbue their double function as professors and educators, and be the leaven, so to say, which is to be mixed with the best flour, according to the Gospel parable, so as to transform it into sweet and substantial bread.[1]

---

[1] Matt. iv., 19.

And as an abiding thoughtfulness for the first and indispensable formation of the spirit and virtues of the priesthood should inspire the masters of your junior seminaries in their relations with their pupils, so, too, the system of study and the whole economy of discipline must be allied to this same primary and directing idea. We are not unaware, Venerable Brothers, that you are to a certain extent obliged to reckon with the State programme and with the conditions imposed by it for obtaining university degrees, owing to the fact that in certain cases such degrees are required of priests engaged in the management of free colleges under the patronage of the Bishops and religious congregations, or in the higher teaching of the Catholic faculties which you have so laudably established. It is, moreover, of sovereign importance for the maintenance of the influence of the clergy on society that they count among their ranks a sufficient number of priests yielding nothing in science, of which degrees are the official evidence, to the masters whom the State trains for its lyceums and universities.

Nevertheless, after making all the allowances imposed by circumstances for this exigency of the State programme, the studies of aspirants to the priesthood must remain faithful to the traditional methods of past ages. It is these which have produced the eminent men of whom France is so justly proud—the Petaus, Thomassins, Mabillons and many others, to say nothing of your Bossuet, called the Eagle of Meaux, because in loftiness of thought and nobility of expression his genius soars in the highest regions of Christian science and eloquence. The study of belles lettres rendered mighty aid in making these men valiant and useful workers in the service of the Church and capable of writing works which were truly worthy to pass down to posterity, and which contribute even to-day to the defense and propagation of revealed truth. For the belles lettres have the property, when taught by skilful Christian masters, of rapidly developing in the souls of young men all the germs of intellectual and moral life, whilst at the same time contributing accuracy and broadness to the judgment and elegance and distinction to expression.

This consideration assumes special importance when applied to

---

[1] Matt. xiii., 33.

Greek and Latin literature, the depositaries of those masterpieces of sacred science which the Church with good reason counts among her most precious treasures. Half a century ago, at that period (all too brief!) of true liberty, during which the bishops of France were free to meet and concert such measures as they deemed best calculated to further the progress of religion, and, at the same time, most profitable to the public peace, several of your Provincial Councils, Venerable Brothers, recommended in the most express terms the culture of the Latin tongue and literature. Even then your colleges deplored the fact that the knowledge of Latin in your country tended to diminish.[1]

But if the methods of pedagogy in vogue in the State establishments have been for several years past progressively reducing the study of Latin and suppressing the exercises in prose and poetry which our fathers justly considered should hold a large place in college classes, the junior seminaries must put themselves on their guard against these innovations, inspired by utilitarian motives and working to the detriment of the solid formation of the mind. To the ancient methods so often justified by their results we would freely apply the words of St. Paul to his disciple Timothy, and with the apostle we would say to you, Venerable Brothers, "Guard the deposit"[2] with jealous care. If it should be destined—which God forbid!—one day to disappear from the other public schools, let your junior seminaries and free colleges keep it with an intelligent and patriotic solicitude. Doing so, you will be imitating the priests of Jerusalem, who, saving the sacred fire of the temple from the barbarian invader, so hid it as to be able to find it again and restore it to its splendor when the evil day should have passed.[3]

Once in possession of the Latin tongue—the key, so to say, of sacred science—and their mental faculties sufficiently developed by the study of the belles lettres, young men destined for the priesthood pass from the junior to the senior seminary. There they will prepare themselves by piety and the exercise of the priestly virtues for the reception of Holy Orders, while devoting themselves to the study of philosophy and theology.

In our Encyclical "*Æterni Patris,*" which we once again recommend to the attentive perusal of your seminarists and their masters, we declared, with St. Paul as our authority, that it is by the empty subtleties of false philosophy "*per philosophiam et inanem fallaciam*"[4] that the minds of the faithful are most frequently led astray and the purity of the faith corrupted among men, we added, and the events of the last twenty years have furnished bitter confirmation of the reflections and apprehensions we expressed at the time. If one notes the critical condition of the times in which we live and ponders on the state of affairs in public and private life he will have no difficulty in seeing that the cause of the evils which oppress us, as well as those which menace, lies in the fact that erroneous opinions on all subjects, human and divine, have gradually percolated from philosophical schools through all ranks of society, and have come to be accepted by a large number of minds.[1]

---

[1] Litt. Synod. Patrum Conc. Paris ad clericos et fideles an., 1849, in Collectione Lacensis Tom IV., col. 36. [2] I. Tim. vi., 20. [3] II. Mach. i., 19-22. [4] Encyclical Æterni Patris.

We renew our condemnation of those teachings of philosophy which have merely the name, and which by striking at the very foundation of human knowledge lead logically to universal skepticism and to irreligion. We are profoundly grieved to learn that for some years past some Catholics have felt at liberty to follow in the wake of a philosophy which under the specious pretext of freeing human reason from all preconceived ideas and from all illusions, denies it the right of affirming anything beyond its own operations, thus sacrificing to a radical subjectivism all the certainties which traditional metaphysics, consecrated by the authority of the strongest thinkers, laid down as the necessary and unshakable foundations for the demonstration of the existence of God, the spirituality and immortality of the soul, and the objective reality of the exterior world. It is to be deeply regretted that this doctrinal skepticism, of foreign importation and Protestant origin, should have been received with so much favor in a country so justly celebrated for its love of clearness of thought and expression. We know, Venerable Brothers, how far you share our well-grounded anxiety on this subject, and we reckon on you to redouble your solicitude and vigilance in shutting out this fallacious and dangerous philosophy from the teaching in your seminaries, and to honor more than ever the methods we recommended in the above-quoted Encyclical of August 4, 1879.

In our times the students in your junior and senior seminaries can less than ever afford to be strangers to the study of physical and natural science. To it, therefore, they must apply themselves—but in due measure and in wise proportions. It is by no means necessary that in the scientific course annexed to the study of philosophy the professors should feel themselves obliged to expound in detail the almost innumerable applications of physical and natural sciences in the different branches of human industry. It is enough that their pupils have an accurate knowledge of the main principles and summary conclusions, so as to be able to solve the objections which infidels draw from these sciences against the teachings of Revelation.

---

[1] De Studiis Monasticis, Part II., c. 9.

It is of capital importance that the students of your senior seminaries should study, for at least two years, with great care, "rational" philosophy, which, as the learned Benedictine Mabillon, the glory of his order and of France, used to say, will be of the greatest assistance to them, not only in teaching them how to reason well and arrive at right conclusions, but in putting them in a position to defend the orthodox faith against the captious and often sophistical arguments of adversaries.[1]

Next come the sacred sciences, properly so called—Dogmatic and Moral Theology, Sacred Scripture, Church History and Canon Law. These are the sciences proper to the priest—in them he receives a first initiation during his sojourn in the senior seminary, but he must pursue his studies in them throughout the remainder of his life.

Theology is the science of the things of faith. It is nourished, Pope Sixtus V. tells us, at those ever-willing springs—the Holy Scriptures, the decisions of the Popes, the decrees of the Councils.[2]

Called positive and speculative or scholastic, according to the method followed in studying it, theology does not confine itself to proposing the truths which are to be believed; it scrutinizes their inmost depths, shows their relations with human reason, and, aided by the resources which true philosophy supplies, explains, develops and adapts them accurately to all the needs of the defense and propagation of the faith. Like Beseleel, to whom the Lord gave His spirit of wisdom, intelligence and knowledge, when intrusting him with the mission of building His temple, the theologian "cuts the precious stones of divine dogma, assorts them skilfully, and, by the setting he gives them, brings out their brilliancy, charm and beauty."[3]

Rightly, then, does the same Sixtus V. call theology (and here he is referring especially to scholastic theology) a gift from heaven, and ask that it be maintained in the schools and cultivated with great ardor, as being abundant in fruitfulness for the Church.

Is it necessary to add that the book par excellence in which students may with most profit study scholastic theology is the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas? It is our wish, therefore, that professors be sure to explain to all their pupils its method, as well as the principal articles relating to Catholic faith.

We recommend equally that all seminarists have in their hands, and frequently peruse, that golden book known as the Catechism of the Council of Trent, or Roman Catechism, dedicated to all priests invested with the pastoral office (Catechismus ad Parochos). Noted both for the abundance and accuracy of its teaching and for elegance of style, this catechism is a precious summary of the whole of theology, dogmatic and moral. The priest who knows it thoroughly has always at his disposal resources which will enable him to preach with fruit, to acquit himself fitly in the important ministry of the confessional and the direction of souls, and be in a position to refute triumphantly the objections of unbelievers.

---

[1] Const. Apost. Triumphantis Jerusalem. [2] St. Vinc. Lir. Commonit, c. 2. [3] Same Const. Apost.

With regard to the study of the Holy Scriptures, we call your attention once more, Venerable Brothers, to the teachings we laid down in our Encyclical "*Providentissimus Deus*,"[1] which we wish the professors to put before their disciples, with the necessary explanations. They will put them specially on their guard against the disturbing tendencies which it is sought to introduce into the interpretation of the Bible, and which would shortly, were they to prevail, bring about the ruin of its inspiration and supernatural character. Under the specious pretext of depriving the adversaries of the revealed word of apparently irrefutable arguments against the authenticity and veracity of the Holy Books, some Catholic writers have thought it a clever idea to adopt those arguments for themselves. By these strange and perilous tactics they have worked to make a breach with their own hands in the walls of the city they were charged to defend. In our Encyclical above quoted, and in another document,[2] we have spoken our mind on this rash, dangerous policy. While encouraging our exegetists to keep abreast with the progress of criticism, we have firmly maintained the principles which have been sanctioned in this matter by the traditional authority of the Fathers and Councils, and renewed in our own time by the Council of the Vatican.

The history of the Church is like a mirror, which reflects the life of the Church through the ages. It proves, better far than civil and profane history, the sovereign liberty of God and His providential action on the march of events. They who study it must never lose sight of the fact that it contains a body of dogmatic facts which none may call in question. That ruling, supernatural idea which presides over the destinies of the Church is at the same time the torch whose light illumines her history. Still, inasmuch as the Church, which continues among men the life of the Word Incarnate, is composed of a divine and a human element, this latter must be expounded by teachers and studied by disciples with great probity. "God has no need of our lies," as we are told in the Book of Job.[3]

The Church historian will be all the better equipped to bring out her divine origin, superior as this is to all conceptions of a merely terrestrial and natural order, the more loyal he is in naught extenuating of the trails which the faults of her children, and at times even of her ministers, have brought upon the Spouse of Christ during the course of centuries. Studied in this way, the history of the Church constitutes by itself a magnificent and conclusive demonstration of the truth and divinity of Christianity.

---

[1] 18 November, 1893. [2] Letter to the Min. Gen. of the Fr. Minor, November 25, 1898. [3] Job xiii., 77.

Lastly, to finish the cycle of studies by which candidates for the priesthood should prepare themselves for their future ministry, mention must be made of Canon Law, or the science of the laws and jurisprudence of the Church. This science is connected by very close and logical ties with that of Theology, which it applies practically to all that concerns the government of the Church, the dispensation of holy things, the rights and duties of her ministers, the use of temporal goods which she needs for the accomplishment of her mission. "Without a knowledge of Canon Law (as the Fathers of one of your provincial councils very well said), theology is imperfect, incomplete, like a man with only one arm. Ignorance of Canon Law has favored the birth and diffusion of numerous errors about the rights of the Roman Pontiffs and of Bishops, and about the powers which the Church derives from her own Constitution—powers whose exercise she adapts to circumstances."[1].

We shall sum up all we have just said concerning your junior and senior seminaries in this sentence of St. Paul, which we recommend to the frequent meditation of the masters and pupils of your ecclesiastical athenæums: "O Timothy, carefully guard the deposit which has been confided to you. Fly the profane novelties of words and objections which cover themselves with the false names of science, for all they who have made profession of them have erred in the faith."[2]

And now we have a word to say to you, dearly beloved sons, who have been ordained priests and become the coöperators of your Bishops. We know, and the whole world knows with us, the qualities which distinguish you. There is no good work of which you are not the inspiration or the apostles. Docile to the counsels we gave you in the Encyclical "*Rerum Novarum,*" you go to the people, to the workers, to the poor. You endeavor by all means in your power to help them, raise them in the moral scale, render their lot less hard. To this end you form reunions and congresses; you establish homes, clubs, rural banks, aid and employment offices for the toilers. You labor to introduce reforms into economic and social life, and in the difficult enterprise you do not hesitate to make serious sacrifices of time and money; and with the same scope you write books and articles in the newspapers and reviews. All these are, in themselves, highly praiseworthy, and in them you give no equivocal proofs of good will and of intelligent and generous devotedness to relieve the most pressing needs of contemporary society and of souls.

---

[1] Conc. Prov., Bitura. 1868. [2] I. Tim. vi., 20-21

Still, beloved sons, we deem it our duty paternally to call your attention to some fundamental principles to which you will not fail to conform if you desire that your activity be really fruitful and reproductive.

Remember, above all, that zeal, to be profitable and praiseworthy, must be "accompanied by discretion, rectitude and purity." Thus does the grave and judicious Thomas à Kempis express himself.[1] Before him St. Bernard, the glory of your country in the twelfth century, that indefatigable apostle of all great causes touching the honor of God, the rights of the Church or the good of souls, did not fear to say that "zeal, separated from knowledge and from the spirit of discernment or discretion, is insupportable . . . that the more ardent zeal is, the more necessary is it that it be accompanied by that discretion which puts order into the exercise of charity and without which even virtue may be changed into a defect and a principle of disorder."[2] And discretion in activity and in the choice of means of rendering activity successful is all the more indispensable from the fact that the present times are disturbed and environed with numerous difficulties. This or that act, measure or practice, suggested by zeal, while excellent in themselves, can only —owing to the circumstances of the race—produce bad results. Priests will avoid this inconvenience and this evil, if before and during their action they take care to conform to established order and the rules of discipline. And ecclesiastical discipline demands union among the different members of the hierarchy, and the respect and obedience of inferiors to their superiors. In our recent letter to the Archbishop of Tours we said the same thing: "The edifice of the Church of which God Himself is the architect, rests on a very visible foundation, primarily on the authority of Peter and his successors, but also on the Apostles and the successors of the Apostles, the Bishops, so that to hear their voice or to despise it is tantamount to hearing or despising Jesus Christ Himself."[3]

Listen, then, to the words addressed by St. Ignatius, the great martyr of Antioch, to the clergy of the primitive Church: "Let all obey their Bishops, as Jesus Christ obeyed His Father. In all things touching the sense of the Church do nothing without your Bishop, and as our Lord did nothing but in close union with His

---

[1] Zelus animarum laudandus est si sit discretus, rectus et purus. [2] St. Bern, Serm. XLIX., in Cant. n. 5. [3] Lett. ad Arch. Turon.

Father, so priests, do you nothing without your Bishop. Let all members of the priestly body be united, as all the strings of a harp are united in the instrument."[1]

Should you, on the contrary, act as priests independently of this submission to and union with your Bishops, we would repeat to you the words of our predecessor, Gregory XVI., viz., that "you utterly destroy, as far as in you lies, the order established with a most wise forethought by God, the author of the Church."[2]

Remember, too, beloved sons, that the Church is rightly compared to an army in battle array *"sicut castrorum acies ordinata,"*[3] because it is her mission to combat the enemies, visible and invisible, of God and men's souls. Wherefore did St. Paul recommend Timothy to bear himself "as a good soldier of Jesus Christ?"[4] Now, that which constitutes the strength of an army and contributes most to its victory is discipline and the exact and rigorous obedience of all toward those in command.

Just here zeal out of place and without discretion may easily become the cause of real disaster. Call to mind one of the most memorable facts of sacred history. Certainly neither courage, willingness, nor devotion to the sacred cause of religion were lacking in those priests who gathered round Judas Maccabeus, to fight with him against the enemies of the true God, the profaners of the temple, the oppressors of their nation. And yet, releasing themselves from the rules of discipline, they rashly engaged in a combat in which they were vanquished. The Holy Spirit tells us of them "that they were not of the race of those who might save Israel." Why? Because they would obey only their own inspirations, and threw themselves forward without awaiting the orders of their leaders. *"In die illa ceciderunt sacerdotes in bello, dum volunt fortiter faccre, dum sine consilio exeunt in praelium.*[5] *Ipsi autem non erant de semine virorum illorum, per quos salus facta est in Israel."*[6]

On this point our enemies may serve us for an example. They are well aware that union is strength, *"vis unita fortior,"* so they do not fail to unite close when it comes to attacking the holy Church of Jesus Christ.

If, then, you desire, as you certainly do, beloved sons, that in the formidable contest being waged against the Church by anti-Christian sects and by the city of the evil one, the victory be for God and His Church, it is absolutely necessary for you to fight all together in perfect order and discipline under the command of your hierarchical leaders. Pay no heed to those pernicious men who, though calling themselves Christians and Catholics, throw tares into the field of the Lord and sow division in His Church by attacking and often even calumniating the Bishops "established by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God."[1] Read neither their pamphlets nor their papers. No good priest should in any way lend authority either to their ideas or to their license of speech. Can he ever forget that on the day of his ordination he promised "*obedientiam et reverentiam*" to his Bishop before the holy altar?

---

[1] St Ign. Ant., Ép. ad Smyrna, 8; idem ad Magn., vii.
[2] Greg. XVI., Epist. Encycl. 15 Aug. 1882.
[3] Cant. vi., 3.
[4] II. Tim. ii., 3.
[5] I. Macc. v., 67.
[6] I. Macc. v., 62.

Above all things, remember, beloved sons, that an indispensable condition of true zeal and the best pledge of success in the works to which hierarchical obedience consecrates you is purity and holiness of life. "Jesus began by practicing before preaching."[2] Like Him, the priest must preface preaching by word by preaching by example. "Separated from the world and its concerns (say the Fathers of the Council of Trent), clerics have been placed on a height where they are visible and the faithful look into their lives as into a mirror to know what they are to imitate. Hence clerics and all they whom God has called specially to His service should so regulate their actions and morals that there may be nothing in their deportment, manners, movements, words and in all the other details of their life which is not deeply impressed with religion. They must carefully avoid faults which, though trivial, in others would be very serious to them, in order that there be not a single one of their acts which does not inspire respect in all."[3] With these recommendations of the sacred Council, which we would wish, beloved sons, to engrave in all your hearts, those priests who certainly fail to comply, who adopted in their preaching language out of harmony with the dignity of their priesthood and the sacredness of the word of God; who attended popular meetings where their presence could only excite the passions of the wicked and of the enemies of the Church, and who exposed themselves to the grossest insults without profit to any one, and to the astonishment, if not scandal, of the pious faithful; who assumed the habits, manners, conduct and spirit of laymen. Salt must certainly be mingled with the mass which it is to preserve from corruption, but it must at the same time defend itself against the mass under pain of losing all savor and becoming of no use except to be thrown out and trampled under foot.[4]

So, too, the priest who is the salt of the earth must in his necessary contact with the society by which he is surrounded, preserve modesty, gravity and holiness in manner, action and speech, and not allow himself to become infected with the levity, dissipation and vanity of the worldly. He must, on the contrary, in the midst of the men, keep his soul so united with God that he lose nothing of the spirit of his holy state, and be not constrained to make before God and his conscience the sad and humiliating avowal: "I never go among laymen that I do not return less a priest."

---

[1] Acts xx., 28. [2] Act i., 1. [3] S. Conc. Trid., Sess. xxii., de Ref., c. 1. [4] Matt. v., 13.

Is it not because they have, with a zeal that is presumptive, set aside those traditional rules of discretion, modesty and prudence that certain priests consider as out of date and incompatible with "the present needs of the ministry those principles of discipline and conduct which they received from their masters in the senior seminary?" They are to be seen rushing, as if by instinct, into the most perilous innovations in speech, manners and associations. Several of them, alas! rashly putting themselves on the slippery incline from which they have no native power to escape, and despising the charitable warnings of their superiors and their older and more experienced colleagues, have ended in apostasies which rejoice the hearts of the adversaries of the Church and brought bitterest tears into the eyes of their Bishops, their brothers in the priesthood and the pious faithful. St. Augustine tells us: "When a man is out of the right way the more quickly and impetuously he advances, the more he errs."[1]

There are, of course, some changes which are advantageous and calculated to advance the kingdom of God in men's souls and in society. But, as the Holy Gospel tells us,[2] it is the province of the "Father of the household" and not of the children or servants to examine them, and, if he judges well, to give them currency side by side with the time-honored and venerable usages, which make up the rest of his treasury.

Lately when fulfilling the apostolic duty of putting the Catholics of North America on their guard against innovations, tending, among other things, to substitute for the principles of perfection consecrated by the teaching of doctors and the practice of saints moral maxims and rules of life more or less impregnated with that naturalism which nowadays endeavors to penetrate everywhere, we proclaimed aloud that far from repudiating and rejecting "*en bloc*" the progress accomplished in the present epoch, we were only too anxious to welcome all that goes to augment the patrimony of science or to give greater extension to public prosperity. But we took care to add that this progress could be of efficacious service to the good cause only when harmonized with the authority of the Church.[3]

As a conclusion to this letter we are pleased to apply to the clergy of France what we formerly wrote for the priests of our diocese of Perugia. We reproduce here a portion of the pastoral letter we addressed to them on July 19, 1866:

---

[1] Enarr. in Ps. xxxi.,n. 6. [2] Matt. xiii., 52. [3] Epist ad S. R. E. Pr. Card Gibbons, 22 Jan., 1899.

"We ask the ecclesiastics of our diocese to reflect seriously on their sublime obligations and on the difficult circumstances through which we are passing and to act in such wise that their conduct be in harmony with their duties and always conformable to the rules of an enlightened and prudent zeal. For thus even our enemies will seek in vain for motives of reproach and blame: *qui ex adverso est vereatur nihil habens malum dicere de nobis.*[1]

"Although difficulties and dangers are every day multiplying, the pious and fervent priest must not for that be discouraged—he must not abandon his duties or even draw rein in the accomplishment of the spiritual mission he has received for the welfare and salvation of mankind and for the maintenance of that august religion of which he is herald and minister. For it is especially by difficulties and trials that his virtue becomes strong and stable; it is in the greatest misfortunes, in the midst of political transformations and social upheavals that the salutary and civilizing influence of his ministry shines forth with greatest brilliancy.

" . . . To come down to practice we find a teaching admirably adapted to the circumstances in the four maxims which the great Apostle St. Paul gave to his disciple Titus. In all things give good example by your works, your doctrine, the integrity of your life, by the gravity of your conduct, using none but holy and blameless language.[2] We would that each and every member of our clergy meditate on these maxims and conform his conduct thereto.

"*In omnibus teipsum præbe exemplum bonorum operum.* In all things give an example of good works; that is, of active and exemplary life, animated by a true spirit of charity and guided by the maxims of evangelical prudence—of a life of sacrifice and toil, consecrated to the welfare of your neighbors, not with earthly views or for a perishable reward, but with a supernatural object. Give an example by that language at once simple, noble and lofty, by that sound and blameless discourse which confounds all human opposition, calms the long standing hatred the world has sworn against you, and wins for you the respect and even esteem of the enemies of religion. Every one devoted to the service of the sanctuary has been at all times obliged to show himself a living model and perfect exemplar of all the virtues; but this obligation becomes all the more instant when, as a consequence of social upheavals, we are treading a difficult and uncertain path where we may at every step discover ambushes and pretexts of attack. . . .

---

[1] Tit. ii., 8.

[2] Tit. ii., 7, 8.

"*In doctrina.* In the face of the combined efforts of incredulity and heresy to consummate the ruin of Catholic faith, it would be a real crime for the clergy to remain in a state of hesitancy and inactivity. In such an outpouring of error and conflict of opinion he must not prove faithless to his mission, which is to defend dogma assaulted, morality travestied and justice frequently outraged. It is for him to oppose himself as a barrier to the attacks of error and the deceits of heresy; to watch the tactics of the wicked who war on the faith and honor of this Catholic country; to unmask their plots and reveal their ambuscades; to warn the confiding, strengthen the timid and open the eyes of the blinded. Superficial erudition or merely common knowledge will not suffice for all this —there is need of study, solid, profound and continuous, in a word of a mass of doctrinal knowledge sufficient to cope with the subtlety and remarkable cunning of our modern opponents. . . .

"*In integritate.* No better proof of the importance of this council could be had than the sad evidence of what is going on around us. Do we not observe that the lax life of some ecclesiastics brings discredit and contempt on their ministry and proves the occasion of scandals? If men, endowed with minds as brilliant as they are remarkable, now and then desert the ranks of the sacred soldiery and rise in revolt against the Church—that mother who, in her tenderness and affection had advanced them to the direction and for the salvation of souls, their defection and wanderings have most frequently had their origin in want of discipline and evilness of life. . . .

"*In gravitate.* By gravity is to be understood that serious, judicious, tactful conduct which should be characteristic of every faithful and prudent minister chosen by God for the government of His family. While thanking God for having vouchsafed to raise him to this honor, he must show himself faithful to all his obligations, and at the same time balanced and prudent in all his actions; he must not allow himself to be dominated by base passions, nor carried away by violent and exaggerated language; he must lovingly sympathize with the misfortunes and weaknesses of others; do all the good he can to every one, disinterestedly, unostentatiously, and maintaining ever intact the honor of his character and sublime dignity."

We return now to you, beloved sons in the French clergy, and we are firmly convinced that our perceptions and counsels, solely inspired as they are by our paternal affection, will be understood and received by you in the sense and bearing we wished to give them in addressing you this letter.

We expect much from you, because God has richly endowed you with all the gifts and qualities necessary for performing great and holy deeds for the advantage of the Church and society. We would that not one among you permit himself to be tarnished by those imperfections which dim the splendor of the sacerdotal character and injure its efficacy.

The present times are evil; the future is still more gloomy and menacing, and seems to herald the approach of a redoubtable crisis and social upheaval. It behooves us, then, as we have said on many occasions, to honor the salutary principles of religion, as well as those of justice, charity, respect and duty. It is for us to imbue men's souls with these principles—and especially those souls which have become captive to infidelity or disturbed by destroying passions, to bring about the reign of the grace and peace of our Divine Redeemer, Who is the Light and the Resurrection and the Life, and in Him to unite all men, notwithstanding the inevitable social distinctions which divide them.

Yes, now more than ever, is there need of the help and devotedness of exemplary priests, full of faith, discretion and zeal, who, taking inspiration from the gentleness and energy of Jesus Christ, Whose true ambassadors they are, "*pro Christo legatione fungimur,*"[1] to announce with a courageous and inexhaustible patience the eternal truths which are seldom fruitless of virtue in men's souls.

Their ministry will be laborious—oftentimes even painful, especially in countries where the people are absorbed in worldly interests and live in forgetfulness of God and His holy religion. But the enlightened, charitable and unwearying influence of the priest fortified by Divine grace will work, as it has already worked, prodigies of resurrection almost beyond belief.

With all our soul and with unspeakable joy we hail this consoling vista, and meanwhile with all the affection of our heart we grant the Apostolic Benediction to you, venerable brothers, and to the clergy and people of France.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on the 8th of September, in the year 1899, the twenty-second of our Pontificate.

LEO, PP. XIII.

---

[1] II. Cor. v., 20.

THE FATE OF HISTORICAL FALSIFICATION.

THE hue and outcry made when De Maistre, in one of his pungent epigrams, declared that "history, as written during the last three hundred years, was nothing more than a conspiracy against truth," may still be recalled by readers familiar with that period of stress and storm. De Maistre was a man not given to sententious moralizing or verbal prudery. Sweeping and paradoxical as the epigram appeared at first blush, it was found upon closer scrutiny to be sharp of edge, packed with meaning and truth, a perfect crystallization of the pernicious influences which made historical writing the vehicle of partisanship, misrepresentation and falsehood. Ostensibly ignoring the imputation cast upon historians, in secret the trained eye of the scientific scholar did not fail to descry more than a mere substratum of truth in the caustic Frenchman's axiom, if indeed, it did not flash its full light into his dazzled eye. In fact instead of becoming an overt gibe, the epigram became a current truism.

Nor is this to be wondered at. A casual glance into the times, methods, purposes and environments of most historians, convinces us that they were the victims, sometimes not unconsciously or unwillingly, of afflictive circumstances, perverse taste, traditional misconception. Under such conditions it was an inevitable result that fierce antipathy, implacable bitterness, blundering ignorance, self-confident audacity, not to say blind partisanship, should usurp the place of manliness of thought, breadth of view, ripeness of judgment, honesty of purpose and fearless integrity.

History became a jest and by-word. The historian an advocate with a brief, the salaried functionary of the State, the tool of the political party, the apologist of the sect. "What is history?" sneeringly asks Napoleon, "but a fiction agreed upon?" "My friend," said Faust, "the times which are gone by are a book with seven seals, and what you call the spirit of past ages is but the spirit of this or that worthy gentleman in whose minds these ages are reflected." As if setting the stamp of fullest assent on this theory, Goethe's illustrious contemporary, Schiller, for years the accredited historian of the Thirty Years' War, with an ingenuousness almost childlike in its simplicity, formulates his historical creed—that history "in general is only a magazine for my fancy, and the objects must submit to be plastic in my hands." One is almost tempted to think that

Nietzsche had the famous Jena professor in view when he maintains the "Suabians are the best liars in Germany—they lie innocently."[1] "No, no," remonstrated the old veteran statesman, Sir Robert Walpole, when his son, in order to relieve the tedium of his declining days, read current literature to him. "No, no—not history, Horace; that *can't* be true." Our own sweet-tempered mild-mannered Emerson, with a tincture of ill-disguised petulance, owns that he is "ashamed to see what shallow village talk our so-called history is." Can it be wondered, then, that the raucous voice of Shopenhauer, the very antipodes of the Concord Sage, joins this chorus and ungallantly arraigns Clio "of being infected even in the smallest artery with the virus of falsehood?"

Seemingly this picture may be drawn with too dark a realism: appear exaggerated and pessimistic; a piece of grotesque jocularity. But who can view the Iconoclasm of History—to use a most applicable phrase of Lord Acton's—during the last fifty years, and not be convinced that the new methods adopted, the new researches instituted, the new discoveries made, and last, but not least, the new objectivity demanded, have shaken the credibility of many historians of the last three hundred years, invalidated the authority of some, remorselessly discredited the honesty of others? Data once looked upon as incontestably secure have been disproven; characters once invested with all the poetic romance and garish glamor of some eulogist's fervid imagination have passed the critical gauntlet woefully bedraggled, sadly crippled, unrecognizably disfigured; individuals once held up to scorn and execration, their bodies rottening in dungeons, their lives forfeited on the gibbet or at the stake, consigned to their graves without a tear, buried without an epitaph, their very ashes scattered to the winds of heaven, now appear irradiantly transfigured as humanity's proudest boast, God's own elect; epoch-making events that once thrilled the heart of a nation, under the modern diagnostician's merciless scrutiny have been found to be national aberrations, fanned by bigotry, nurtured by ignorance, inspired by political chicanery; heroes whose awesome and gigantic stature once dwarfed all posterity to a race of liliputians, have been toppled from their pedestals, hurled from their niches and found to belong, after all, to the common, ignoble herd. Disenchantment and disillusion fairly dazes us, and sends us groping into a still more bewildering amazement.

The veil of Isis is gradually being lifted. The modern critical and scientific spirit is no longer satisfied with the ancestral historical patrimony, with the unaccredited tradition of past ages and men.

---

[1] Nietzsche's Sämmtliche Werke, Vol. VIII., p. 225.

Close investigation discovered the moral debasement, if not spuriousness of the current historical coinage; the die must be broken; the alloy differentiated from the pure gold; the original weight and value must be re-established. History must be rehabilitated, its equity vindicated. Detail and not deduction, reference and not inference, logic and not sophistry, fact and not fiction, self-effacement and not arbitrariness, are the shibboleths of the new movement. It begins with original research and penetrates the very fountain head. It rummages every neglected archive, ransacks every begrimed library, invades the buried wastes of the past, burrows into the bowels of the earth, scans every vestige of human activity, searches the very hearts of men; for not only geographical, economic and ethnographic problems demand solution, but psychical, political and ethical as well. The master builder of modern history cannot be satisfied with the printed page alone. After all, it is nothing more than the material used by his predecessor, straw that has been threshed a thousand times without wheat. The very process in its transmission is calculated more to perpetuate than rectify error. Documentary evidence is the battle cry of the new school. What revolutions it has effected within the last seventy years—for we can only date the documentary period from 1830—are manifest. The forgotten folio, the worm-eaten parchment, the century-stained manuscript, the shriveled papyrus, the tarnished palimpsest, the incrustrated clay brick, the shivered entablature have been triumphantly brought from their forgotten recesses or mouldering tombs to bear testimony, not only to the corruption of history, but more signally to the perennial youth and deathless vitality of Truth.

Truth outraged demanded vindication; truth silenced demanded voice; truth suppressed demanded publicity. This is the real mission of the "epoch of full-grown history."

With few exceptions, the historians of the old school, and *pari passu*, their readers, were under the spell and thrall which Cardinal Newman, at one time himself its victim, most happily calls "the immemorial, unauthenticated tradition." This tradition was reverenced as a finality—a court from which there was no appeal. Like the Pillars of Hercules, it was the terminal of all exploration. Without questioning its authenticity, accounting for its inconsistencies, unraveling its contradictions, reasoning even about its possibility or probability, it was transmitted and diffused to generations as uncritical and credulous as itself. Thus misinformation and error were allowed to penetrate the minds of men till they fastened and ramified with the poisonous contagion of a cancer. What were most historians but mere canals, who in pure passivity received the stream of human testimony without analyzing its wholesomeness, filtering its suspicious-looking murkiness, dredging its alluvial deposits or banishing its swarming infusoria?

Buckle claims that till the beginning of the seventeenth century France—and he might without much hesitancy have added Germany and England—did not produce a single historian, "because she had not produced a single man who presumed to doubt what was generally accepted."[1] We know, of course, that he refers to that crucial period in French history when the men of "super-celestial opinions and subterranean morals" had an undisputed field to themselves; when truth was so outrageously caricatured that Montaigne, always epigrammatic, could only gloss it over on the plea "that lying was not a vice among the French, but a way of speaking;" when the hierophant of infidelity, Voltaire, inextricably entangled in his monstrous falsehoods, laughed his adversaries to sullen discomfiture by the flippant cynicism, "it was only a frolic of my imagination." Striking, but illusory, as Buckle's postulates sometimes are, there is more than a half truth concealed in the present one, and with some qualification we can readily concede it. Not on universal skepticism as a stepping stone must the historian climb the mountain of Truth, but on doubt as a preliminary to certitude. With Cartesian doubt, if you will, must the critical inquiry be prosecuted. He cannot be satisfied with the uncorroborated word or unproven fact of his precursor in the same field. He has the right to demand from his fellow craftsman his credentials as to character, vouchers as to capacity, testimonials as to trustworthiness. He can compel the production of the title deeds to his new acquisitions or discoveries; he can challenge the chain of evidence, and reject it, if but one link be missing which places it beyond the range of ascertainable and verifiable knowledge. Lord Acton substantially inclines to the same position. In his inaugural lecture, when assuming the chair of Modern History at Cambridge, he formulates a series of historical canons which in comprehensiveness seemingly meet every contingency and safeguard the historian with a defense and security that must command respect and carry authority.

"The critic," he contends, "is one who, when he lights on an interesting statement, begins by suspicion. He remains in suspense until he has subjected his authority to three operations. First, he asks whether he has read the passage as the author wrote it. For the transcriber and the editor and the official or officious censor on the top of the editor have played strange tricks and have much to answer for. And if they are not to blame, it may turn out that the author wrote his book twice over; that you can discover the first jet, the progressive variations, things added and things struck out. Next is the question where the writer got his information. If from a previous writer, it can be ascertained, and the inquiry has to be repeated. If from published papers, they must be traced, and when the fountain head is reached, or the track disappears, the question of veracity arises. The responsible writer's character, his position, antecedents and probable motives have to be examined into; and this is what, in a different and adapted sense of the word, may be called the higher criticism, in comparison with the servile and often mechanical work of pursuing statements to their root. For a historian has to be treated as a witness, and not believed until his sincerity is ascertained. The maxim that a man must be assumed to be honest until the contrary is proved was not made for him. The main thing to learn is not the art of accumulating material, but the sublimer art of investigating it, of discerning truth from falsehood and certainty from doubt. It is by solidity of criticism, more than by plentitude of erudition, that the study of history strengthens and straightens and extends the mind. And the accession of the critic in the place of the indefatigable compiler amounts to a transfer of government in the historic realm."[1]

---

[1] "History of Civilization in England," Vol. I., p. 555.

This may be said to give us a summary of the science of history, one that is now universally accepted and finds its best exponents in Menzel (K. A.), Ranke, Böhmer, Waitz, Janssen, in Germany; Maitland, Green, Stubbs, Gardiner, Brewer and Gasquet, in England. It lifts history from the humble sphere of a profession to that of an authoritative science.

But history is more than a mere science. It is also an art. It not only demands the analytical keenness of the paleographist, the critical subtlety of the philologist, the searching intuitiveness of the psychologist—not to mention a familiar acquaintance with political philosophy and economy, the comparative studies of legal institutions and international law—but the well-cadenced ear, the symmetric eye, the deft handiwork of the literary artist. Its influence, no matter how potent or essential, would be circumscribed, if not defeated, if it appareled itself in archaic, forbidding garb, presented itself in the chilling form of a mathematical equation, chemical formula or metaphysical abstraction. True historic portraiture must appeal to the imaginative as well as perceptive faculties. Cold science must be cunningly blended with warm imagination; dry details must artfully coalesce with charming narrative. The philosophy of history must not deport itself with pedantic stiffness nor give utterance in portentous phraseology, but must captivate by engaging form and pleasing speech. The element of poetry, though judiciously subordinated, cannot be entirely eliminated. Was not the original, primitive history a legend, a romance, a poem? Shelley is not far astray when, in the language of the poet, he defines history as "the cyclic poem written by time upon the memories of men. The past, like an inspired rhapsodist, fills the theatre of everlasting generations with her harmony."

---

[1] Quoted in *Nineteenth Century*, October, 1895, p. 624.

Here a most insidious snare besets the path of the historian and sorely tempts his historic conscience. "Instead of being equally shared," to quote Macaulay, who was better at preaching than practicing, "instead of being equally shared between its two rulers, the Reason and the Imagination, it (history) falls alternately under the sole dominion of each. It is sometimes fiction; it is sometimes theory."[1] Literature affords distressingly sad examples how literary ambition perverted the historic instinct and the unleashed imagination played havoc with truth and fact. The monuments authors reared in the fond expectation that they would share the perpetuity of Gizeh and insure an immortality in which as

> Dead but sceptred sovereigns who still rule
> Our spirits from their urns,

have proven

> Like the baseless fabric of a vision,
> Leaving not a wreck behind.

The old English school of history, notably that represented by Hume, Robertson and Macaulay, to single out three of its best exponents as a general illustration, suffered the full penalty of allowing imagination to outrun discretion and fairness. Looking at the exquisite workmanship revealed in their histories, it needs no keen sight to see that the midnight oil has been devoted, we will not say wasted, more in giving literary symmetry, rhetorical grace, imaginative scope to their productions than in searching musty documents or deciphering vexatious incunabula. The turning of a startling metaphor, the constructing of a striking antithesis, the rounding of a clever epigram, the chisseling of a scintillating *jeu d'esprit*, received the minutest care. Contemptuous indifference, utter neglect awaited the garbled reference, the unverified citation, the buried manuscript. The task of digging with patience and toil in the deep, unexplored mines of history's richest ore seldom entered their minds. Like surveyors, their sextants, with a wide sweep, staked off the ground on the surface; the woodman with his axe, the geologist with his hammer, the metallurgist with his crucible had to follow to reveal the hidden wealth. Besides, might not the intrusion of unembellished data, like a discordant note in a cloyingly sweet melody, retard the stately march of the picturesque and absorbing narrative? Did not Macaulay boast that he would write a history whose literary charm would make the society woman throw her latest romance in the waste basket? Does he not furthermore contend that history begins in the novel and ends in the essay? On what ground can we account for the astonishing rapidity with which Hume wrote the history of England, from the Roman Invasion to the Revolution—five quarto volumes—in nine years? Or explain how Maitland's rude scalpel fairly eviscerates Robertson's Charles V., disclosing an uncritical and romancing spirit simply astounding? Or excuse Macaulay's diffuseness in covering a period of fifteen years of English history, with five portentous volumes? Do we not, to come to a later date, find one of the most admired historians fall into the same pit? The Prophet of Craigenputtock, booted and spurred and cap-a-pie, with savage phillipics enters the arena to batter down all shams and hoist high the pennant of the "eternal verities:" what a redundancy of oracular declamation, pessimistic vaticination, crypt phrasemaking—

---

[1] Macaulay's Essays, Vol. I., p. 145, 1879.

As when some mighty painter dips
His pencil in the hues of earthquake and eclipse!

"Words, words, pictures, tropes, sublimities enough to make the major and minor prophets, but nothing to hold by, to work with or to teach."[1] "Is history a pageant or a philosophy?"—ask the genial author of Obiter Dicta. Even Taine, a worshiper of Carlyle, cannot but own that "prophecy is a violent condition which does not sustain itself, and when it fails, is replaced by grand gesticulations!"[2]

If the historian who is tempted into the realm of imagination, where facts form but the background of the canvass, encounters such dangers, what must be the ordeal and failure of the one who builds up a theory, battles for a hypothesis? Historical theory and historical partisanship are convertible terms. "A formed hypothesis," says Shopenhauer, "gives us a lynx-eyed vision for all that is favorable, but makes us blind to all that is unfavorable."[3] The theorist not only mars the beauty of his work, impairs its usefulness and destroys its credibility, but becomes the victim of an idiosyncrasy that relegates his performance more to the domain of the psychological than the historical student. Had Hume suppressed or even softened his bitter aspersions against the English, the Whigs, Whig principles and Whig ministers, the happy *bon mot* that he was "a political historian, or rather a historical politician" would have left his name untarnished. Had Robertson endeavored to take his authorities even at second or third hand, instead of working on a theory and jotting down the first ragged and vague citation that was offered to him, he would not now be consulted with suspicion by the ordinary reader and relegated to the top shelf by the scholar.[1] Had Macaulay threaded his way through "unfair party spirit," which made him make so many loose statements and rash inferences, his value would be immeasurably enhanced. Had even Gibbon, who probably focalizes more of the essential requisites of a great historian than any writer in the language,[2] omitted the last two chapters of the first volume of his inimitable masterpiece, he would not have offended Christian sensibility, done violence to truth, called into question a work well nigh perfection. Had Buckle abandoned his fatuous theory about the general laws governing the course of human progress, he would have bequeathed to posterity one of the most precious and classic torsos in the history of any literature. Had not the late Regius professor of modern history at Cambridge[3] confined his theory "that history fades into mere literature when it loses sight of practical politics" to England, who knows but that it would have dignified the mission of the "ring" and its ethics elevated the status of the "heeler" had it ever reached our own shores? Had Froude, the most exquisite prose colorist of the language, the incomparable master of *mis-en-scene,* steered clear of the theories he wished to establish, he would never have devoted the copious resources of his passionate eloquence, exuberant fancy and matchless verbal briliancy to prove that Henry VIII. "cut off his wife's head one day and married her maid the next morning out of sheer love of his country."[4] He might even have escaped the crushing British fisticuff given him by one of the most conservative of English reviews, when it remarks that "ordinarily it is the task of a critic to notice any error into which an author may have fallen. But in the case of Mr. Froude the problem ever is to discover whether he has deviated into truth."[5] But why continue? The task of enforcing a theory—of historical rehabilitation was not the besetting sin of Froude alone, when he tried to efface what Dickens somewhat unpatriotically calls

---

[1] Frederic Harrison: "Choice of Books," p. 197. [2] "The methodical people so much ridiculed by Carlyle," continues Taine, "have at least the advantage over him of being able to verify all their steps. Moreover, these vehement divinations and assertions are often void of proof." "History of English Literature," Vol. II., p. 451. [3] Welt als Wille und Vorstellung, Vol. II., p. 244.

---

[1] "Robertson had the oddest way of consulting his friends as to what subject it would be advisable for him to treat, and was open to proposals from any quarter with exemplary impartiality. This only showed how little the stern conditions of real historic inquiry were appreciated by him." J. Cotter Morrison's Gibbon : "English Men of Letters Series," p. 192.

[2] "The work of Gibbon as a whole, as the encyclopædic history of thirteen hundred years, as the grandest of historical designs, carried out alike with wonderful power and with wonderful accuracy, must ever keep its place. Whatever else is read, Gibbon must be read, too." Freeman, ibid., 104-5.

[3] J. R. Seeley.

[4] Freeman : "The Method of Historical Study," p. 06

[5] *London Quarterly Review*, July, 1898.

"that blot of grease upon the History of England,"—no we might point to Lord Elphinstone, who wrote a most eloquent defense of Pontius Pilate; or Carducci, whose pathetic efforts to restore the shattered reputation of Judas Iscariot are still in process; or Proudhon, who yearned to embrace Satan and defend him from the cunning malice of Jesuits and the malignant libels of the priests.

It is clearly evident that danger lurks alike in historical fiction and historical theory, and we can only gain a sure foothold in the one case and a clear vision in the other by planting ourselves upon the unshifting ground of fact, above the nebulous haziness of speculation. If the philosophy of history is teaching by example—a truth which in spite of the Latin saw—*exempla illustrant, non probant,* we will assume for the present, it is equally patent, that we must endorse Macaulay when he, perhaps somewhat regretfully, moralizes, "to be a really great historian is perhaps the rarest of intellectual distinctions." But this reflection should never be dissociated from the more pregnant one, "That the true historian . . . seeking to compose a picture of the thing acted, must collect facts, select facts and combine facts. Methods will differ, styles will differ. Nobody ever[1] does anything exactly like anybody else, but the end in view is generally the same, and the historian's end is truthful narration."[2]

. . . .

These reflections bring us to the subject indicated by the rubric of this article: to ascertain the attitude of historical writing during the last three hundred years toward the Catholic Church; to discover whether fiction or fact, theory or truth, were the contributing elements to build up the accepted tradition; to allow the new school of Protestant historians to pass judgment on the credibility and motives of their predecessors who erected and buttressed the tradition, and in what manner it has served the cause of truth.

Since the Reformation, and until within the last fifty or sixty years, Protestantism occupied and monopolized the field of ecclesiastical history in Germany and in England, the two nations wrested from Catholic unity. It was more than a monopoly; it was what in the phraseology of the day might properly be called, if not chartered, at least a sort of consecrated trust. The literary activity of the Reformation, primarily the result of the late discovery of printing, was an inheritance of the Renaissance, and not its own spontaneous outgrowth. The subsequent ascendency of the Reformation was coincident,—the cause of literary deterioration. The Reformers became the residuary legatees of the methods, tactics, grandiloquence and calumnies of the pagan element of Humanism. Bocaccio was the precursor of Erasmus; the Decameron is the model of the Familiar Colloquies; Ulrich von Hutten is the lineal descendant of Lorenzo Valla; the literary syndicate that perpetrated the *Epistolæ obscurorum virorum,* abstracting, of course, from its unprintable coarseness and untranslatable obscenity was more than a reminiscence of Lorenzo Medici's Academia. What Humanism attempted by a repristination of ethical paganism, though the sensuous element was always dominant, the Reformation ostensibly attempted to accomplish by a return to primitive Christianity, though its elemental truths were always lacking. When Humanism discovered the unæsthetic and unintellectual drift of the Reformation, the line of demarcation at once became apparent, it deepened and widened into a breach, until the rupture became pronounced and final. But the ultimate object of both was consistently the same in the beginning—the undermining of Catholicism and the severance of the bonds that moored the two nations to the Holy See.

---

[1] "A Child's History of Engl.," Vol. II., p. 106. [2] Birrell: *Contemporary Review*, June, 1885, 79.

In literary activity the Church was anticipated and outstripped by its antagonist, and the latter was far in the race before the former was in readiness to start. With its printing resources it fairly deluged the land before the Catholic scholars, resting on the security of sixteen centuries' undisputed possession were aware of the cataclysm, had time to prepare for the coming tide, much less adopt effective means to divert or stem it. Feverish unrest and brooding discontent like an infection permeated the political body; stoic apathy and moral laxity enervated the ecclesiastical life; a clamorous craving for change was a most pronounced symptom, an ominous portent in the lower strata of society. By invoking the aid of the secular government and rewarding the bankrupt princes and robber barons with undreamed wealth—investing their persons with unprecedented dignity and prestige and holding out prospects still more alluring—the Reformers played the master stroke in diplomacy.[1] "In Silesia," says Menzel, "the new church was mainly established by the favor and protection of princes and magistrates. Nearly all the people were loyal to the ancient faith and had not the remotest thought of making any change in their religion. . . . In Sweden, Gustavus Vasa, who had conquered the independence of his country, professed the new teachings because he desired to bring to the support of his throne the wealth and the power that had been taken from the clergy."[2] "The princes of the North are unquestionably under great obligations to them [the Reformers,]" writes Frederic the Great to Voltaire . . . "for by secularizing the church property they have added considerable to their incomes."[1] "If the church had no property," is the laconic way the Puritan Dr. Coxe, when Bishop of Ely, puts it, "there would have been a faint cry for its reformation."[2] Did not the maintenance of the new order involve the piratical rights the princes and nobility secured over the confiscated monastery and lands? Did not the newly acquired social and legal and ecclesiastical prerogatives conferred on the civil power gratify their ambition and cupidity? The logical evolution of this Reformation endowment was the creation of a new element and power in Christendom—secular absolutism in the ecclesiastical sphere. Inspired and encouraged by the Reformers, it grew with marvelous rapidity. In Germany it found its culmination in the peace of Augsburg (1555), when the infamous axiom—*cujus regio, illius religio*—received legal sanction, and the prince became the master of the body and soul of his subject.[3] In England it even advanced further than in Germany by a public promulgation under the most bloody accompaniments of Cæsaro-Papism. The act of supremacy dethroned the Pope and enthroned the King—the triple crown was torn from the venerable head of Clement VII. and now adorned the chaste brow of Henry VIII.! The effect of this course in giving strength to the tradition can hardly be overestimated.

---

[1] "What the Reformation would have been without the three Saxon Electors . . . it is impossible to say." Beard: "The Hibbert Lectures," 1883, p. 101. [2] "Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen," Vol. II., p. 1.

In the next place the pulpit was not silent or inactive in propagating it and carrying legend and myth, properly garnished, into every village and cottage. The priests of the old Church were gagged in the one land and exiled in the other if they dared contravene the shrieking innovator. The professorial chairs at the universities and colleges and gymnasia were in the gift of the ruling prince or the local parish. The fitness of the incumbents was gauged by the ability, zeal and success with which they vindicated the tradition and traduced the Mother Church. It mattered little that the very endowment which made the sinecure a possibility, was the revenue of the desecrated sanctuary, the secularized monastery or the suppressed orphan asylum.

In Germany polemical bitterness and secular despotism made the task of the apologist of Rome one of daring hardihood. A prejudice blind, insatiate, ineradicable, swept the countries like a blighting typhoon. The champions of the Church were derided as obscurantists, bigots, idolators—traitors to national, religious and intellectual liberty. In England confiscation, the tower, the headman's axe awaited the doughty soul that would question royal supremacy. To continue the unequal struggle at long range, from Douay, Rheims or Salamanca, proved perhaps less dangerous, but despairingly ineffective.

---

[1] Oeuvr.. Vol. XXI., p. 64, May 14, 1731. [2] "Historical Portraits of the Tudor Dynasty," etc. Sir Hubert Burke, Vol. II., p. 411. [3] "Luther," says Wolfgang Menzel, "was only promulgating the doctrine of the right of temporal sovereigns to decide all ecclesiastical authority. . . . Episcopal power passed entirely into the hands of the prince." Geschichte Deutschlands, Vol. II., p. 249.

This combination of potential influences only accounts for the propagation of the tradition, but leaves its origin unexplained. How did it take its rise? Under what conditions and circumstances was it fostered? What credence can be attached to its authors?

Taking the queries in the concrete, the answer is—and Protestants are the witnesses—that their true source is misapprehension and misrepresentation, ignorance and prejudice, fabrification and forgery. The ethical code that swayed the historian was of a jelly fish pliancy. It was the glorification of Protestantism primarily, the defense of truth secondarily. If conflict arose between the two postulates, the latter was invariably sacrificed to the former. Truth might be mutilated, its sacred mission prostituted, posterity imposed upon, but the cause of Reform could not be allowed to suffer or the Catholic Church appear in any light than that of the Apocalyptic Vision. No concession to Rome. *Calumniare audacter, semper aliquid adhaeret.*

In Germany Luther himself sounds the keynote. "What harm would there be," says the new Ecclesiastes, "if to accomplish better things and for the sake of the Christian religion, one told a good, thumping lie?"[1] That his followers fully availed themselves of this plenary license is a stain on the escutcheon of a brave people, and the confusion it gave rise to forms the lament of all modern German historians. "The falsification of history during the last three hundred years," is the plaint of Wolfgang Menzel,[2] "has done an immeasurable amount of harm and occasioned deep shame, and even now the end is not in view, when this falsehood will take an end." "Protestant historians," is the refrain of Töllner, "have made history nothing more than an historic apology for the necessity of ecclesiastical reformation. According to the Protestants, the Church was since the eighth century, the home of ignorance and wickedness. All in authority were abominable heretics and the Church a perfect bedlam (Narrenhaus). . . . The exaggerated care with which they represented all former rulers and leaders of the Church as tyrants and the members as pagans, and the disgraceful neglect with which the exemplary piety existing at all times side by side with the encroaching evil was overlooked—these shortcomings of Protestant historians have been most assiduously used by the opponents of Christianity."[3] The great German historiographer Böhmer, in 1826, already exposes the weakness and imposture of the Reformation historians. "The history of the Reformation," he writes," demands an entirely new treatment. This I realize the more searchingly I look into the writings of the Reformers themselves, who in the new current representations appear before us in a mythical garment."[1] The slogan "Protestantism is an uninterrupted attack, the utmost straining of every nerve and sinew against Rome; its whole battle is to extirpate Roman Catholic doctrine and energy,"[2] was then, as it is now, the focus of all its concentrated zeal and activity. If at times some honest and courageous spirit, smarting under the yoke of this oppression of conscience, this muzzling of truth, tried to allay this bitterness, it was only to be "prepared for the most brutal defamation and enmity," says one of the victims, "in spite of all adulation and self-praise of German impartiality the same holds good to-day. Disciples of the school of wisdom who look upon their master [Hegel] as the absolute personification of the Spirit, demand that the Reformation century shall only be written by those who are penetrated with an unshaken conviction that the men of their affected veneration were right in everything, and the opponents just as uniformly and constantly wrong."[3] "Because I did not maintain the Pope to be anti-Christ and Rome to be the Babylonian——" says Janssen's great preceptor, Böhmer, "Waitz [professor at Göttingen] declares me destitute of all German patriotism."[4]

---

[1] "Was wäre es, ob Einer schon um Besseres und der christlichen Kirche willen eine gute starke Lüge thäte." Lenz: "Briefwechsel," etc., Vol. I., p. 382; Kolde: "Analecta Lutherana," p. 356. [2] "Kritik des modernen Zeitbewusteeine," 2 Aufl., p. 153. [3] "Vermischte Aufsätze," p. 71.

When Ranke's "History of the Popes" first appeared, a work which in spite of much painstaking research and documentary copiousness does but scant justice to some of the illustrious men it deals with, he was branded as a "crypto-Catholic" by one of the most conservative and influential journals.[5] K. A. Menzel in the first volume of his great history of Germany[6] cut away from the traditional acceptation of the Reformation and brought the Reformers from the national Walhalla of German myth-history to the critical tribunal of scientific investigation, with the result that he was fiercely attacked by the literary journals and condemned to a conspiracy of silence by the German savants. In language temperate but trenchant he vindicates himself in the preface to the second volume. After his death his editors bodily cut the preface out of the second edition. Novalis pays a most glowing and impassioned tribute to the Catholic Church in one of his most inspirational works.[7] In the first three editions of the author's complete works it was omitted. Schlegel insisted upon its insertion in the fourth edition.[1] In the fifth edition Tieck, after Schlegel's conversion, had it again suppressed, and the mutilated edition is still in circulation. Janssen followed the advice of his Protestant master, when, standing before the statue of Charlemagne at Mayence, "that picture tells us what is wanting: a history of the German people from the pen of a Catholic historian; for what we call German history is a mere farce."[2] He wrote a work that should make him a national classic and hero, but he was denounced by the champions of the tradition as an "historical juggler," "the assassin of historical science," "a traitor to his country;" his masterpiece of German scholarship was "the work of a scoundrel," "a devil's work."[3] Even one of the most eminent professors of the Berlin University, Hans Delbrück, went as far as to put the question whether "in view of this densely stupid forger some one did not have the impulse of Hutten when he cut off the ears of the two Dominicans!"[4]

---

[1] Janssen: "Böhmer's Leben und Anschauungen," p. 265. [2] Stahl: "Die lutherische Kirche und die Union," p. 455. [3] K. A. Menzel: "Neuere Geschichte," etc., Vol. II., p. 8. [4] Janssen, ut supra, p. 22. [5] Kreuz-Zeitung, 28 Mai, 1886. [6] Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen, 3 vols. Breslau, 1826-30. [7] "Die Christenheit oder Europa. Ein Fragment."

"German historical writing"—to return from the digression and quote Professor Hillebrand—"during the last thirty years [1875] was in its whole character national and Protestant. The learned professors may indulge many illusions concerning their objectivity, their scientific incorruptibility and conscientiousness, concerning the infallibility of their wonderful methods. . . . They have unconsciously and unintentionally served the Protestant and national interests, and in obedience to them have they made history yield, have they sifted and compiled facts. . . . The nation (not the entire nation, but the greater part of the so-called men of culture) was actuated since the twenties with the anti-Catholic, or, rather, anti-Christian spirit."[5] Caustic and bitter is the arraignment of Professor Scherr (Zurich): "Mammon and Moloch, the golden calf and the brazen steer, money and success, are the only deities in which our epoch believes with sincerity. An immoral writing of history (Geschichtschreibung) such as is now prevalent, especially in Germany, prostrates itself before and swings incense to these idols."[6]

It is more than passingly strange that the German Universities, notorious hotbeds of rationalism, pantheism, atheism, are allowed to disseminate their pernicious teachings without molestation or hindrance; but if they dare represent with even an approximation to truth Catholic history or doctrine, consternation seems to take possession of the lay and academic world. The panic is amusingly analogous to that of the Church of England at the present time.

---

[1] Berlin, 1826, Vol. I., pp. 189, 191, 208. [2] Pastor: Johannes Janssen: "Ein Lebensbild." p. 2. [3] Ib., pp. 100, 106. [4] "Preussische Jahrbücher," Vol. 53, p. 259. [5] Karl Hillebrand: "Zeiten, Völker und Menschen," Vol. II., pp. 317-319. [6] T. Scherr: "Von Zurichberg," p. 141, 2 Aufl.

Every shade of theology and neology is complacently tolerated, but the mere suspicion of the odor of incense or the casual whispering of the words, reservation of the sacred species, though the actual meaning of the words has not been defined by dogmatic enactment or primatial decree, all the same it rouses the choleric Briton to a frenzied state of patriotic devotion. Exeter Hall and Trafalgar Square ring with delirious, hysterical protests, Parliamentary seats are jeopardized, Ministries threatened with dissolution, a national crisis like a London fog looms up menacingly over the British Empire. The German Protestant is somewhat like his English brother —whenever he "sees anything in religion which he does not like he always *prima facie* imputes it to the Pope."[1]

If we turn our attention to England, we find the tradition even more deeply rooted, more carefully propagated and the mighty arm of the State for nearly three centuries barricading every avenue that might disturb its peace or threaten its security. With the most inhuman proscriptive enactments against the Catholic episcopate and priesthood, the printing of Catholic literature made a treasonable offense, the adherents and advocates of the ancient faith martyred, the tradition, though seated on a throne, propped by the bayonet and sword, with every advantage of human influence and royal power, all the same met the fate of historical falsification and had to bite the dust in the end. The very names that once were indissolubly identified with the history of the English Reformation have lost their authority, are quoted with feelings of distrust, treated with contempt and of about as much interest to the scientific historian, as the provender which the saurians and crustaceans munched in pre-diluvian days is to the political economist.

Maitland,[2] and no better authority could be produced, writes that "for the history of the Reformation in England we depend so much on the testimony of writers who may be considered as belonging or more or less attached to the puritan party, or who obtained their information from persons of that sect, that it is of the utmost importance to inquire whether there was anything in their notions respecting *truth*, which ought to throw suspicion on any of their statements." He continues: "There is something very frank (one is almost inclined to say honest) in the avowals, either direct or indirect, which various puritans have left on record that it was considered not only allowable, but meritorious, to tell lies for the sake of the good cause in which they were engaged."[1]

---

[1] Bagehot: "Literary Studies," Vol. II., p. 61.

[2] "Let me name a historian who detested fine writing and who never said to himself, 'Go to; I will make a description,' and who yet was dominated by a love for facts, whose one desire always was to know what happened to dispel illusion and establish the true account—Dr. S. R. Maitland, of the Lambeth Library, whose volumes entitled 'The Dark Ages' and 'The Reformation' are to History what Milton's 'Lycidas' is said to be to poetry: if they do not interest you, your tastes are not historical."—Augustin Birrell, Contemp. Rev., June, 1885, p. 775.

Unconsciously Foxe, to whom Maitland alludes, absorbed the same conception of truth as Luther. He was the fountain head of the English Reformation history, the reservoir that fed all the smaller tributaries, the cribbing ground of almost every subsequent writer. Maitland finds his work fairly bristling with the grossest and at times most ludicrous perversions of truth. His credulity is phenomenal, his ignorance palpable, his falsehoods transparent.[2]

Men, measures, scenes and all
Misquoting, misstating,
Misplacing, misdating.

It can hardly be a matter of surprise that Brewer accuses him of downright falsehood and forgery. "Had he," writes the English historian, "been an honest man, his carelessness and credulity would have incapacitated him from being a trustworthy historian. Unfortunately he was not honest; he tampered with the documents that came into his hands."[3] Burnet, the other column supporting the Reformation's historical arch, was certainly a scholarly man, and had access to a perfect treasure-trove of unpublished documents; but, as his editor proves, "his dates are nearly as often wrong as right, while with regard to individuals, he constantly makes mistakes from mere ignorance of the history of the period. . . . He selected from the immense mass of papers which were open to inspection such as suited his purpose. . . . He can never be trusted except when he gives a reference, and will be generally found to have misrepresented the author he quotes."[4] Mackintosh, the Scotch historian, calls him a "purveying advocate," and, to show his utter contempt for him, continues: "To express astonishment at this would perhaps argue a want of due acquaintance with human nature and with Burnet."[5]

In Scotland our Reformation data came from the pens of Knox and Buchanan. Of the former Dr. Whitaker, Regius professor in the University of Cambridge, writes, and with abundant illustrations presents a formidable indictment, "that he was an original genius in lying . . . that he felt his mind impregnated with a peculiar portion of falsehood which is so largely possessed by the father of lies."[6] Of the latter he continues "that he became equally devoid of principle and of shame, ready for any fabrication of falsehood and capable of any operation of villainy."[1] The language may sound harsh and intemperate, but it must be borne in mind that his falsehoods were of a nature to compel the interposition of a special Parliamentary act to expurgate them. At Oxford his book was publicly burned. It seems that shameless dishonesty and conscienceless garbling of documents was the prominent attribute of the Reformation historian of that period, or why should the same Dr. Whitaker have the confession wrung from his saddened heart. "Forgery—I blush for the honor of Protestantism while I write—seems to have been peculiar to the Reformed. I look in vain for one of those accursed outrages of imposition among the disciples of Popery!"[2]

---

[1] "Essays on subjects connected with the Reformation in England."—S. R. Maitland, D. D., F. R. S., F. S. A., p. 1, 1849. [2] Eight glaring blunders are pointed out on one random page by Maitland. "Six Letters on Fox's Acts and Monuments," p. 40. [3] Brewer: "Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic," etc., Vol. I., p. 60, pref. [4] N. Pocock: "Christian Remembrancer," Vol. XLIX., pp. 147, 183. [5] Mackintosh: "History of the Revolution," p. 617. Lond., 1834. [6] J. Whitaker: "Mary Queen of Scots Vindicated," Vol. II., p. 22.

With Foxe and Burnet in England, Knox and Buchanan in Scotland, found lacking the constitutive principles of reliable historians, their honesty impugned, their veracity successfully challenged, "the credit of their copyists has also disappeared," and with their disappearance the fate of historical falsification becomes not only an unsightly actuality, but manifests the hand of God in visible retributive justice.

The pathway of the three last centuries is strewn with the wreckage of historical falsehood. The triumph of truth may be impeded, but with crushing step it will and must move on. The disappearance of the phantasmal Popess Joanna, the darkness lifted from the Middle Ages, the explosion of the Gunpowder Plot, the leveling of the "tall bully" that commemorated the Popish plot to burn London, the moribund Galileo myth, the supposititious divine mission of the Reformers, the tottering St. Bartholomew legend, the misty Inquisition spectre, whose total disappearance was only prevented by Llorente's assassination of the witnesses, all, all prove that the Catholic Church has nothing to fear, all to hope and gain by the new scientific school of history. Its guiding maxims resolve themselves into the simple but adequate law laid down to the Catholic historian by the present illustrious Pontiff Leo XIII.: "The first law of history is not to tell a lie; the second, not to fear to tell the truth." In this he more than anticipates—sees the full and glorious realization of the prediction made by one of France's most commanding intellects, Alexis de Tocqueville—that *"the restoration of the science of history is the restoration of Catholic greatness."*

H. G. Ganss.

Carlisle, Pa.

---

[1] Ib.

[2] Ib., p. 2.

RACE WAR AND NEGRO DEMORALIZATION.

FROM the date of the introduction of negro slavery as a general system in the American colonies down to the present hour the race problem has cast its dark shadow over the fair face of the land. We always had the trouble with us, in one form or another. In the old slave-holding days the horrors of the social ulcer were not all confined to the unhappy race who paid the penalty of human greed; the moral torture of a portion at least of the stronger population at the spectacle of degraded and brutalized humanity was keener because more exquisite than the pangs of outraged nature and family affection among the sable thralls. Nemesis, surely, was never more appallingly realized than in the punishment which has followed the introduction of this moral poison into our national veins. Emancipation, which it was fondly hoped might bring its own solution of the ethical problem, has failed to civilize the negro. With the baldest outfit of education and the lowest plane of moral perceptions, he has been brought into contact with the vices of a political condition in which all the resources of a perverted white intellect and all the passion for power and profit and political intrigue are utilized without scruple and with a total disregard of the moral consequences. The shadow deepens, rather than declines, as the years roll on. In the early days of the trouble the only factor resorted to for the settlement of race conflicts was the shot-gun. It is to-day the shot-gun, with the addition of the hangman's rope by way of variety, and now and again the blazing pile and the implements of torture, as seen in use among the aborigines in the early days of colonial settlement.

The immediate causes of the race conflicts have been various—often, perhaps chiefly, they arise from the political aspects of the question; sometimes they grow out of the difficulties of the social problem, and sometimes, as in the matter of lynchings, they grow out of immorality and lawlessness.

Of late the lynchings have mostly occupied the public mind, and for some months one has scarcely been able to pick up the daily papers without seeing in any one of them reports of one, two or even three lynchings for that crime which all white men in the South hold as the greatest and most detestable, and which has been properly termed the "nameless crime" of criminal assault. It would indeed have been remarkable if these lynchings had not increased the tendency towards conflict between the races, and had not engendered recriminations and bitterness. On the one hand the white people of the South have been painted as lawless and cruel, carried away by unwarranted prejudice against the negro; on the other, fierce denunciations have been made against the immorality of the negroes, the usual cause of the lynchings. With the former question this article does not intend to deal; but it is thought that some service may be rendered by giving at this time an idea of the condition of morality among the negroes, an explanation of the causes which have led up to their present moral condition, and a remedy, which the writer believes to be the only true one suggested.

I.

The status of negro morality may perhaps receive its fullest general illustration from the last United States census, which presents the following comparative table of criminal statistics. It will be noted that under the head of "colored" the census includes "persons of negro descent, Chinese, Japanese and civilized Indians." The last three classes, however, are too insignificant in numbers to be taken into practical account:

Number of prisoners in the United States, classified by sex, general nativity and color, and offenses committed, 1890:

Offenses.	Total.	Males. *a*	Females. *b*	Nat. white		For'gn white		Colored *c*	
				M'les	Fem's	Mal's	Fem'es	Mal's	Fem's
All offenses	82,329	75,924	6,405	38,156	2,315	13,869	2,063	23,030	1,989
Against the government	1,839	1,823	16	1,188	8	439	6	191	2
Against the currency	389	385	4	260	2	97	2	27	..
Against the election laws	69	67	2	39	2	12	..	16	..
Against the postal laws	299	297	2	220	1	40	1	35	..
Against the revenue laws	290	284	6	170	1	55	3	58	2
Against the pension laws	28	26	2	16	2	3	..	7	..
Against the military laws	764	764	..	483	..	232	..	48	..
Against society	18,865	15,033	3,832	7,784	1,572	4,346	1,557	2,708	695
Against public health	11	11	..	3	..	7	..	1	..
Against public justice	729	682	47	347	17	77	8	254	21
Against public morals	10,100	8,001	2,099	4,283	952	2,438	836	1,178	306
Against public peace	4,944	3,676	1,268	1,623	426	1,033	590	989	250
Against public policy	3,081	2,663	418	1,528	177	791	123	286	118
Against the person	17,281	16,511	770	6,852	220	2,976	110	6,580	434
Homicide	7,351	6,958	393	3,045	112	1,163	50	2,698	228
Rape	1,392	1,387	5	607	2	200	1	576	2
Abduction	155	140	15	74	8	23	2	42	5
Abortion	36	25	11	18	7	5	3	2	1
Assault	8,347	8,001	346	3,108	91	1,585	54	3,262	198
Against property	37,707	36,382	1,325	19,668	375	5,313	282	11,155	650
Arson	886	806	80	303	22	124	9	372	49
Burglary	9,734	9,647	87	5,392	16	1,404	6	2,791	65
Robbery	2,381	2,350	31	1,439	11	325	5	573	15
Larceny, not specified	8,403	7,978	425	3,705	92	1,079	103	3,166	225
Grand larceny	6,731	6,411	320	3,571	95	962	65	1,877	159
Petit larceny	3,741	3,475	266	1,828	89	545	72	1,077	100
Larceny of horses	1,632	1,627	5	923	5	187	..	485	..
Receiving stolen goods	487	430	57	247	25	106	14	75	18

Offenses.	Total.	Males. [a]	Females. [b]	Nat. white		For'gn white		Colored [c]	
				M'les	Fem's	Mal's	Fem'es	Mal's	Fem's
Embezzlement	485	480	5	320	1	85	..	72	3
Fraud	886	868	18	524	6	136	2	200	10
Forgery	1,887	1,865	22	1,201	13	276	2	372	7
Malicious mischief and trespass	454	445	9	215	..	84	4	144	5
On the high seas	4	4	..	2	..	2	..	..	..
Murder at sea	1	1	..	..	..	1	..	..	..
Assault at sea	1	1	..	1	..	..	..	..	..
Piracy	2	2	..	1	..	1	..	..	..
Miscellaneous	6,633	6,171	462	2,662	140	793	108	2,396	202
Double crimes	3,449	3,367	82	1,747	26	415	23	1,194	33
Violation of municipal ordinances	488	388	100	152	27	81	27	150	46
Unclassified	53	53	..	11	..	4	..	38	..
Not stated	2,286	2,101	185	641	63	240	48	934	69
Held as insane	291	212	79	90	18	42	7	62	47
Held as witnesses	66	50	16	21	6	11	3	18	7

---

[a] Includes 869 prisoners whose nativity is unknown. [b] Includes 38 prisoners whose nativity is unknown. [c] Persons of negro descent, Chinese, Japanese and civilized Indians.

On this Henry Gannet observes ("Statistics of the Negroes in the United States," by Henry Gannet):

"The proportion of criminals among the negroes is much greater than among the whites. The statistics of the last census show that the white prisoners of native extraction confined in jails at the time the census was taken were in the proportion of 9 to each 10,000 of all whites of native extraction while the negro prisoners were in the proportion of 33 to each 10,000 of the negro population. Thus it appears that the proportion of negroes was nearly four times as great as for the whites of native extraction. It should be added, however, that the commitments of negroes are for petty offenses in much greater proportion than among the whites."

If we should exclude the population under 15 years of age, which practically does not come under the law, the proportion would be yet higher against the negro.

This surely is an astounding state of morality. That the negro should have against him a criminal record three to four times as great as that of the whites is something appalling. Yet, dark as the picture is, it is made still darker if we consider the nature of the negro's chief criminality. The following table will bring this out still more clearly than the general census: (Hoffman, p. 219.)

FEMALES.

	Total No. of Prisoners.	Colored Prisoners.	Col. Prisoners Per Cent.
Offenses against the government	16	2	12.50
Offenses against society	3,832	683	17.58
Offenses against the person	770	432	56.10

	Total No. of Prisoners.	Colored Prisoners.	Col. Prisoners Per Cent.
Offenses against property	1,325	655	49.43
Offenses of a miscellaneous character.	462	200	43.29
Aggregate	6,405	1,972	30.79

Proportion of colored population over 15 years of age in total (female), 11.09 per cent.

MALES.

	Total No. of Prisoners.	Colored Prisoners.	Col. Prisoners Per Cent.
Offenses against the government	1,823	176	9.65
Offenses against society	15,033	2,577	17.14
Offenses against the person	16,511	6,308	38.21
Offenses against property	36,382	10,924	30.03
Offenses of a miscellaneous character.	6,175	2,320	37.95
Aggregate	75,924	22,305	29.38

Proportion of colored population over 15 years of age in total (males), 10.20 per cent.

The proportion of colored males is slightly above 10 per cent. of the whole population; but his crimes, according to the census, against *the person* are above 38 per cent.! The colored females are in proportion slightly above 11 per cent. of the total female population, whereas their crimes against *the person* are above 56 per cent. of all such crimes committed by women. This means that with regard to the most serious of all crimes—those against the person—the negro is from 4 to 5½ times as criminal as his white brother!

The following table will bring out more clearly still the specified offenses: (See Hoffman, p. 220.)

MALE PRISONERS.

	Total No. of Prisoners.	Colored Prisoners.	Col. Prisoners Per Cent.
Crimes against the person—			
Homicide	6,958	2,512	36.10
Rape	1,387	567	40.88
Abduction	140	32	22.86
Abortion	25	2	8.00
Assault	8,001	3,195	39.93
Crimes against property—			
Arson	806	372	46.15
Burglary	9,647	2,710	28.09
Robbery	2,350	555	23.62
Larceny	7,978	3,126	39.18
Grand larceny	6,411	1,774	27.67
Petty larceny	3,475	1,055	30.36

FEMALE PRISONERS.

	Total No. of Prisoners.	Colored Prisoners.	Col. Prisoners Per Cent.
Crimes against the person—			
Homicide	393	227	57.76
Assault	346	198	57.23
Crimes against property—			
Arson	80	49	61.25
Larceny	425	225	52.94
Grand larceny	320	159	49.67
Petty larceny	266	99	37.22

On this Hoffman observes ("Race Traits and Tendencies of the American Negro," by Frederick L. Hoffman, F. S. S.):

"The table fully explains itself and needs little comment. Of homicides the colored prisoners formed 36.1 per cent. For the most atrocious of all crimes, rape, 40.88 per cent. of the prisoners convicted were colored, and for assault 39.98 per cent. The proportion of colored females charged with homicide was even greater than that of males, and the same is true for the cases of assault."

If, following Gannet's mode, we compared the negro only with the native white population, the record against him would give him 50 per cent. of all the *convictions* for rape! If, again, we took into account the number of those crimes committed in the South for which there is neither trial nor conviction, but lynching pure and simple, the percentage would probably swell to from 70 to 90 per cent. That is to say, for the most bestial and detestable of all crimes against the person, the negro is 7 to 9 times as great a criminal as the white man!

Let it not be thought, as some may imagine, that this result of the criminal record of the negro is brought about by severity and discrimination against the negro in the courts of the South. In those portions of the country which have ever boasted a partiality for the colored brother the same evidences of negro criminality are found, as the following table from Hoffman's work—page 221—will show:

CONVICTS IN PENNSYLVANIA PENITENTIARY, 1886 AND 1894.

	Total.	Colored.	Percentage of Colored.
MALES.			
1886	1,730	244	14.10
1894	2,312	384	16.61
FEMALES.			
1886	41	14	34.15
1894	52	18	34.61

Percentage of colored in total population over 15 years of age: Males, 2.23; females, 2.09.

It will be seen that in Pennsylvania, where the negro males formed only 2 per cent. of the male population and the negro females about 2 per cent. of the female population, 16 per cent. of the male convicts and 34 per cent. of the female convicts were negroes. In New Jersey the same status is observed, the negroes forming 17 per cent. of the male and 34 per cent. of the female convicts, although the negro men are only about 3 1-2 per cent. of the whole male population and the negro women about the same of the whole female population.

And so it is elsewhere—wherever, in fact, so far as the writer has ascertained, the negro exists in the United States.

There are two points not sufficiently emphasized by these statistics, yet whose existence no man doubts. Moreover, they are so important that negro morality cannot be properly appreciated without taking them into consideration. The first of these is the negro's tendency to steal, his dishonesty; the second his sensuality.

In the table given on pages 91-92 it will be noted that the negro is charged with 30 to 49 per cent. of the offenses against property. And, as has been observed, Henry Gannet notes that commitments of the negro for "petty offenses" is in much greater proportion than among the whites. So universal, however, are these petty offenses, the majority of which never come to court, that there is everywhere a general mistrust of the negro. In the South it is seldom that a housekeeper having negro servants will leave her goods exposed or unkept of key. It is seldom, too, that a negro can obtain credit at stores without ironclad legal security. This habit of dishonesty the negro may have had in savagery or may have acquired in slavery; but whatever excuse there may be for it, it exists among them to such an extent that it may well be reckoned a racial characteristic.

As to their sensuality, it would be impossible for those who have not lived among them to know how sadly prominent it is as the besetting sin of the race. Whilst it is not possible to bring forward much official data on this point, and we are left largely to private testimony, still some indications can be noted which will give us something of a correct idea.

It will be remembered that the criminal sensuality of the negro, as expressed in the crime of rape, was enormous—put down as not less than 7 to 9 times as great as among the whites. This is rendered still more striking if we reflect that the negro commits this crime in the South where he knows that in every case he is certain of sure, swift and terrible punishment—nothing less than lynching, and sometimes burning at the stake by a frenzied mob.

How great must be the sensual tendency which causes the negro, in spite of this knowledge, to burst all bonds and to rush to such terrible destruction, we leave the reader to consider. Nor is this indication of sensuality lessened if we look to milder forms of expression. The following table of illegitimate births is given by the official records of Washington City:

PERCENTAGE OF ILLEGITIMATE IN TOTAL NUMBER OF BIRTHS, 1879-1894.

(Report of the Health Officer of the District of Columbia 1894, p. 152.)

	White.	Colored.
1879	2.32	17.60
1880	2.43	19.02
1881	2.33	19.42
1882	2.09	19.73
1883	3.14	20.95
1884	3.60	19.02
1885	3.00	22.88
1886	3.28	22.86
1887	3.34	21.27
1888	3.49	22.18
1889	3.59	23.45
1891	2.90	25.12
1892	2.53	26.40
1893	2.82	27.00
1894	2.56	26.46
Average 1879-94	2.92	22.49

Such is the condition of affairs in Washington City, where it is natural to expect that the negro would make an especially good showing for himself. Washington is the very Mecca of the negro in this country. Hither he has flocked in such numbers that he forms about one-third of the entire population. Here he has churches and schools and position such as he possesses nowhere else. The record gives him no less than seventy-seven churches, he is endowed here with schools the most superb, his status and independence here is higher perhaps than anywhere else on earth, and yet even here the official records, which are necessarily defective, declare that he is from ten to eleven times as sensual as the white man—that more than one-fourth of his children are born bastards!

In other places the facts are even more damaging to him than in Washington, and it must also be noted that where such illegitimacy so universally reigns, there must be an enormous amount of sensuality multiplied of which no record is or can be kept.

If, again, we turn to diseases which are caused by sexual vices, we find an equally enormous disproportion in regard to the two races, as will be seen from the following table, taken from Hoffman's monograph, page 94:

MORTALITY FROM SCROFULA AND VENEREAL DISEASES, BALTIMORE AND WASHINGTON, 1885-1890.
(Per 100,000 of Population.)

	Scrofula.		Contagious Diseases.	
	Baltimore.	Washington.	Baltimore.	Washington.
White	6.12	5.28	3.06	5.89
Colored	29.09	38.39	13.29	23.89
Per cent. of excess of negro mortality	375.30	627.10	344.30	305.60

The subject might be pursued very far, but enough has been said to show that this vice of sensuality is a most marked and prevalent one among the colored people, and to prove also that the negro is sunken in moral or immoral condition three or four times as degraded as that among the whites, and that he develops his most powerful vicious tendencies in the worst classes of crimes—those against the person.

This picture, however, of negro immorality would be incomplete if we did not bear in mind the following points, viz.: that the negro's appreciation of crime is not so strong as that of the white man, and that there is in him a great weakness of will power. The negro mind, taken in general, does not develop to that full maturity of judgment and perception to be found in the whites, and, as Booker Washington observes, he seems not to possess that strength and tenacity of will so necessary in overcoming difficulties. The importance of these facts in regard to morality cannot be easily exaggerated. On the one hand they lessen the negro's guilt, on the other his elevation to a higher standard is rendered much more difficult.

Nor should this portion of the subject be closed without observing that crime has not among the colored people the stigma cast upon it which it has among the white people. The colored criminal is seldom barred from his wonted society by the commission or conviction of crime; he is not shunned by his fellows; he suffers from no change of feeling in his regard unless, indeed, it be that he is oftentimes made a hero of. Not infrequently does it happen that when a number of negro criminals are to be carried to the penitentiary they are surrounded at the depot by their friends and receive a farewell ovation to be excelled in hearty good will and friendliness only by the welcome which awaits them upon their return from prison. And the crime? Well, the gentlemen of color made a mistake—like some of their rich white brethren—the mistake of being caught!

II.

How has the negro fallen so low? How has it happened that forming one-seventh of the population he stands distinguished from the rest of the inhabitants of the country not alone by strong marks of repugnant difference in color and physiognomy, but above all by a criminality so greatly out of his proper proportion?

The answer takes us far back into history, but it is easily found. When the African was brought to America he was a perfect savage, with the undeveloped moral sense of the savage. Up to thirty-four years ago he was treated under a Protestant system of slavery as a piece of property; and whilst it is untrue that the slave-holders were unkind to their slaves or were not provident for them in a material way, it is undeniable that no adequate attention was paid to their moral and spiritual welfare. Indeed, investigation would most probably show that almost as little was done for them in these respects as if they had possessed no souls at all.

Under practical Catholic masters this sad neglect could not exist, and would never be tolerated by the Church. Where Catholics who heeded the voice of the Church possessed slaves, they were under the strictest obligation to look after their religious welfare, and the result of such care on the part of the Church is seen in every part of the globe wherever Catholic slave-holders once existed. In the United States it is owing to this fact mainly that we have any negro Catholics at all. That the morals of these negro Catholics, who are attentive to their religious duties, is of a high standard will be attested by those who have worked amongst them.

But the majority, almost the universality of slave-holders in the South were Protestants of some denomination. Protestantism could bind them to nothing. They felt no obligation regarding the morals of their slaves, and they practically fulfilled none. Whatever improvement came to the negroes in slavery in this regard was from contact with the whites, which was much more intimate in the days of slavery than it has been since. But no man will contend that this was of a character sufficiently efficacious for their complete upraising.

The reader, however, may ask: "But since those days of slavery has not much been done? Have not the negroes been abundantly supplied with schools and churches and ministers? Have not millions upon millions been poured out for the uplifting of the freedman?"

Truly may we answer "Yes" to these questions. Upon no people that ever existed upon the face of the earth have so much treasure and other aid been expended as upon the colored people of the United States for their upraising. The private donations for this purpose from individuals in the North have been so lavish that such men as Dr. J. L. M. Curry have felt themselves obliged to call publicly for a cessation of such charity and to advise that it be not given except through certain fixed channels. Nor have the white people of the Southern States, unjustly held up though they often are as being inimical to the negro, been behind in their efforts for his advancement. At great sacrifice to themselves in the midst of new conditions and pressing poverty, it is computed that they have given for the education alone of the negro no less than seventy-five or eighty millions of dollars within twenty years.

The negro everywhere has his churches and his schools. He is naturally religious and a great church-goer; and as to ministers, he has perhaps more to the square mile than any other people in this country. His crimes, however, have not diminished; his attacks upon persons and property are as grave and numerous as ever; his propensity to pilfering has not grown less; and, if we are to judge by statistics, his lust has greatly increased.

Nor will the reader be astonished at this result if he take time to carefully investigate the means employed to elevate negro morality. It is to be borne in mind that the negro was and is four times as immoral as the white man, with abnormal propensities to stealing and lust—the last being the most difficult passion of human nature to control. It will further be borne in mind that the negro possesses an extremely weak will. To raise this weak race from the low condition of morality in which it was sunken and to which it was and is chained by the strongest passions, two levers presented themselves—the school and the church.

As to the school, to educate a man without at the same time training him to virtue and religion is simply to increase his capacity for wickedness. The history of the world does not show that nations grew in virtue as they increased their knowledge. Nor will any one pretend that a comparison of nations to-day will prove that the better educated are more virtuous than the ignorant. Education divorced from religion, so far from making men more moral, will but give them an increased capacity for vice. Now of all the systems of education ever devised by the human brain there is not one less calculated to uplift the negro than the one adopted and under which the mass of the negroes are as a matter of fact being taught, viz., the public school system of the United States. Under this system it is absolutely forbidden to give any religious education. "The public school," say its advocates, "is not for religion and morals. These are to be left to the individual and the church. The object of the school is simply to impart knowledge and to develop the mind." To expect the elevation of morals from such a source is absurd upon its face. Yet this is the system which was expected to raise up one of the most morally degraded people on earth who pretend to any degree of Christian civilization—a people weak of will and held in thrall by the strongest passions of human nature!

Nor is it surprising that the religion of the negro has not produced better results. There has never, perhaps, been given anywhere or at any time so striking an example of the inefficiency of Protestantism in a missionary field as the spectacle it has presented in its treatment of the negro, both during and since slavery. Here was a race of people professing Protestantism, but sunk to a low moral condition and practically ignorant of even Protestant Christianity, and yet scarcely one white Protestant missionary could be found to devote himself to them. It is true that here and there, where masters or mistresses were of a specially devout turn of mind, there were some sporadic efforts made at religious training and instruction, but when all is said the fact remains that the amount of Christian teaching and moral training which the slaves received was so meagre as to put to shame any people professing the name of Christian.

After the Civil War the negroes, practically forced out of the white churches, were compelled to congregate by themselves and to choose their ministers from their own race, ministers mostly as ignorant and undeveloped as was the flock which they were to preach to.

And what a religion they adopted! Had they taken the entire catalogue of Christian sects which have arisen since the commencement of the Christian era, they could hardly have adopted one less calculated to raise them from their sunken condition than Protestantism. Born of lust and license, teaching nothing definite, allowing the individual by the principle of private interpretation to believe what he pleases and practice what he chooses, Protestantism is nothing more than a glittering generality. Such a system of religion served the negro in no other respect than to satisfy in a vague way his natural desire for a religion of some kind. To expect that it would serve to impel the negro to self-abnegation and sacrifice, that it would strengthen his weak will to overcome his strong passions, that it would inspire him with the determination to undertake the most difficult of all conquests—that of immoral tendencies and fleshly appetites—was simply expecting an impossibility.

The moral condition of the negro is therefore a logical outcome of Protestant principles—they believe what they choose and practice what they wish—proving it all by the Bible. Though they spend the Sundays in church-going, in singing, in shouting, in preaching and in praying, their religion has so little moral effect upon their lives that most of them will at the same time that they are working themselves up into a frenzy of excitement by their exhortings and prayer meetings, carry on the most shockingly immoral practices without apparently so much as a qualm of conscience. Religion and morality are two separate and divorced subjects.

Such has been the work of Protestantism on the negroes, offering no practical bar to, if not logically enforcing, the degraded moral condition in which they had sunken.

What, then, is the prospect for the negro? Is he to remain in his present condition? *Can* he remain in his present condition? Can this weak race survive in the state of moral degradation in which it is to-day? Is it doomed to destruction, or is there a means to save it and raise it up?

The last census, indeed, shows that the negro is on the increase, but not in so great proportion as the native white population. But independently of this there are authors like Hoffman who point out the fact which is everywhere admitted that the negroes are physically deteriorating, and that certain diseases which they attribute to their immorality are being propagated enormously amongst them at an ever increasing ratio.

The black man was not formerly more subject to these diseases than the white man, yet through them the constitution of the whole colored race is now being gradually undermined, and each generation is less and less resistive of their attacks, until in the process of time the negro must disappear unless there be placed a more efficacious bar to his immorality than any yet applied. The following are tables of statistics which will illustrate the progress of the diseases above referred to: (See Hoffman, pp. 80, 83, 84, 85, 94.)

CONSUMPTION IN CHARLESTON, S. C.
(Death rate per 100,000 of population.)

Period.	White.	Colored.
1822-30	457	447
1831-40	331	320
1841-48	268	266

Period.	White.	Colored.
1865-74	198	411
1875-84	255	668
1885-94	189	627
1822-1848	347	342
1865-1894	213	576

MORTALITY FROM CONSUMPTION IN FOURTEEN AMERICAN CITIES.

(Rate per 100,000 population, 1890.)

	White.	Colored.
Charleston, S. C.	355.4	686.3
New Orleans, La.	250.3	587.7
Savannah, Ga.	371.1	544.0
Mobile, Ala.	304.1	608.2
Atlanta, Ga.	213.8	483.7
Richmond, Va.	230.5	411.1
Baltimore, Md.	250.6	524.6
Washington, D. C.	245.0	591.8
Brooklyn, N. Y.	284.9	539.0
New York, N. Y.	379.6	845.2
Boston, Mass.	365.8	884.8
Philadelphia, Pa.	269.4	532.5
St. Louis, Mo.	159.9	605.9
Cincinnati, Ohio	239.1	633.3

MORTALITY FROM PNEUMONIA IN TWO CITIES.

(Death rate per 100,000 living at same age.)

	White.	Colored.	Col. over white Per Cent.
Ages 8 to 5.			
Baltimore, Md.	645.01	2158.95	234.72
Washington, D. C.	466.17	1642.15	252.26
Ages 5 to 15.			
Baltimore, Md.	37.52	105.01	179.87
Washington, D. C.	28.08	119.72	326.35
Ages 15 to 45.			
Baltimore, Md.	74.20	123.74	66.76
Washington, D. C.	69.32	194.00	179.86
Ages 45 and over.			
Baltimore, Md.	323.93	360.53	14.39
Washington, D. C.	274.18	446.28	62.77

There has already been given in this article a table setting forth the mortality resulting from diseases more directly due to immorality than the above.

It is asserted that the negro by excessive unchastity, chiefly through prostitution with the whites, is undermining his constitution and hence becomes an easy and ever increasing prey to these diseases. The following extracts from the "Report on the Social and Physical Condition of Negroes in Cities," by Professor Eugene Harris, himself a negro, bears out this assertion with fearful force:

"From 1870 to 1880 the negro population increased nearly 36 per cent.; from 1880 to 1890 the increase was only a little over 13 per cent. This is about one-half the rate of increase among the whites.

"For the year 1895, when 82 white deaths from consumption occurred in the city of Nashville, there ought to have been only 49 colored, whereas there really were 218, or nearly four and one-half times as many as there ought to have been. It is an occasion of serious alarm when 37 per cent. of the whole people are responsible for 72 per cent. of the deaths from consumption. Deaths among colored people from pulmonary diseases seem to be on the increase throughout the South. During the period 1882-1885 the excess of colored deaths (over white) for the city of Memphis was 90.80 per cent. For the period 1891-1895 the excess had risen to over 137 per cent. For the period of 1886-1890 the excess of colored deaths from consumption and pneumonia for the city of Atlanta was 139 per cent. For the period 1891-1895 it had risen to nearly 166 per cent. . . . Before the (civil) war this dread disease was virtually unknown among the slaves. According to Hoffman, deaths from consumption have fallen off 134 in 100,000 among the whites and increased 234 in 100,000 among the blacks since the war.

"The constitutional diseases which are responsible for our unusual mortality are often traceable to enfeebled constitutions, broken down by sexual immoralities. According to Hoffman, over 25 per cent. of the negro children born in Washington City are admittedly illegitimate. According to a writer quoted in 'Black America,' in one county in Mississippi there were during twelve months 300 marriage licenses taken out in the County Clerk's office for white people. According to the proportion of population there should have been in the same time 1,200 or more for negroes. There were actually taken out by colored people just three. . . . A few years ago I said in a sermon at Fisk University that wherever the Anglo-Saxon comes into contact with an inferior race the inferior race invariably goes to the wall. I called attention to the fact that, in spite of humanitarian and philanthropic efforts, the printing press, the steam engine and the electric motor in the hands of the Anglo-Saxon were exterminating the inferior races more rapidly and more surely than shot and shell and bayonet. I mentioned a number of races that have perished, not because of destructive wars and pestilence, but because they were unable to live in the environment of a nineteenth century civilization; races whose destruction was not due to a persecution that came to them from without, but to lack of moral stamina within; races that perished in spite of the humanitarian and philanthropic efforts that were put forth to save them."

Nor let the idea be thought a vain one. No individual or race can sin vitally against nature's laws and live. An example and object lesson in this we possess in the population of Hawaii. Seventy years ago, according to Charles Gulick, the Hawaiians, whose territory we have so lately and so graciously stolen, were a race of uncorrupted children, sweet, gentle, generous, hospitable. We gave them seventy years of "Protestant missionary efforts," schools and teachers without stint. Read the record of their population since that time: (See Hoffman, p. 319.)

ACTUAL AND RELATIVE DECREASE IN THE POPULATION OF HAWAII 67 YEARS.

1823	142,000
1853	71,019
1872	49,044
1890	34,436
Total decrease	107,564

Per cent. of decrease, 75.8; average annual per cent., 1.12.

It is clear that their sun is set, and in a few years they will be forgotten. The cause of it? Unchastity, chiefly with the whites. The same cause is now operating with the negroes, and the facts cannot but cause grave concern to every friend of the negro race. Is there nothing that can stem the tide? Is there no balm in Gilead for this terrible sore? Secular education has been tried and has failed. Protestantism has been tried and has failed. But there is a regenerating and uplifting power which as yet has not really entered into the struggle, and to it we must look for the gaining of the victory—the energetic work of the Catholic Church and the Catholic school. Without this there is no hope for the negro. State schools without religion cannot correct and elevate a degraded moral condition. Protestantism has had the negroes in its hands for many years during slavery and since slavery; it has multiplied its establishments and poured out its millions in mission work, yet it cannot be shown that it has benefited the negro morally. He is undoubtedly worse than when it took hold of him. Only the energetic work of the Catholic Church and the Catholic school can raise up the negro from his degraded condition and save him.

The Catholic Church is a mother to all men, and takes the negro lovingly to her bosom, cherishing him there and insisting upon his perfect equality with the rest of her children, displaying a special kindness and love for *him* because he is poor, downtrodden and sunken. She sends forth her clergy, trained and educated, to devote and sacrifice their lives to his every need. She presents the word of God to him, not doubtfully, but teaching and interpreting it with infallible certainty and commanding by divine authority. She permits no opinions, but a clear fixed code of belief and morals, which by divine command she enforces upon all alike. She cherishes with loving, constant care each individual soul. She goes into the conscience and regulates that upon each of its acts. She holds a man constantly to that fixed definite regulation by the confessional, and she causes him to do penance for its every violation. She preaches no easy doctrine of the forgiveness of sins—a fatal defect in Protestantism in its work against immorality, especially in reference to the negro. Moreover, her religious exercises, her sacraments, her spiritual direction, her sermons, preached and enforced with divine authority—in a word, her whole system of teaching and practice is eminently qualified to aid the negro, to meet his needs and to raise him from his degraded condition.

But the work of the Church cannot be expected to have its full effect upon the older population. It is hard to straighten a tree which has already attained its growth. But taking the young people and training them in her schools, the Catholic Church would be the salvation of the negro. She would surround his weakness with every aid; she would correct his morals, especially his propensities to stealing and lust, most effectually, and she would, by consequence, avert his present physical deterioration and probable future destruction, caused by his present immoral life. Under her loving and fostering care he would rise to a new life and assume amongst the rest of the population that position for which God has destined him.

That the work of the Catholic Church is effectual on the negroes is well attested by those who have worked amongst them. The negroes who are practical Catholics lead moral and edifying lives in striking contrast with those outside of the Church, and some of them would rank with our best Catholics in any portion of the globe. Many thoughtful Protestants in the South recognize the power of the Catholic Church in regard to the negroes, and some among negro leaders openly advise the negroes to become Catholics.

Nor let it be looked upon as an idle vision—this work of regenerating the negro by the Catholic Church. True, the work of the Catholic Church among the negroes is meagre at present, but we are not to take things on the surface. The normal condition of the Church is one of missionary effort. The command to teach all nations, to preach the Gospel to every creature is the very life of her mission on earth, and hence, as long as there is a soul on earth without the fold she cannot rest easy or unconscious of struggle. In the United States her energies have hitherto been absorbed in the endeavor to save her own—to house and provide against the loss of her many children who have poured themselves upon these hospitable shores. This work, however, has been now in a great measure accomplished, and it takes neither prophet nor the son of a prophet to predict that the Church in the United States is on the eve of a great missionary upheaval. How else can it be? Can the Church be untrue to her mission and fail to put forth her efforts to save the millions of non-Catholics surrounding her?

Nor are there signs wanting that this missionary spirit is quickening on every side of us. Alas! indeed that quickening as it is, it should at present be so weak! Though the religious orders seem to be fast increasing, though candidates for the diocesan priesthood are too numerous in some dioceses to be accommodated, we have hardly begun work upon our own white non-Catholics, and almost the entire colored race lies perishing at our feet. All honor to the Josephites who have nobly gone forth first to this, the most self-sacrificing mission work of our country—a work in which at present difficulty and hardship and lack of worldly honor are their portion. Theirs is a noble mission, more akin to that which the *Great Master* chose for Himself on earth—"the poor have the Gospel preached to them!"

THOMAS F. PRICE.

Raleigh, North Carolina.

IMAGINATION AND FAITH.

THE abuse of the imagination is easy, and far-reaching in its consequences. In matters of faith it seems to find its widest, or at least its most serious, inlet playing havoc with the beliefs of many and blocking their way to the Church by throwing false lights and shades upon Catholic doctrine. A priest whose apostolic duties place upon him the guidance of enquirers to the faith has not infrequently to resign himself to long delays on minor points of doctrine or discipline. Again and again, when principles of belief and authority sufficient to cover the entire Catholic system seem to have been fully consented to, the work of catechising comes to a standstill on the catechumen's taking fright and shying at some item of belief already implicitly held in the acceptance of first principles. Moreover, many of those who do not seek admission or instruction in the Catholic faith from a denial of some of its fundamental tenets are open to the charge of being swayed by their imagination to the discredit of their reason.

To take some examples. It is incredible how much abhorrence is felt in certain quarters for the use of images. We have known a guileless and deeply religious soul who confessed to an irresistible feeling of sickness on seeing a priest lead the Rosary from a prie-dieu before Our Blessed Lady's statue. Mr. Kensit and his sympathizers seem to have a genuine distaste for any outward honor paid to the crucifix. Yet, as a recent writer in the *Church Times* has cleverly reminded them, on taking an oath in court it is the custom to kiss the Bible. With Catholic controversialists it is a commonplace when disputing on this point to urge the genuflexions and bowing and elaborate marks of honor paid to sovereigns. To see no harm in kneeling before Royalty or in kissing the Bible and yet to refuse to kiss the crucifix or kneel before a sacred image is an inconsistency due in great part to the imagination.

The Litany of Our Blessed Lady, with its varied list of titles, offers a serious obstacle to many non-Catholics. They cannot find in themselves to call the Virgin "Cause of Our Joy," "Ark of the Covenant," "Gate of Heaven," etc. Yet by their acceptance of the Council of Ephesus they have already given her the incomparably higher title of "Sancta Dei Genetrix," Mother of God, θεοτόκος.

Those again who hold baptismal regeneration, yet deny the Sacrament of Penance, lay themselves open to the charge of giving way to their imagination. That one man should be freed from sin by kneeling at the feet of another and hearing his acquittal seems the height of credulity to believe. Yet they have virtually conceded the possibility of such a power by allowing that the minister of baptism cleanses the soul by pouring water upon the brow. Indeed, the great objection to penance being its accompanying humiliation, they would seem to have conceded a still greater abasement by holding the justifying power of baptism. To many minds it may well be more humbling to submit publicly to a physical cleansing than to listen to a judicial acquittal in private.

The doctrine of Purgatory is untenable to those who are led by the imagination. The analogy of Nature, if realized to the full, would not merely prepare us for it, but would, perhaps, lead us to expect it. What evidence we find in the world goes a great way towards proving that our present state is one of trial and preparation and discipline. If such a state be reasonable before death, why not after death, especially since it is evident that the cleansing process can hardly be said to have reached completion in many cases at the hour of death?

One of the most common triumphs of the imagination is the disdain felt for miracles. That a simple Franciscan friar should be taken up in ecstacy many miles above the earth is passed over as a legend, or at best, a hyperbole—so strongly is the theory of gravitation imbedded in the imagination. Yet that bodies should fall is just as inconceivable on *a priori* grounds as that they should mount; nor is any one astonished on seeing his arms or limbs raised at the bidding of his soul. Are we not giving way to our imagination when we deny to spirit the power of raising the whole body? That it should be raised three inches or three miles is merely a question of less or more, which should be neglected in our reasoning, however much it may repel the imagination. Again, to believe that the dead have been brought back to life is considered by some as the highest pitch of human credulity. Yet, as a matter of fact, Nature daily brings thousands to life. Why should not some higher Power be able to bring them "back to life?"

The doctrine of transubstantiation is rejected by many who have little difficulty in admitting the transubstantiation of water into wine at Cana of Galilee. To others it seems inconceivable that accidents should exist without their proper substance; even whilst they admit that the human nature of Jesus Christ existed without its personality; if, indeed, they hold the Divinity of Jesus Christ with all its consequences. Our Blessed Lord's lengthy discussion with the Jews, preserved for us by St. John in the sixth chapter of his Gospel, would almost seem to be summed up in this: "You will be called on to accept the greater, *i. e.*, My Divinity; do not reject the less."

It may be asked how is this abuse of the imagination to be accounted for? Perhaps the most influential reason is the confusion in our use of the term. It is easy to mistake reason for imagination, and imagination for reason. The word is loosely used for the power of inventiveness. A drama or poem of skilful plot and striking combinations is called a work of vivid imagination; whereas it might be more accurate to speak of our great dramas and poems as works of reason, enriching its productions wih the more graceful trophies of the imagination. This inaccuracy of thought has become so widespread that one of the most constant obstacles to the teaching of scholastic philosophy is the powerlessness of certain minds to distinguish practically between an intellectual idea, judgment or argument and a phantasm of the imagination.

Hence to those who are in great part, if not altogether, bereft of imaginativeness, it is common to mistake their reasonings for fancies, and hence to fail in giving arguments their due. In the case of moral arguments and evidences of Christianity and the like, where "probability is the very guide of life," the mistake of confounding imagination with reason produces harmful results. Such minds will feel uneasy with the doctrine of the Trinity—to take one example from many. Baffled in their endeavor to realize it, they turn from all the delicate arguments in its favor as from an attempt to submerge reason.

The confusion between thoughts and fancies leads other men to trust their imagination in place of reason. They believe whatever can be outlined or pictured or drawn up in groups of statistics. Of Dean Stanley, Huxley once said: "Stanley could believe in anything of which he had seen the supposed site, but he was skeptical where he had not seen. At a breakfast at Monckton Milnes' just at the time of the Colenso row, Milnes asked my views on the Pentateuch, and I gave them. Stanley differed from me. The account of the creation in Genesis he dismissed as unhistorical; but the call of Abraham and the historical narrative of the Pentateuch he accepted. This was because he had seen Palestine—but he wasn't present at the creation."[1]

Birth, education, environment help on this tyranny of the imagination. A conviction once begotten by its activity, day by day, as the despotic image grows more familiar and clearer it asserts its power by stifling our reason and blunting the force of argument. Some men cannot handle or bear the sight of firearms without an irresistible dread. When every precaution has been employed and every means has been taken to show them that the weapon is unloaded and harmless, they will still reply: "I know it is unloaded. But it is safer to lay it aside. It might go off."

---

[1] The *Nineteenth Century*, August, 1896. "T. H. Huxley," by W. Ward.

Only a sharp effort of the will can shake off this tyranny of the imagination in the things of faith, where intrinsic evidence is not strong enough to compel assent. At times the great act of submission to the authority of the Church puts an end, once and for all, to the fetters which an uncurbed fancy has forged round the soul. The majestic Bride of Christ fills the imagination with an object that suffers no lesser fancies to dispute its sway. Sometimes the process of drawing off from the servitude of the imagination is gradual. The tyranny has rooted itself too firmly and its effects are too widespread to be torn up by a sudden effort. The exercise of will power, which is the prime moving cause, and the meritorious principle of the act of faith has a daily duty of compelling the imagination to picture the reverse of much that it formerly held true. In the end, when the prejudices and fancies that swayed the mind are as good as supplanted by sober pictures of the truth, the peace of soul which results is a reward above measure for the closeness of the struggle. To have been forced for years to fight a daily battle against the presumptions of a lower faculty makes us wary in trusting to vivid imaginings. Constant exercise of our reason and our higher will has established our soul on a basis of truth, and we have only to be faithful in few things in order to merit the reward of being set over many and of seeing what we have so long felt to be true.

VINCENT MCNABB, O. P.

England.

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION.

THE losses entailed alike on the workingmen and on their employers by the industrial conflict which they call *a strike* have been so appalling that both capital and labor have come to the conclusion that, in the settlement of their contests, it is better to appeal to reason and good will than to resort to brute force. The wisdom of this course will be made evident by counting the expenses of one of the contests, the great Chicago strike of 1894. In this deplorable struggle the Pullman Company and the twenty-four roads centering in Chicago suffered a loss of earnings amounting to $5,358,224; the actual loss to the workingmen in wages alone amounted to $1,750,000. But this is only a small part of the cost of this industrial war: The displacement of labor always involves serious losses. The expenses of United States deputy marshals—a small army of officials—of the United States troops, and of the militia; lastly, the lack of transportation, and the consequent stagnation of trade, must be added to the list of losses. Hence, we need not be astonished to find that the indirect damages, in the opinion of some, amounted to 80,000,000 of dollars; and, if this estimate be correct, then this deplorable war consumed wealth to the amount of 87,000,000 of dollars, without bringing any compensation whatever. Evidently, this sort of war is too expensive; victory is as destructive as defeat, and the victor cannot stand many triumphs of this kind.

The forces are organized on both sides; combined capital must meet combined labor; the State is in duty bound to protect both combinations so long as neither one nor the other commits any breach of the law. The time is passed when the employers could say that there was *nothing to arbitrate,* and that they were ready to meet their workingmen individually, but must decline to recognize their organizations. United States Commissioner of Labor Carroll D. Wright says: "The claim on the part of the great employers that they can deal only with individual employés is as absurd as it would be for the labor organizations to insist upon meeting the individual stockholders or the individual members of a firm. Neither party has a right to make such a claim. Representatives must deal with representatives; organization must recognize organization, and the committees of the two must meet in friendly spirit for the purpose of fairly and honestly discussing the questions under consideration. When this takes place it is incumbent upon the representatives of the employers to state frankly and fully the conditions under which they are attempting to produce goods; they know the conditions of the workingmen, and the workingmen can know the conditions of the production only through the representatives of organized capital. The very spirit of conciliation means frankness, a desire on the part of each to inform the other fully of the merits of their respective claims. Whenever such a course is pursued the results are usually satisfactory."[1]

We have seen that strikes are disastrous both for the capitalists and for the workmen; that they inflict great losses upon the country at large; that individual action is unable to control the forces which conflict in times of strikes or lockouts. Can the State interfere and enforce peace at the point of the bayonet? This would be slavery pure and simple; besides, it would put an end to the freedom of contract which is warranted by the Constitution, and would substitute for it a most oppressive kind of State socialism. No resource is left but to bring the representatives of capital and those of labor to meet one another in friendly conference; and if agreement be found impossible, to refer the whole question to an arbiter whom both parties can accept and in whose decision both parties are bound to acquiesce. Such is the only way, short of an appeal to brute force, by which conflicts may be prevented or terminated without violence, and without sacrifice of dignity on the part of either contending party.

---

[1] "Elements of Practical Sociology," C. D. Wright—Longmans, Green & Co.—p. 295.

Industrial *Arbitration* and *Conciliation* are the names indifferently given to this method of settling or preventing industrial conflicts; yet, although Conciliation and Arbitration are often merged into one another, there are some differences between the two which ought to be brought out clearly. *Conciliation* is an effort on the part of one or several persons, acceptable to both parties, to reconcile their differences by making them understand each other and agree on a compromise, when a compromise is possible and equitable, thus preventing an outbreak; or, if the outbreak has occurred already, by allaying the passions and presenting proposals on which both may agree. The mediators may, or may not, have been appointed beforehand. The essential is that the peacemakers be not considered as judges, but merely as mediators, and may act entirely in the latter capacity. When Conciliation is possible, it is the mildest and best way of preventing or ending conflicts, and it has the great advantage that it leaves no wounds to be healed except such as may have been already inflicted before the mediators had begun their work of reconciliation. *Arbitration* is a recourse to a judge or umpire whose decisions are binding in honor or in law. Such decisions must be based on the real merits of the case, not on the dispositions of the contending parties. The result of *Conciliation* is an agreement; the result of *Arbitration* is a judgment. Conciliation requires prudence and sympathy for both disputants; Arbitration requires equity and a judicial mind. Boards of Conciliation, established permanently or not, have been often successful; but it has been often found that they led to no conclusion, unless Arbitration stood back of them in order to give their decision sufficient weight and authority.

Arbitration may be, first, *Legal;* that is, established and operated under statute law with its sanction and power of enforcing awards; or, second, *Voluntary;* that is, established and operated by mutual agreement. In either case, while there may be a choice as to the submission of the dispute, yet, when so submitted, the decision is binding upon both parties, and can, so far as its character permits, be legally enforced. These distinctions are here introduced to explain the meaning of the authors who have written on this subject.[1] In this paper we shall consider arbitration as either *Legal* or *Voluntary*.

Before expressing an opinion on the kind of tribunal which is likely to be most successful in preventing industrial disputes, or in settling them, without any appeal to force and without leaving the scars of deep-seated wounds, it is best briefly to state what sort of courts have been tried before, and what success has attended the efforts at *Conciliation* and *Arbitration.* During the mediæval period the Guilds, *i. e.*, the confraternities of craftsmen, could regulate both trade and labor with the concurrence both of the State and municipal authorities. Guilds had their chartered privileges and their special jurisdictions, varying according to time, place and the prevailing polity; they had a sort of autonomy, and they consisted of *Masters, Journeymen* and *Apprentices,* bound together by their constitution and by a community of interests; but, under their various forms, those associations embodied the corporate strength of the crafts which their officers represented. The workman was not isolated; he was a unit in an aggregate which possessed considerable strength and power. Under the pretense of freeing the workmen from a hateful bondage, but in reality with a view to concentrate the energies of the nation in the moral impersonal being called the *State,* these useful associations were suppressed. In France the suppression took place in 1789. In England the Guilds were stripped of their possessions by Henry VIII., and destroyed by the Municipal Reform Act of 1835; in Germany the North German Industrial Code of 1869 had a similar effect. These ill-advised attempts to free the workers from the laws imposed by the Guilds had the effect of opening a gap between masters and workmen, of bringing disorder where order was prevailing before, and of leaving the workers defenseless in the hands of capitalists.

Napoleon I. saw the necessity of establishing a tribunal of Conciliation and Arbitration which could supply the place of the guilds, and by a decree dated March 18, 1806, he instituted a *Conseil de Prud'hommes* (council of prudent men), and gave it an extensive jurisdiction in trade matters. It proved successful, and similar institutions were founded in the principal trade centres. "These Conseils," says Joseph D. Weeks, "are judicial tribunals established under the authority of the Minister of Commerce, upon the request of the Chamber of Commerce, indorsed by the Municipal Council of the city where the proposed conseil is to be located. The request sets forth the need of a conseil, the trades that will be represented in it, divided into categories of cognate trades, and other facts that guide the Minister in deciding upon the application. The municipal council promises to provide for the expenses of the conseil. The officers of the conseil are a president and a vice president, named by the Chief of State, who hold office for three years; a secretary, appointed and removed by the Prefect, and a certain number of members, termed *prud'hommes,* the number in any conseil being not less than six, half of whom are employers and half employed, each class electing its own representatives. Certain qualifications as to ability, experience, age, residence and character are required to be possessed, both by the *prud'hommes* and, in a less degree, by those who elect them. The *prud'hommes* hold office for six years, and, together with the officers, are re-eligible. The members of the conseils serve without pay."

---

[1] Joseph D. Weeks in "Cyclopedia of Practical Science." Article: "Industrial Arbitration."

Probably the most important feature of this institution is the division of the *conseil* into two chambers, called the *private bureau* and the *general bureau.* The private bureau consists of two members only, and its function is to *conciliate.* If it fail to conciliate, then the case is referred to the general bureau. There another attempt at conciliation is made. If this second attempt fail also, the case is tried and judgment rendered. "The workings of these courts have been beneficial to French industry, especially in conciliation, by which more than 90 per cent. of all cases brought before tribunals are settled. In 1847 the sixty-nine councils then in existence had before them 19,271 cases, of which 17,951 were settled by conciliation in the private bureau, 519 more by open conciliation, and in only 529 cases was it necessary to have formal judgment. In 1850, of 28,000 cases 26,800 were settled by conciliation. There were, at the close of 1874, 112 councils in France. This is a most satisfactory showing; but it falls far short of expressing the great benefit these councils have been to French industry, especially in removing causes of differences or preventing them from growing into disputes."[1]

In these institutions abundant provision is made for conciliation and for arbitration, although the latter is seldom necessary. But arbitration is compulsory upon the application of either party, and the decision of the courts can be enforced the same as those of any other court. This is, in a measure, *Compulsory or Legal Arbitration,* owing to this feature. The plan has not proven acceptable to English workmen, who hate anything like compulsion. Tribunals very like the conseils have been established in Belgium also; but, owing probably to the fact that in the latter country they have, in some cases, criminal jurisdiction, they are not as popular as in France.

---

[1] Carroll D. Wright: "Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration," p. 8.

"Previous to 1860, a year which marks an epoch in the history of industrial arbitration in England, it had frequently been applied to the settlement of industrial disputes. Legal sanctions, however, were never sought for the awards."[1] It is evident that the success of these institutions depends on the good-will of the working population, and that the same measure of freedom does not suit alike all social conditions.

"In England, though a law somewhat similar in its character to that of France has been on the statute books since the fifth year of the reign of George IV. (1824), so little use has been made of its provisions that its existence was practically forgotten." Before tribunals of Conciliation and Arbitration could be accepted their decisions had to be deprived of their legal and compulsory features, and to depend entirely on the sense of honor and on the *esprit de corps* of the societies which called for their intervention.

Both Mr. Mundella and Mr. Kettle, who were chiefly instrumental in causing the Boards of Arbitration and Conciliation to become features of English industry, agree that these boards should be voluntary, and not compulsory. Though there are acts of Parliament which provide compulsory legal powers, these acts remained dead letter; while the voluntary boards, created under the influence of these high-minded gentlemen, have been very successful and have prevented or settled many disputes which would have proven very disastrous to the English industry. The system adopted by Mr. Mundella is now known as the Nottingham System of Arbitration and Conciliation, because it was first put into practice in the hosiery and glove trade which was carried on in the immediate vicinity of Nottingham. "*From 1710 to 1820 there is an awful list of murders, riots, arson and machine breaking recorded,*" says Colonel C. D. Wright, "*all arising out of industrial differences.*" The awful penalties enacted by Parliament prevented the continuance of these acts of violence, but left the attitude of hostility between employers and employés just what it was before the Draconian legislation was put into force. Mr. Mundella met the workmen, showed them that the existing conditions were deplorable and succeeded, not without great difficulty, in making them constitute a Board of Conciliation and Arbitration. Mr. Mundella himself was the first chairman of the board, and speaking of this, he says: "I have a casting vote, and twice the casting vote has got us into trouble, and for the last four years it has been resolved that we should not vote at all. Even when a workingman was convinced or a master was convinced, he did not like acting against his own order, and in some instances we had secessions in consequence of that; so we said, 'Do not let us vote again; let us try if we can agree;' and we did agree." There is an inherent defect in this system, for there is no provision for a deadlock. Eventually they had to resort to an independent referee or umpire. This defect was avoided in the Wolverhampton system by the election of an umpire. This was done by each party using a list of six names. The first name on both lists was that of Mr. Rupert Kettle, Judge of Worcestershire county. He was accordingly elected and served for ten years. The Nottingham rules had in the beginning no provision for arbitration, but had to make up afterwards for the deficiency. The Wolverhampton system made no provision at first for conciliation, but it became evident that this feature was necessary to expedite business and diminish legislation, and it was accordingly added to the system.

---

[1] Carroll D. Wright: "Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration," p. 9.

"The scheme adopted by Mr. Kettle," says Colonel Wright, "was a simple but admirable application of the principles of common law. A code of rules is framed; these rules, signed by the arbitrators and umpire, are posted in all the workshops represented in the board, and a copy given each workman on his hiring, he being informed that it is the contract under which he is to work. If any question arises it is to be referred to the board, or the conciliation committee under the amended rules, and it is by them decided. Any breach of the rules is a breach of contract, which can be punished the same as the breach of any other contract. It should be noted that this idea of a contract enters much more largely into the question of wages and the relation of employer and employed in England than with us.

"There are two radical differences between this plan and the Nottingham system," adds Colonel Wright. "The latter provides no method of enforcing the award of the board, while under the Wolverhampton system provision is made for their enforcement the same as any other contract. . . . The second difference in the two systems is the provision for the election of a permanent arbitrator or umpire. . . . Mr. Crompton in his work,[1] though strongly favoring conciliation, confesses that every board of conciliation must have an ultimate appeal.

"Another of the rules embodied in this system is deserving of more than passing notice. It is the third: 'Neither masters nor men shall interfere with any man on account of his being a society man or a non-society man.' " Some rule of this kind should be introduced into all labor combinations, or great disorders are unavoidable wherever there is a difference of opinion between the two classes of men. Consequent upon such disorders the employment of force is necessary, and there is an end of conciliation. A similar agreement was entered upon in Philadelphia. It became necessary because the agents of workingmen's associations had no authority to make their agreements binding.

---

[1] "Industrial Conciliation," p. 24.

"Philadelphia, November 12, 1887.

"The twenty-four firms, members of the Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association, believe that to longer make an effort to deal with an organization without the power to enforce contracts is useless, unbusiness-like, unjust to ourselves and to those of our late employés who wish to work, and invites a risk of capital, reputation and business that we cannot entertain. Therefore, profiting from past experience and from observation of various manufacturing industries, we propose to open our factories on Monday, November 14, 1887. We will not discriminate for or against any person because he or she is not a member of any organization; (we) will meet a committee of our working people as a board of arbitration, and those who wish to work in our factories will be fully protected in their workings by the following rules and regulations: The bill of wages paid prior to the strike will be paid in each of the branches in the several factories until December 1, 1888, and should there be any change desired at that time the rules make provision for that change."[1] Here follow the rules, which are too long for reproduction, but which will amply repay careful reading.

The need of courts of arbitration and conciliation is so evident that very few will question their usefulness. Already in twenty States such courts have been established by law, and most likely all the other States will follow the example of these twenty States. But among the systems which have been mentioned, which one is best adapted to the wants of the time and to the character of the American people? This is the question with which we have now to deal. Five plans seem elastic enough to bear the modifications which time and circumstances may suggest, and yet be available to prevent or end industrial disputes.

First. The creation of a board of conciliation consisting of an equal number of representatives selected by the employers and of members elected by the workingmen. This board may have either a temporary or a permanent existence. It would be best to give it permanency. This is conciliation pure and simple, and agrees substantially with the Nottingham plan.

---

[1] "Bulletin of the Department of Labor" for January, 1897, pp. 18, 19, 20, 21.

Second. A similar institution with the addition of an umpire not belonging to either party, whose decision is final in case of a tie. The carrying out of the judgment to be binding in honor, but not in law. This is voluntary arbitration, and had to be resorted to in the place of the casting vote of the chairman in the Nottingham plan.

Third. A tribunal appointed with the sanction of the State to try conciliation first, then to pass a judgment. The conclusion of this tribunal to be considered as a *prima facie* evidence of the right or wrong on the side of either of the contending parties; and, unless rebutted, to be held as decisive by the courts of equity. This is substantially the Wolverhampton scheme, less the initial contract.

Fourth. A State-appointed tribunal with the same functions as in No. 3, but with full power to compel the attendance of the parties, to send for persons and papers, examine the books and judge the case in first instance. This plan comes nearest to the institution of the *prud'hommes.*

Fifth. Compulsory arbitration pure and simple. It has failed completely in England, and it should never be resorted to except in cases of great disorders which would cause serious public disturbances and endanger the life and property of citizens. In our opinion the powers entrusted to the courts of equity are amply sufficient to meet such contingencies. Of course the mandates of these courts should be enforced by civil and military authorities, for they are entitled to all the support that the State can afford.

In our opinion the Wolverhampton plan is the best, and would be easily accepted by the American workmen. The Nottingham plan seems to be so weak for want of any legal sanction that, in a country where the population contains so many foreign and discordant elements, it might prove unfit to cope with the difficulties arising from the varying phases of the struggle. It is true that the population is becoming more and more homogeneous, and that there is a growing tendency on the part both of the manufacturers and of the workmen to meet each other in friendly conferences; but to expect that the era of conflict between capital and labor is closed is to take an over-sanguine view of the situation. Combinations of masters and societies of workmen whose delegates would meet at the same board to discuss the questions which interest both, supplemented by a State board of arbitrators whose decisions should be final, and should, if necessary, be supported by State and national courts, would probably be the best solution of the difficulty. A refusal to arbitrate should be considered as a presumption of fraud or unfairness. An agreement to arbitrate should be a prerequisite to admission into these societies. We submit the text of an agreement of the kind which has been in force for some time in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

> As I am a firm believer in the principle of arbitration, I propose to inaugurate that principle in my business.
>
> Now, therefore, I, John Smith, a shoe manufacturer, in the city of Brockton, Mass., of the first part, and we, the undersigned, employés of said Smith, shoe manufacturer, of Brockton Mass., of the second part, hereby mutually agree that whenever, hereafter, any grievance, controversy or difference shall arise between said party of the first part and the undersigned employés of the second part, we shall mutually submit the subject matter of such controversy or difference to the State Board of Arbitration and Conciliation in the manner provided by our statutes, and that, pending the decision of said board, the work and labor in the factory of said Smith shall suffer no interruption, and that we will respectively abide by the decision of said arbitration.
>
> JOHN SMITH, Manufacturer.
> WILLIAM JONES,
> CHARLES BROWN, Employés.

When both masters and workmen are bound by a contract, as in the Wolverhampton plan, there is always a sort of potential compulsion, for the courts which have equity jurisdiction may enjoin the fulfilment of the contracts. It is true that, as long as joint boards of employers and employés are free to act and are willing to abide by the judgment of an umpire selected by themselves, or to refer their case to a court of conciliation and arbitration appointed by the State, the actual employment of force is a remote contingency; yet the right to resort to it as a last resource abides with the regular courts and gives great weight to the decisions of the umpire or of the State board. This is probably as far as compulsion could go safely. "Those who advocate the compulsory method of arbitrating labor difficulties," says Colonel Wright, "do not hesitate to advocate frankly that the State shall intervene and try the questions raised and *compel* both parties to accept whatever result shall be rendered; they do not hesitate to admit that compulsory arbitration is a law suit; they declare that what our courts are to individuals a board of arbitration would be to corporations, and, furthermore, they contend that all supposed difficulties would vanish if a court of arbitration were established and its duties defined."[1] But this is clearly an illusion. Let us suppose the award is against the manufacturers, and they object that they cannot continue to work their plants without losing more money than their value can justify; will you confiscate their plants and have your own appointees run them? This would be a violation of property rights warranted by the Constitution; it would be nothing but undisguised socialism. What the manufacturers would have to do would be to lower the value of their products without lowering the prices, and then they might have a chance of recuperating themselves at the expense of the public. Suppose, on the other hand, that the award is against the workmen; are you going to arrest them all and compel them at the point of the bayonet to work for the wages which appear to you sufficient? How long would the people tolerate such a sort of compulsion? Why, your prisons would soon be filled, and all your soldiers would soon be engaged in driving the workmen to the mines and the factories. In the meantime liberty would be at an end, and the sway of despotism would be supreme. Moreover, compulsory labor is very costly labor, and the people who in the last resort would have to pay the expenses of this sort of compulsion would soon put down the galling and costly despotism which would have been created for the purpose of enslaving labor, while diminishing production and increasing profitless consumption. Actual and forcible compulsion will not solve the problem. Let us have conciliation first; arbitration next. If neither the one nor the other prove sufficient, then let the regular courts be appealed to in individual cases in which laws are being openly defied or contracts have been ruthlessly broken. If the property or life of citizens be assailed, then, but then only, let the whole strength of the State be called upon to support the laws and maintain public security.

---

[1] The remarkable article of Colonel Carroll D. Wright from which these lines are taken will be found in the *Forum*, May, 1893, p. 322.

REV. RENE HOLAIND, S. J.

Washington, D. C.

TENNYSON'S RELIGION.

IN the modern literary world Tennyson may be regarded as most characteristically English. Of the cultured British voice of this century he has been an almost flawless organ, and all those who speak the tongue that he used must exult in the music of which he proved it capable. It is, perhaps, as a language-artist rather than a poet of mankind that he will be best remembered. A remark of *Blackwood's Magazine* of forty years ago is always true of his verse: "It is a rosary of golden beads, some of them gemmed and radiant, fit to be set in a King's crown; but you must tell them one by one and take leisure for your comment while they drop from your fingers." He polishes and enshrines oftener than he delves or quarries.

His subtle delicacy of thought, however, has touched most human subjects and has lured minds into heights and depths that even his choicest words could but glimmeringly embody. To religion and matters cognate with it he recurs incessantly.

That poets either tend to or trench on things sacred is commonly noticeable and easily explicable. Real poetry is always in some degree an effort to suggest what is supersensible and even inexpressible. To move pleased sympathy to far-off true things, true though presently intangible, seems its highest ambition; hence the leadings of the greater poets will, consciously or unconsciously, be often toward the Infinite and Eternal.

Tennyson's poetico-religious gravitation is interesting in itself as one man's feeling about for acceptable truth. It is still more interesting as a figure of the bearing toward Christianity of educated England. For, what England thinks and says may influence so much of the world that her faith or unfaith is vastly important in the eyes of all believers.

To the mere literary student of Tennyson the poet's religion is also a primary question. Without it the personality and power of the author of "In Memoriam" and the "Idyls of the King" would sink and shrivel; only a skin would remain—fine-veined, indeed, but dry and empty. To come in contact with the sap of life he, like other seekers after greatness, had to grope back towards our origin, and to catch any glimpse at all of the highest fruit-bearing branches of the race it is necessary to turn in the direction of our destiny. Even Carlyle, the Balaam of bombast—who sometimes raked great truths into his heaps of rubbish—categorically declares, "It is well said, in every sense, that a man's religion is the chief fact with regard to him." If this be true of every man, it must be specially predicable of the writer—who aims at influencing his fellow-creatures, most specially so of the poet—who would waft us toward all that befits our loftiest aspirations.

Supposing, then, that Tennyson's religion is worthy of some thought, let us see whether we can fairly determine its nature and extent. The task is not easy. In spite of many lights afforded by different schools of admiring interpreters, the subject lies in shadow, with its outlines hardly discernible. Was the poet a believer or a rationalist? Was he theist or pantheist? Was he Protestant or Christian? All these questions are still askable, and could we ask them of the man himself he might refer us to his published works. "His creed," writes his son, "he always said he would not formulate, for people would not understand him if he did; but he considered that his poems expressed the principles at the foundation of his faith."

We may, therefore, assume that Tennyson's religion is to be traced in what he wrote. Happily the search through his poems is pleasant and advantageous. They are beautiful fields to wander in. The air, though seldom of mountain or sea strength, is full of healthful odors, and the sights and sounds are mostly of the purest. When the new Laureate sang admiringly of his predecessor, Wordsworth, as "of him that uttered nothing base," he revealed his own tendency and prefigured the judgment to be generally passed on himself.

'Tis charming to keep Tennyson's company—but what is his religion? Were there such a thing as an *English* religion, I should be inclined to call that *his* religion. The paramount excellence, actual or prospective, of the English is his most masculinely inspiring ideal. That his countrymen, in great crises, "were left to fight for truth alone;" that they constitute "the one voice in Europe;" that his country is "the eye, the soul of Europe;" that keeping "noble England whole" and saving its "one true seed of freedom" is helping "to save mankind"—are all premises of his world-philosophy.

Excess of enthusiasm for his own nation bred some scorn of others. It also fostered that strongly Saxon self-sufficiency which was one of the Laureate's least amiable qualities. Being very English, he sometimes narrowed himself to standards arrogantly insular. "No little German State are we," was a petty vaunt—though it occurs in a generous outburst of patriotism. Indeed, Tennyson was not himself the fullest exemplification of that broadly truthful dictum of his: "That man's the best cosmopolite who loves his native country best."

The poet's fine Englishry gleams through Newman's one brief communication with him. "Great differences of opinion and personal history lie between us," the eminent convert wrote in 1877, "but it would be strange if I alone of Englishmen did not feel the force of those endowments of mind which have made your name so popular."

His admiration of things nobly English led to views of higher and wider range. Whilst exalting his countrymen he tried to exalt humanity. He would hold it and prove it of measureless elevation. Of his typical Anglo-Saxon he might mainly be thinking; yet for all men he was vindicating the possibility of spotlessness and the likelihood of immortality. His maintaining that man ought to be, must be, immortal is his most nearly religious effort. He is reported to have said that "If faith means anything it is trusting to those instincts, or feelings, or whatever they may be called, which assure us of some life after this." There is here, of course, but a poor description of *faith*—but of that later.

He held those wisest who "looked beyond the grave," not "crowning barren Death as lord of all." Among other fine lines on the dead he has these strong ones:

> "Gone forever—ever! No! For since our dying race began,
> Ever, ever, and forever, was the leading light of man."

And though he pleads for purity and truth and justice in any and every case, yet he spiritually adds:

> "The true, the pure, the just—
> Take the charm *forever* from them, and they crumble into dust."

He argues convincingly that our dim present life cannot be the end of such creatures as we know ourselves to be, with all our affections and aspirations. He will not have us "dream of human love and truth, as dying nature's earth and lime." Least of all can he imagine that noble characters become dust and no more. He says he knows that "transplanted human worth will bloom to profit, otherwhere." His lamented Hallam is—after all forms of discursive speculation—at last firmly addressed as "dear heavenly friend that can'st not die." Nelson he calls a "spirit among things divine;" and for Wellington, he doubts not "that for one so true there must be other nobler work to do, than when he fought at Waterloo."

With the same confidence, and more reason as well as grace, he makes the dying *May Queen* whisper to her mother:

> "Forever and forever, all in a blessed home—
> And there to wait a little while till you and Effie come—
> To lie within the light of God, as I lie upon your breast—
> And the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest."

These passages and other similar ones, which if less explicit are very frequent, might seem to authorize the statement that Tennyson held absolutely to the common doctrine of another world. It is hardly so, however. Having no fixity of belief, he is necessarily inconsistent. He at times seems to give up the opinion of individual continued existence. When rejecting the "faith as vague as all unsweet" that we shall merge "in the general soul," he certainly affirms that "eternal form shall still divide the eternal soul from all beside," and that he shall know his friend when they meet; yet with the same friend he afterwards mingles "all the world" and finds him "some diffusive power mix't with God and Nature."

Here and there he gives indications of a leaning to something like spiritual metempsychosis. He trusts "that those we call the dead are breathers of an ampler day, for ever nobler ends," and he teaches that the "eternal process moving on, from state to state the spirit walks."

In "The Two Voices"—where, as in stronger writings than any of Tennyson's, the objections occasionally outweigh the solutions—he yields points and confuses issues. He says:

> "But if I grant thou might'st defend
> The thesis that thy words intend—
> That to begin implies to end;
> Yet how should I for certain hold,
> Because my memory is so cold,
> That I first was in human mould?"

If these lines mean anything definite, they give up either individual creation or individual immortality. That we are distinct from others and from our Creator is—as we may see in regard to Hallam—very strongly affirmed by Tennyson. Yet even on this prime head his contention is not uniformly maintained. That saying reported of him in his last sickness: "What a shadow this life is, and how men cling to what is after all but a small part of the great world's life," is at best equivocal.

The world, "the immeasurable world," appeared to become the principal object of his later poetic contemplations. He looked on it with awe; he almost crouched before it, as unknowable and dreadful. That he did not make it *God*, we are assured by those who knew him most intimately; some passages of his, however, would very nearly demand that interpretation. His speaking of God's "whole world-self" and of "the Free-will of the Universe" may be only Teutonic frippery; but a theist or even a deist significance is not easily found in the quasi-definition:

> "That God, which ever lives and loves,
> One God, one law, one element,
> And one far-off divine event,
> To which the whole creation moves."

The bewildered poet was not quite decided about attributing personality to God, so he speaks of Him as "that which" is everywhere and "that which made us." In his lines on "The Higher Pantheism" he appears to argue that the manifestation of God in creation is God Himself, for he says:

> "The sun, the moon, the stars, the seas, the hills and the plains—
> Are not these, O Soul, the Vision of Him who reigns?
> Is not the Vision He? tho' He be not that which he seems?"

And, in queer contradictoriness, clinging more to human personality than to Divine, he adds:

> "Dark is the world to thee: thyself art the reason why?
> For is He not all but thou (sic) that hast power to feel 'I am I?'"

The seemingly final profession—"He, They, One, All; within, without; the Power in darkness whom we guess"—is a sadly obscured summary of belief.

A strange problem is offered by this apparent pantheism of the poet, in connection with his many most gracefully Christian utterances. His work occasionally has on it something resembling "the light that shone when Hope was born"—as he beautifully sang of the first Christmas. He speaks of "that mystery where God-in-man is one with man-in-God," and by his rather untheological expression may possibly mean the truth. He refers to "the Word," he invokes the "Strong Son of God," he prays to Christ. But, alas! we are authoritatively told that by *Word, Immortal Love,* etc., he meant merely "the Revelation of the Eternal Thought of the Universe"—whatever that may be.

It would disappoint many to find that the author of such Christian sentiment and even Christian argument as the poems display did not himself believe in Christ. But the same inevitable unsatisfactoriness is in all pretences of Christianity without Catholicity.

How much there is of the right spirit in the treatment of the Camelot knights and ladies! And yet fable runs there in closer alliance with revealed truths than could be tolerated by a religious believer.

In the introduction of Scripture phraseology, which is frequent and dexterous, there is unpalatable evidence that the poet is rather using the word of God than being guided by it. This, however, seems a common characteristic of Bible-alone people. That he really believes what he skilfully chants is never quite fully averred. That he was ill-disposed to actual belief is often most painfully manifested. He was inclined to dogmatize poetically on *real faith;* though, that he ever had had any or even knew its meaning, is more than problematical. His oft-quoted "we have but faith" sounds fair enough till it is interpreted to mean—we are sure of nothing, not even of the facts of so-called science. To the question, "Is there any hope?" his answer came "in a tongue no man could understand." He indulges in the threadbare, and for him most unworthy, superficialities about *forms* and *creeds* and *systems,* seeming to think that the truths held by Christians are of arbitrary human selection. That faith means full assent, by the grace of God, to what we sufficiently know God has revealed, is a fact of which he does not appear to have the least inkling. His late as well as his early cry was that "it is man's privilege to doubt," implying, too, that if he does not *doubt* he must attach himself to an *idol.* He wants his readers to believe that "there lives more faith in honest doubt than in half the creeds." Though the *creeds* he knew may have been worthy of little consideration, yet his decrying them was but a catchy way of raising prejudice against religious authority. Similarly his worshiper "whose faith has centre everywhere" gets away from all inconveniently definite teaching. This might do if faith meant mere "trusting to instincts or feelings," as we saw he expressed it. But since it is a divine thing of highest intellectuality and obligation, he was far from grasping not alone its practical but its poetical significance.

Tennyson was really a victim of Anglican effeteness. His is an impressive example. In him can be seen, as strikingly as in any man of the century, the necessary result for highly-gifted religious minds of entanglement in an illogically national system of churchism. He was too mistakenly English to cast England's religion quite behind; but he was injuriously perplexed by its hopeless inefficiency. He was driven to rickety imaginings of necessary worship because of the shallow inconsistency of the only cult with which he was at all acquainted. Then he had to fall back on the equally thin Protestantism of doubts and denials or of groundless sentimental vaporings.

Yet this was not what Tennyson wished or needed. He wanted undoubted truth to build on, and heavenly realities to nerve his best aspirings. When the flimsiness of unorthodox religiosity crumbled in his hands, he traced some of his daintiest figures in very wretched dust. "Most delicately hour by hour he canvassed human mysteries;" but they proved puzzles of ever growing perplexity. So he feared that in "seeking to undo one riddle" he should "knit a hundred others."

It was all in vain to murmur "how sweet to have a common faith;" in vain to scorn the age in which "doubt is the lord of this dunghill;" in vain to anathematize his own "damned vacillating state." He got no further, for he had no ground to go on. He remained in sickly doubt, floundering now and again into sloppy dilutions of false philosophy. He was probably sincere in saying that he hated "utter unfaith," and he was convinced that "unfaith in aught is want of faith in all." Nevertheless, he continued in peddling uncertainty and, with more reason than his own Arthur, might say at the end—"for all my mind is clouded with a doubt."

What a man he might have been had his feet been planted on the rock of unfailing Catholic doctrine! What a poet of humanity, too, if he had been bathed in the light and warmth of the living Church of God! He himself said well of the poet that he should be "bravely furnished all abroad to fling the winged shafts of truth," and of his mind that "clear and bright it should be ever." This would require most intelligent Catholicism; and had Tennyson not been robbed of his ancestral faith it might now be true to say of him, as he said of his ideal poet:

"He saw thro' life and death, thro' good and ill,
He saw through his own soul.
The marvel of the everlasting will,
An open scroll,
Before him lay."

Antipathy to the Catholic religion is remarkable in the late Laureate's work more perhaps by its absence than by its presence. Complete exemption from the taint is too much to expect from any author who belongs to even the most shadowy species of Protestantism. The most delicately sympathetic writers can be gross and insulting on that point. Even Hawthorne and the Brownings and Russell Lowell have, one time or other, befouled themselves by throwing mud at the sanctities which they did not understand. One of the great weights of iniquity on the English-speaking races must undoubtedly be the enormous amount of traditionally stupid libel which their writers have everywhere amassed against the Church and her children. In its thick unrepenting unteachableness it is also a blot on the annals of civilization. For rancorous ill-will to anything so nobly—not to say divinely—upright and intellectual as Catholicism is necessarily a base failing, whether the baseness lie in ignorance or in immorality.

Tennyson cannot, on the whole, be classed as anti-Catholic, but here and there he is weakly bigoted. He retails the English view of *fat monks, leering priests, bluff Harrys* and *iron-worded Luthers.* He is venomous in his representations of Philip and Mary and the leading Catholics of their time. National hate or politic pandering to it was incentive enough to caricature such personages. But how the poet could condescend to make Cranmer figure as a conscientous Christian, and even try to patch him up as a martyr, is beyond explanation. The arch-hypocrite is placed by Macaulay among the catiff crowd of fallen angels who neither rebelled nor were faithful, and of whom he writes:

"Slaves of his class are never vindictive and never grateful. . . . When an attempt is made to set him up as a saint it is scarcely possible for any man of sense who knows the history of the times to preserve his gravity. . . . It is extraordinary that so much ignorance should exist on this subject. . . . If Mary had suffered him to live, we suspect that he would have heard Mass and received absolution, like a good Catholic, till the accession of Elizabeth, and that he would then have purchased, by another apostasy, the power of burning men better and braver than himself."

The real Cranmer must have been thoroughly known to Tennyson, and the false representation was unworthy. Fidelity to historical truth, in so leading a part, would have been commendable and was even demanded by fairness. In minor points he sometimes exaggerated its importance. It was, perhaps, the weak dramatist's straining after exactitude that caused him to put roughly irreligious language in the mouths of a few of his characters. But there was no excuse for his allowing Elizabethan ruffians to pronounce what, to Catholic ears, is ugly blasphemy. There the bigot ousted the poet.

Where nationalism at all entered he was unfair. To the mid-century priesthood of France he is sullenly referring when he says:

> "The Jesuit laughs, and reckoning on his chance,
> Would unrelenting
> Kill all dissenting——"

The uglier British tone may again be recognized in the silly query: "Rome of Cæsar, Rome of Peter—which was crueler, which was worse?"

To Catholic forms of expression the poet is addicted simply because he is a poet. The depth and tenderness of the true religion attracts genius—artistically if not otherwise. Hence imaginative writers seldom treat seriously of anything Christian without taking on a semblance of Catholicity. Hence also are some authors so much more apparently Catholic in their spontaneous verse than in their prejudiced prose. Protestant and English as he is, Tennyson says pretty things about the *Heavenly Bridegroom,* the *Crucifix,* the *Blood of God,* the *Blessed Sacrament,* the *Maid-mother,* the *Angels,* the *Saints,* the *confession and forgiveness of sin.* Martyrdom, too, and chastity and mortification, and other grandeurs characteristically Catholic, are treated with decent reverence.

The poet's occasional leaning to Church ways may be attributed in some degree to his aristocratic radicalness. He advocated nobility with equality. The leveling-up process was one of his human perfectibility dreams. Proud he certainly was—personally most proud. To the "daughter of a hundred Earls" he could truly affirm: "Your pride is yet no mate for mine, too proud to care from whence I came." But his pride was in real or imagined worth and plumed itself mostly on its broadly human sympathies. It was not pettily selfish. The haughty reserve and lofty disdainfulness of the man may receive the gentlest interpretation when we recall how genuinely he hymned the true nobility of goodness, of kindness, of simple faith. He finally accepted a title and its honors; yet there is the ring of sincerity in his scorn of vaunting any lineage above our common descent from "the grand old gardener and his wife."

For the luxurious refinements of high caste society he had the English gentleman's appreciation. He aspired to place and name and wealth, and to the daintiness of life which they render possible. But the touch of nature he never loses; and one of the clearest glimpses of his character is caught in his advice—no matter what else is possessed—to "pray heaven for a human heart."

The Church's insistence on the dignity of redeemed humanity must have pleased a mind like Tennyson's. He could hardly help coinciding with her true statement of the sense in which all men are equal, and of the grounds of individual preëminence. Natural equality as a basis for merited supernatural excellence offers a fine field for the exercise of constructive imagination. There human affairs may be treated most radically and yet not lowered. True worth, true as God sees it, is alone considered; but that is no less raised than from earth to heaven. Hence, being an aristocrat by taste and a democrat on principle, the noble bard sympathized with the elevated justness of the Catholic system.

Nevertheless, his training and his environment rendered ludicrously false his intentionally Catholic appreciations. The fallen Guinevere has but just had her shame discovered when she is made to say to the holy Sisters: "So let me be a nun like you"—and she is soon nun and abbess! That exemplified, indeed, an English view of cloister happenings. The Catholic idea of asceticism is also missed. Tennyson's "Simeon Stylites" is an avowed candidate for canonization; he boasts blatantly; he proposes himself for worship, and is, withal, a whining unreality.

From the most shocking of carnal errors concerning Christianity (that which would identify natural or sexual love with divine charity) the poet is not quite exempt. His later social perfection chimeras may have lured him toward that quagmire. Having no hold on "the substance of things to be hoped for" in another life, and being "immers'd in rich foreshadowings" of an earthly future, he sang of "the crowning race of humankind" and of "what the world will be when the years have died away." Even his lauded pean of victory—"ring in the Christ that is to be"—is nothing more than a proclamation that "social truth shall spread."

But unstable and changing as men without faith must always be, he finally doubted about this worldly progress and the promised eras of bliss. There is heard a double despondency in the lines:

"'Twere all as one to fix our hopes on Heaven
As on this vision of the golden year,"

and the weakest hopelessness in the couplet:

"Earth may reach her earthly worst, or if she gain her earthly best,
Would she find her human offspring—this ideal man at rest?"

How unsatisfactory is this ending to a great soul's research and a great teacher's doctrine! He never reached the rock foundation, and so he raised no lasting edifice. Of what he erected—philosophic or religious—his own words must prove true: "The house was builded of the earth, and shall fall again to the ground." His unhappy spiritual condition seems often unconsciously pictured by himself. To whose case more forcibly than to his own could be applied the words, "Cursed be the social lies that warp us from the living truth!"? It was the inveterate bias of the Reformation that kept him astray. England was the real Princess of whom he said: "And so she wears her error like a crown, to blind the truth and me." Bereft of the divine certainty which Catholic teaching assures, he could but piteously lament:

> "I stretch lame hands of faith, and grope,
> And gather dust and chaff, and call
> To what I feel is Lord of all.
> And faintly trust the larger hope."

Lame and faint, indeed, must have been such a soul's reliance on the rubbishy impertinences of Universalism. And yet he is said to have twisted to his "larger hope" ineptitude even Dante's grand sentence: "*Fecemi la divina potestate, la somma sapienza, e 'l primo amore*"—because, forsooth, *amore* is last mentioned. The poet theologian was, of course, but marking the Procession of Persons in the Blessed Trinity, and the truth that acts *ad extra* are common to the three.

There is pleasure in noting an approach to the Christian's trust in those last published lines of the poet:

> "For tho' from out our bourne of Time and Place,
> The flood may bear me far,
> I hope to see my Pilot face to face
> When I have crost the bar."

But the *Shakespeare* incident has a tawdry unfitness about it. A dying poet's asking for his copy of the great dramatist may be an effect of habit, and may approve itself to literary mawkishness; but such a request, responsibly made, could scarcely do less than jar with the Christian solemnity of the decisive moment. What is there to admire in a man's dying with any man's book in his hand? The awfulness of the passage would have been very differently illumined were the poet's belief the living reality that his best friends might desire. Then, too, a trace of *Gerontius'* fear and contrition and confident supplication would leave nobler impressions on the minds of sorrowing witnesses.

A Catholic's review of the Laureate's life-work is, not unreasonably, tinged with sadness. There is a feeling that much has been wasted. The poet's natural endowments were rich, his opportunities were splendid, his intentions generally pure; yet he accomplished relatively little. The art results may, indeed, be great; but the moral effect is trifling or questionable. With his powers of mind, his university training, his inherited respect for Christianity and his markedly religious tastes, he seemed qualified to be a teacher. Moreover, he set out with high resolves. He appeared to mean it when he sang:

> "And yet, though all the world forsake,
> Tho' fortune clip my wings,
> I will not cramp my heart, nor take
> Half-views of men and things."

The groundwork, however, failed. His lessons were seldom either impressive or conclusive; for on crucial points he could rarely venture to say—yes or no. He hobbled between dilemmas and wavered on lines of cleavage. If he dogmatized, it was as fancy led, and contradiction came with a change of humor. Having no infallible reserve of truth which he could unquestioningly call his own, he was often helplessly at sea in his favorite quasi-religious speculations. At times he felt himself sinking, and confusedly drew back. But honestly to avow ignorance and seek for light was foreign to his disposition. In intellectual pride he spun many cobwebs over the deficiencies of his knowledge. When the want of reserve which marks non-Catholic tampering with mysteries of religion pushed him into statements that he would not deliberately maintain, he awkwardly sidled out of the difficulty.

His deeper sympathies seemed undeniably with revealed truths, but *revelation* and *truth* are hazily changeable to the vagaries of private judgment. It is a fact, also, that he repudiated the wish to "part and divide," or to close the "grave doubts and answers" which he proposed. He would poetically introduce the "slender shade of doubt," but would not draw the "deepest measure from the chords." All this, however, is but trifling, and trifling in matters of religion arises from one source—from defect of faith.

There is a certain parity between England's religious state and Tennyson's. She has so much that is good one wonders she has not more. Long and singularly blessed in temporal estate, she has unfortunately missed her spiritual mission. It is not that she has no desire to evangelize. Like the belated Jews, she has a zeal for the law—as she chooses to interpret it. But her labor is vain, for she cannot give what she has not. She lacks the one note which makes a message acceptable—the satisfying note of authority. Not being sure of the truth of God, how can she pretend to impart it? In her best creed and psalm there is an unavoidable discord. At home or abroad her teaching is never long heard before it is found to contradict itself. The discrepancy may appear at first to be, as in Tennyson's song, but a "little rift within the lute;" yet by and by it "will make the music mute, and ever widening slowly silence all."

The rift in England's lute is the breach with the Church. For a brief space of time it may have looked little. When only the Supremacy was explicitly rejected, the squeaking sounds produced might pass with the unskilled ear as the voice of Catholicity. But with the Supremacy necessarily followed the Infallibility, and with the Infallibility Tradition, and with Tradition all certain Revelation. The widening of the rift went so far that the silence of all the music of the Gospel seemed imminent. Then half-remedies were hastily adopted; but only the few have yet had the courage to take the heroic part of closing the breach. Some would be Christian, but not Catholic; others would—as the Laureate makes the *Queen Mary* gentlemen express it—be Catholic, but not Papist.

England's loss of faith is a loss to the world, yet still the loss is principally her own. Apart from eternal questions and prospects, all her intellectual life is falsified. It is evident that our essential relations with heaven cannot be mistaken or misstated without a derangement of all our rational bearings. A civilized nation in error concerning Christianity may, in a very special sense, be said to toil in the night; and walking in the darkness it hurts itself against every stone of offense. When its energies are not paralyzed its efforts are thrown away. 'Tis pitiful to see England's Gladstones and Tennysons and Ruskins and Arnolds spending their gorgeous powers in the endless search for subterfuges from infidelity on the one hand and from Catholicity on the other. Could they enter on their careers in the secure possession of the Church's great world of unfailing truth, they would be giants in the good fight for true human liberty and progress.

The old fallacy that Catholics must be intellectually stunted, that their faith enslaves their understandings, is now but rarely advanced. It never could have any respectable support. Tennyson, indeed, refers to "cramping creeds," but he was not speaking—for he was unaware of its existence—of the fulness of Revelation infallibly enjoyed. 'Tis almost a truism to say that truth, most particularly the highest truth, constitutes the intellect's proper object, and opens for it a boundless sphere of action. To range there is to be untrammeled. The bird is not less free because its flight is confined to the limits of the atmosphere: that's its element. Any truth of the Catholic religion is wider and higher than the reach of wing of even the eagles of human intelligence. Tennyson's airy fancy might have gilded nobler pinnacles than he ever reached, had he believed as the Church does; and he would have trod with surer foot, avoiding many stumbles. His aberrations were only loss and could have in them no poetic beauty.

The wandering from even natural truth of so many of England's most intellectual non-Catholics should be a matter for serious religious reflection. The abandonment to a reprobate sense is a

Scripture threat to be always dreaded. Men of deep science are teachable: they believe on sufficient authority. And as refusing to acknowledge God's unmistakable voice in our own time and place is in other ways a tendency toward bestiality, so is it also in the consequent darkening of the intelligence. Believing that we may know is human. Far more retrograde are the polished doubters of modern England, in the winter of their torpid agnosticism, than are the simplest faithful who live always in the season "when faith," as St. Augustine so profoundly observed, "predisposes them for the exercise of reason."

With faith Tennyson might have been a Dante for the ages to come, while with delusive Anglicanism he may be regarded, after all, as only the most delicate of rationalistic versifiers. Similarly his country, with its traditionally Christian name, has retained but liittle of its Christian character. Its influence does not spread belief. Where England alone of the civilized nations is known, Christianity is regarded as mere respectability or mere hypocrisy. There is hardly a true missionary that does not prefer to meet the untutored savage rather than the spoiled heathen who bears a varnish of Anglo-Saxon religion or education. The divisions and vacillations of so-called Christians supply an excuse for making light of conversion; their open or most thinly-veined worldliness is a standing cause of scandal and derision.

When Tennyson sang that he counted "the gray barbarian lower than the Christian child," he was glorifying civilized progress and its wealth in books, in railways, in steamships. He was expressing no preference for Christian belief; but, as often occurs to poets, his words carried farther than he aimed. The Christian child with its Christian catechism is, intellectually, on a higher plane than any barbarian; and barbarian, in a growingly literal sense, must be considered every man who has not an intelligent hold on the elements of the Church's teaching. Her disciple alone is "the heir of all the ages." The sweeping statement, "Better fifty years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay" will still be accepted as substantially correct. The Europe, however, of such incomparable value is not the Europe of godless schools and fashionable infidelity; not even the Europe of minute refinement and colossal marketing. These things China may have had for decades of centuries. 'Tis rather the Europe of the believing nations, the Europe of art and industry built up on Christian standards; the Europe of heroism and sacrifice that, whilst ennobling every object of sense, was ready to give up all for the unseen realities of faith.

GEORGE LEE, C. S. SP.

Bennett, Pa.

CARDINAL GIULIANO DELLA ROVERE.

"The History of the Popes From the Close of the Middle Ages." Drawn from the Secret Archives of the Vatican. From the German of Dr. Ludwig Pastor, Professor of History in the University of Innsbruck. Edited by Frederick Ignatius Autrobus, of the Oratory. Volumes V. and VI. B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo.

THE welcome intelligence of the death of his inveterate enemy, Alexander VI., reached the Cardinal of St. Peter ad Vincula in his French retreat, and was a signal that the days of his exile were ended. In a few days he was back in Rome, and in a few months he was Pope Julius II. As Borgia had adopted Alexander the Great for his patron saint, della Rovere invoked the rival memory of Julius Cæsar. The words of Dante spring to our lips:

> "Un Marcel diventa
> Ogni villan che parteggiando viene."

Without wasting time in moralizing, we cannot but regret that Julius did not imitate his great prototype in one particular: he ought to have found time, amidst his manifold activities, to write or dictate his commentaries. Unfortunately for his reputation, he left the task of immortalizing his name to painters, sculptors and architects, and never did Pope or King employ artists of such transcendent merit; but he neglected to secure the humble but more effective services of the scribe. In consequence his historical character has fared worse than the magnificent monument which Michel Angelo designed for him, but never completed. Enough and to spare was written about his pontificate; but as he had a peculiar gift of making enemies for himself, and as the virulence of a Renaissance enemy was truly demoniacal, there is no crime of which a human being is capable that has not been charged against him. On the other hand, none of his contemporaries deemed it his business to undertake the defense of this "terrible" apparition.

As for the thirty-two years of his Cardinalate, it is well-nigh impossible to reduce his erratic career to anything like consistent conduct. And yet there must be a key to the actions of so resolute a man if we could but discover it. The task of discovering this key we shall leave to some one more highly gifted with psychological insight; we are content to follow the mighty Cardinal as he appears and disappears on the ever-shifting stage of Italian politics.

The only writer of importance who has made a special study of the personal history of della Rovere is Moritz Brosch, whose well-known monograph, "Papst Julius II.," appeared in Gotha in 1878.

It is confessedly a one-sided presentation of the subject, founded mainly upon documents preserved in the Venetian Archives. The author by long study has become so thoroughly imbued with the Venetian spirit that one might imagine he was writing a political pamphlet in the interest of the Signory. This is surely an unsatisfactory method of writing "scientific" history. His concluding words, moreover, prove that he did not himself consider that he had done full justice to his "hero," for he tells us:

"The true grandeur of this Pope lies in a domain outside the framework of this treatise, and we must here hand him over to the specialist historian of art: we refer to his relations to the building arts. It was given to him, by virtue of a will-power which demanded to be immortalized, not only to admire the sublimest products of monumental creations which the human spirit has brought forth since the palmy days of Greece, but to be a co-worker in their production. Chance, or what may appear to us to be such, gave him for contemporaries the most perfect of artists; but it is his work, his merit, his enduring renown that, seizing his opportunity, he recognized these artists, entrusted to them the mightiest of tasks and spurred them on with passion and intelligence. The name of Julius II. has been engraved in marble in indelible characters by Michel Angelo, the greatest of modern artists and the noblest personage of the Italian Renaissance, and time will not efface it."[1]

It is obvious that a biography which so sharply and curtly distinguishes between "Julius the follower of Pericles the Olympian and Julius the statesman and Pope-King" can present no full and adequate picture of a busy and many-sided life. It would be more accurate to designate Brosch's treatise as "The Story of Julius II. as Viewed by Contemporary Venetians."

There is ample room, therefore, for a life of this extraordinary Pontiff to be written with a far greater breadth of vision than Brosch allowed himself to take, and from a more impartial standpoint.

Giuliano was born December 5, 1443, at Albizzola, a hamlet in the neighborhood of Savona. Pastor still maintains against the opinion of Reumont, Brosch and others that the della Rovere family, though impoverished, was of noble extraction. Whatever doubt there may be of its nobility, there is none of its extreme poverty. The future arbiter of Europe began life either as an artisan or, according to another account, as a clerk in the service of Venetian merchants. Bembo's venemous libel that "shortly before his elevation to the Cardinalate" he had been detected in the theft of two ducats from his employers is of value, as Brosch wisely remarks, only as manifesting the hatred and contempt with which his name was mentioned in the circle of the Venetian nobility.

---

[1] P. 276.

At an early age he followed his uncle, Francesco della Rovere, into the Order of St. Francis, and when Francesco forged his way upward through the gradations of general of the order and Cardinal to the Papacy, the nephew followed rapidly in the path of glory. Sixtus IV. is the Pope who reduced nepotism to a political science and made it the engine of Papal government. Finding the States of the Church torn and distracted by rebellious and semi-independent barons, and suspecting on the part of the Sacred College a disposition to look down on the scion of a lowly house, he determined to surround himself with agents entirely devoted to his own person and ready to execute his commands with implicit obedience. Thanks to the fecundity of his Ligurian stock, he was abundantly supplied with relatives, who were invited to Rome and elevated to the highest dignities of Church and State.

Sixtus was elected Pope on the 9th of August, 1471, and four months later, notwithstanding the indignant protests of his Cardinals—protests which were rather deep than loud—he introduced, as the equals of the sons of the old Italian nobles, two of his nephews whose parents had won a scanty livelihood by fishing in the Golf of Genoa. Then, for the first time, men learned two names which they were destined often afterwards to pronounce with affection or hatred, *Riario* and *della Rovere*. To his sister's son, Pietro Riario, aged 24, Sixtus gave the title of Cardinal of S. Sisto; to Giuliano, who was four years older than his cousin, was given the title vacated by his uncle, of S. Peter ad Vincula, by which he was known to the civilized world for above thirty-one years.

In order to enable these two poor Franciscan friars, now become the spoiled children of fortune, to sustain their dignity with proper state, the indulgent uncle showered upon their heads a bewildering accumulation of Patriarchates, Archbishoprics, Bishoprics, Abbacies and other opulent benefices in every part of Christendom. The results of this sudden metamorphosis upon the two young men were as different as their characters. The open-hearted and light-headed Riario ran a course of extravagance which brought him to his grave in two years, leaving the record, unprecedented in those days, of having spent 200,000, or as some will have it, 300,000 ducats, and bequeathing to his fond uncle 60,000 ducats of debts. An attempt was made some thirty years ago by the *Civiltà Cattolica* to reinstate his memory before the court of history, but, we regret to say, the attempt was a failure.

The tougher fabric of Giuliano's character enabled him to resist the temptations to dissipation before which his cousin fell so easy a victim; and although Madama Felice remained to furnish irrefragable testimony that her father had not in his youth been invariably true to his monastic vows, nevertheless the general tenor of his conduct was earnest and dignified. Frivolous pleasure possessed at no time of his life much attraction for the restless soul of Julius. In this respect he bore a strong resemblance to his energetic uncle; and possibly for the very reason that both drew so copious an amount of sap from the family "oak," the relation between them was rather that of respectful admiration than of warm affection. Giuliano was never his uncle's "favorite;" nor can we imagine the reserved, gruff, headstrong man as a favorite with any one. Whatever affection Sixtus possessed went out to his sister's children; and his preference for the Riarii was so pronounced that whispers began to spread abroad that Pietro and his brother Girolamo must be nearer to the Pontiff in blood than was officially proclaimed. The suspicion was without foundation; but in the days of Machiavelli suspicion built whole castles without foundations, and many of these airy castles have endured to the present time.

Whilst Cardinal Riario was dazzling and shocking the Italians with epicurean banquets and with royal progresses through the States of the peninsula, Giuliano was devoting his time and his large revenues to his favorite occupation of building palaces and fortresses. Indeed it soon became patent that the two cousins were at cross purposes and that there was but little love between them. Each had a brother for whose advancement he was eager. Giuliano's brother Giovanni was a student at the University of Pavia, and Cardinal Riario having ascertained that Duke Galeazzo of Milan "had cast his eyes upon him and expressed a wish that this nephew of the Pope's should be connected with his family by marriage,"[1] had him secretly conveyed from Pavia to Rome, and substituted in his stead his notorious brother and successor in the Pope's affections, Girolamo, upon whom Sforza bestowed the hand of Caterina, his natural daughter. It can scarcely be wondered at that so vindictive a man as Giuliano should have preserved a life-long resentment against Girolamo, which manifested itself in many a sudden outbreak of anger whilst the latter was omnipotent in the counsels of Sixtus, and yet more in the aid which Giuliano gave to Cesare Borgia in the uprooting of his dynasty in the Romagna. Giuliano secured a more substantial, if less brilliant, alliance for his brother by marrying him into the family of Federigo di Montefeltro, Count, later Duke, of Urbino, which eventually resulted in the establishment of the della Rovere dynasty in that Duchy.

---

[1] Pastor, IV., 247.

After the premature death of Cardinal Riario in 1474, Giuliano came forward more prominently; and it is characteristic of him that his first appearance should be at the head of an army. The object of this military expedition was to reëstablish something like order in the valley of the Tiber, some of the cities of which were a prey to downright anarchy, others, especially Città di Castello, were usurped by petty tyrants. The warlike Cardinal succeeded in reducing Todi and Spoleto; but when he addressed himself to the subjugation of Niccolo Vitelli, the tyrant of Città di Castello, he found his efforts opposed by the machinations of Florence, Milan and the neighboring barons. The greedy merchants of Florence were intent upon enlarging their territory at the expense of the Church, and were much annoyed because Sixtus had forbidden the sale to them of his city of Imola, which had come temporarily into the hands of Sforza. As regards the larger and smaller dynasts of Italy, from the Duke of Milan and the King of Naples to the most insignificant of them, since they all held their domains with no other title than the sword, it had become the unwritten law that they should all unite to prevent the deposition of any *de facto* ruler.

An instructive illustration of the working of this law of "honor among thieves" had recently been furnished by no less faithful a vassal of the Holy See than the Count of Urbino himself. For twenty-four years Federigo had waged war against Sigismond Malatesta, Lord of Rimini, who was straining every nerve to form for himself an independent kingdom in Central Italy. Finally, in 1463, the Pontifical troops succeeded in crushing the tyrant, and Malatesta was permitted by Pius II. to retain the city of Rimini as a personal fief until his death, upon which it should devolve to the immediate jurisdiction of the Church. Sigismond died in 1469, leaving no legitimate issue from his numerous wives. But, strange to say, Federigo supported the pretensions of Robert Malatesta, a natural son of Sigismond, against the Supreme Pontiff and "arranged a new confederation of Milan, Florence and Naples for the independence of Rimini.[1] So jealous were the Pope's vassals and neighbors of any increase of his power. Actuated by this same feeling, Sforza, the Medici and the King of Naples lent every aid to the little tyrant of Città di Castello. Federigo, no doubt, sympathized with him, but was bought off by the alluring vision of the ducal crown and the flattering offer of alliance with the Papal family. Resuming his old command as general of the Papal forces, Duke Federigo appeared before Città di Castello and had sufficient influence and diplomacy to free Cardinal Giuliano from a most embarrassing situation.

---

[1] Dennistown: "Memoirs of the Dukes of Urbino." Vol. I., p. 186.

Vitelli made a nominal surrender and accompanied the Duke and the Cardinal to Rome. "Surrounded by treachery, with such an ally as Ferrante of Naples at his side, and with neighbors like Lorenzo de Medici, can the Pope be blamed for establishing his nephews firmly in the States of the Church, where a Cesare Borgia and a Pope like Julius II. were needed to purge it from its oppressors great and small?"[1] The extreme recklessness with which the Italian politicians pursued their plans for the weakening of their neighbors is expressed with cynical frankness in Lorenzo's utterance: "For any one in my position, the division of power is advantageous; and, if it were possible without scandal, three or four Popes would be better than a single one."[2]

How Pontiffs of a different stamp from Sixtus IV. would have dealt with the problems which confronted him we can only surmise. The Rovere Pope saw no way out of his difficulties except to adopt the tactics of his adversaries. He had a fit instrument for such work at hand in the person of his nephew Girolamo Riario. This worthy had begun life either as a clerk in a drug store or as public scrivener, or probably in both capacities. Had he been left at these humble occupations it would have been a great blessing for the Catholic Church. But unfortunately he was destined for higher and baser things. We have seen how, through the intrigues of his brother, he had been intruded into the family of the Duke of Milan. His wife, Caterina Sforza, was, to be sure, only a bastard daughter of the Duke, but, as Commines somewhere quaintly remarks, female illegitimacy was of no consequence among the Italian princes of that age. Caterina possessed all the energy and unscrupulous ambition characteristic of her family, and she brought her husband as dowry the city of Imola in the Romanga. It was Pandora's gift for Italy and the Universal Church. For, in the first place, it was well understood that this petty countship was intended to be only the stepping-stone by which Girolamo should rise to greatness; and, secondly, the establishment of a Papal nephew in that region ran counter to the views of the Florentine magnate, Lorenzo de Medici. The consequence was the shameful tragedy enacted in the Cathedral of Florence in 1478, and the war with the Republic which convulsed the Peninsula and led to still worse evils.

All these deplorable transactions are narrated by Pastor frankly and dispassionately, and we refer the reader to his pages. We allude to them here simply in order to state that the Cardinal of St. Peter ad Vincula was in no wise responsible for this dark side of the Pontificate of his uncle. There was, however, a bright side to this

---

[1] Pastor, IV., p. 268.

[2] Pastor, IV., p. 300.

Pontificate, and in it Giuliano figures quite creditably. Sixtus, as everybody knows, was by eminence the patron of the arts and the renovator of Rome. In this field of work he was ably assisted, if not instigated, by the energetic and art-loving Cardinal, and beyond doubt many of the great artistic glories of Sixtus owe their existence to the wise suggestions of Giuliano. In addition, the Cardinal, out of his own revenues, rebuilt the Church and Convent of S. Pietro in Vincoli, continued the work begun by Cardinal Riario on the SS. Apostoli and fortified Grottaferrata and Ostia. He was also entrusted with several important embassies to the European powers. In 1476 we meet him in France;[1] in 1480 he is Legate in the Netherlands;[2] again in 1482 he is Legate at the Court of Louis XI. and returns to Rome with the released Cardinal La Balue. In fact, Giuliano, according to modern notions, ought to have taken up his permanent residence in France, to look after his Archiepiscopal See of Avignon and his bishoprics of Viviers and Mende. But these sees were of interest to him at that time for revenue only.

During the last two years of the Pontificate of Sixtus (1482-1484), years made gloomy by the disgraceful war against Ferrara and the dissensions of the Orsini and the Colonna, Giuliano appears at his best in the quality of peacemaker. No one attempts, except on the plea of senility, to justify the alliance of Sixtus with the grasping Republic of Venice for the overthrow of the Este dynasty. It was an insane scheme of Girolamo to aggrandize himself with the aid of Venice, and when he discovered (what was patent from the beginning) that the Venetians, after devouring Ferrara, would devour his own little territory, he caused his uncle to turn face, order his allies to withdraw their troops, and, on their refusing, to excommunicate them. It would be difficult to find in the entire history of the Papacy so reckless an exercise of the supreme power of the keys.

The Ferrarese war was on the point of breaking out when Cardinal Giuliano returned from his second legation to France; and to him Duke Ercole d'Este and Lorenzo de Medici had recourse, beseeching him to exert his influence in the interest of peace. "They were well acquainted," says Pastor,[3] "with the Cardinal's opinion of the ambitious and restless Riario." "Duke Ercole," says Reumont,[4] "vainly tried through Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere to make the Pope understand that it would be neither to the honor nor the advantage of the Holy See to leave him to be crushed by the superior power of Venice." Unfortunately, the aged Pope was so completely enslaved by the overbearing Riario that, as Brosch remarks, "twenty Giulianos could not have moved him to act against the will of Girolamo."[1]

---

[1] Pastor, IV., p. 322, very justly expresses his amazement that Brosch knows nothing of this embassy, and finding no mention of Giuliano in contemporary Venetian authorities, "takes upon himself to suggest that the Cardinal Legate may at this time have fallen under the Pope's displeasure." Thus history is written! [2] Pastor, IV., 334. [3] IV., 352. [4] "Lorenzo de Medici," Vol. II., p. 198.

Giuliano made another solemn effort in July, 1482. Placing himself at the head of the Cardinals then residing in Rome, he repaired to the Vatican and earnestly implored the Pope to restore tranquillity to Italy. "Hearing of this, Girolamo hastened to the Holy Father and succeeded in dissipating the last hope of peace." It was a strange and aimless war, and so completely were the old ideas and traditions of men upset that we find the Duke of Urbino leading the troops of the Pope's enemies, whilst the Papal army is under the command of Robert Malatesta.

It was slow work convincing Sixtus that in aiding to extend the possessions of Venice he was building up the most dangerous enemy of the Holy See—"the very power which threatened to become most dangerous to him by its constant endeavors to obtain control over the cities on the Adriatic coast."[2] But finally the peace party prevailed. "Giuliano della Rovere—who, twenty years after, as his uncle's successor, opposed in arms the power of this republic, his uncle's old ally—seems to have been the means of finally inducing the Pope to break with Venice."[3]

The last year of Sixtus IV. was embittered by the intestine quarrels of the Roman nobility, especially the recrudescence of the old feuds between the Orsini and the Colonna. Into this affair we need to enter only to say that Cardinal Giuliano again appears as the determined opponent of Girolamo's violence and as a *sequester pacis*. When the Colonna faction had been crushed and their palaces razed to the ground, the Cardinal came forward to advocate moderation and amnesty. It is also said that "high words passed between Girolamo Riario and Cardinal Giuliano, even in the presence of the Pope. Cardinal Giuliano had granted asylum in his palace to some fugitives from Cardinal Colonna's dwelling, and had expressed his displeasure at Riario's violence. Girolamo accused the Cardinal of protecting rebels and enemies of the Church. Giuliano replied that the men whom he protected were no rebels against the Church, but some of her most faithful servants; that Girolamo was hunting them out of Rome, setting the Church of God on fire and destroying her. He was the cause of all the evil deeds which were bringing ruin on the Pope and on the Cardinals. The Count, on this, flew into a rage and declared that he would drive him out of the country, burn his house over his head, and give it up to plunder, as he had done to that of the Colonna."[1]

---

[1] Brosch, p. 24. [3] Reumont, II., 202. [2] Reumont, ibid.

Is it not just possible that the poor old Pope, as he witnessed this disedifying domestic squabble, may have begged pardon of God and His Church for having obstructed his needy relatives upon the Papacy? Not long after, August 12, 1484, he passed away, leaving Rome in confusion and far worse scenes to follow.

The energetic measures by which the College of Cardinals restored order in the Eternal City and banished Girolamo to the Romagna are graphically narrated by Pastor.[2] In the ensuing Conclave Cardinal Giuliano, though without hope of securing the election for himself, dictated that of a candidate "who owed everything to him." This was Cardinal Cibo, a Genoese, who had been Bishop of the native seat of the Rovere in the days of their obscurity and who was indebted to the personal friendship of Giuliano for his subsequent elevation to the Cardinalate. The chief merit of Cibo in the eyes of Giuliano was his weakness and indecision of character, which emboldened the Rovere to aspire to the position of "the power behind the throne." In order to carry through the election of his creature, "he threw himself into the contest with all the unscrupulous energy of his nature and did not hesitate to have recourse to bribery. . . . The worldly-minded Cardinals were all the easier now to win over, because they were afraid that he might ally himself with the Venetians, in which case Barbo, whose principles in morals were very strict, would have ascended the chair of S. Peter. Giuliano succeeded first in gaining the Cardinals Orsini, Raffaele Riario, then Ascanio Sforza. Sforza was followed by Borgia, and the latter persuaded Giovanni d'Aragona to join their party. Jakob Burchard, who took part in the conclave, relates that Cardinal Cibò won the votes of his future electors by signing petitions for favors which they presented to him during the night in his cell. The negotiations had lasted through the whole night. By the morning of 29th August, 1484, Giuliano della Rovere had secured eighteen votes for Cibò. The opposition party now gave up all resistance as useless. At 9 o'clock A. M. Cardinal Piccolomini was able to announce to the crowd assembled outside the Vatican that Cardinal Cibò had been elected and had assumed the name of INNOCENT VIII. The people burst forth into acclamations, the bells of the palace of S. Peter's began to ring, and the thunder of cannons resounded from the Castle of S. Angelo."[3]

Instead of rejoicing, the short-sighted populace ought to have gone through the streets of Rome chanting the Miserere and tolling the church bells in token of the departing decorum of the Sacred College. Had Giuliano sought the things that are of Christ instead of pursuing his own selfish aims, he had influence enough to check the downward tendency which had set in. But the shameful Conclave of 1484 was followed, as a logical consequence, by the still more shameful election of Borgia by the same simoniacal methods in 1492. Eight years of the Pontificate of one who flaunted in the Vatican the fruits of his early incontinency made it possible to intrude into the Papal Seat one who continued in incontinency till his old age.

---

[1] Pastor, IV., 383.

[2] Vol. V., p. 229 *et seqq.*

[3] Pastor, Vol. V., p. 238.

In forcing Cibò upon the Church, is it not possible that Giuliano, who was tarred with the same pitch, was deliberately introducing a precedent in order to facilitate his own elevation on a future occasion? A precedent was certainly needed; for the Popes of the Middle Ages had at least been chaste. Dante, who in his bitter partisanship has accused them of almost every other crime, has never once charged them with gross immorality. Nor can the Popes of the Tusculan era be quoted otherwise than as exceptions confirming the rule; for they were not the free choice of the qualified electors, but creatures of the civil power.

At any rate Innocent was elected, and merrily rang the bells. As a token of gratitude and of servitude the Pope installed the Cardinal of St. Peter ad Vincula in the Vatican, and it was well understood in Urbe and in Orbe that Giuliano was master and Innocent a docile slave.

The first use which Giuliano made of his grand vizirship was to involve the Pope in a war with Naples, the necessity and opportuneness of which are by no means apparent. Not that there were not solid grievances against the Aragonese monarch, who in his anxiety for the aggrandisement of his realm was insistent upon the annexation of Terracina and of the Papal enclaves of Benevento and Pontecorvo. He, moreover, refused to pay any other tribute for his kingdom than the traditional white palfrey. There was also sharp antagonism between King Ferrante, who wished to be master in his realm, and his barons, who were as refractory as the vassals of the Pope. In addition to these subjects of dispute which arose from the feudal relations of Rome and Naples, there were serious complaints against Ferrante on account of his arrogant pretensions in matters pertaining to the ecclesiastical affairs of the kingdom. The differences might possibly have been adjusted by compromise; but Giuliano was not a man who believed in compromises. On October 14, 1485, Innocent, though destitute of allies except the rebellious barons, and opposed by all the Italian powers, declared war against Ferrante. In a few weeks the Neapolitan army under Duke Alfonso, the King's son, reinforced by the Orsini, the Florentines and the Milanese, appeared before the gates of Rome.

"Amidst the general alarm and excitement," says Pastor,[1] "there was one man only who kept his head on his shoulders, and that was Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere. If Rome did not fall into the hands of the enemy, and if their hopes of help from within the city itself were disappointed, it was to the iron energy of that prelate that the Pope's thanks were due. Day and night he allowed himself no rest. In the cold December nights he was to be seen with Cardinals Colonna and Savelli making the round of the guards of the gates and walls. The Vatican was turned into a fort, the house of the Neapolitan Ambassador was pillaged, the castle of the Orsini on Monté Giordano was set on fire. Virginio Orsini swore that he would have his revenge; that the head of Giuliano should be carried through the town spiked on a lance."

"Virginio Orsini carried on the war with Rome with the pen as well as with the sword. He wrote pamphlets calling for the deposition of Giuliano, whom he accused of the most horrible vices, and of Innocent VIII. The Romans were urged to rebel against the degrading tyranny of the 'Genoese sailor,' who was not even a true Pope. Orsini offered to assist in bringing about the election of a new Pontiff and new Cardinals, and threatened to throw Innocent VIII. into the Tiber."[2]

Evidently Giuliano's reckless leadership had led the Papal policy into a blind alley, from which there were but two methods of escape. Innocent must either retrace his steps and accept such terms as his enemies chose to concede, or he must hew down the opposition of the Italians by the importation of foreign troops. That was a most momentous meeting of the Cardinals in which this solemn alternative was discussed, and the hatred which every Catholic feels for the name of Borgia is materially lessened when we reflect that the detested Rodrigo resisted Giuliano and his French colleague, La Balue, with stubborn persistence. From this time forward Borgia and Giuliano were bitter and unrelenting enemies. The fact that Borgia was notoriously immoral in his private life has led many to admire the hatred with which Julius pursued him in life and death. But it was no subject of ethics which caused the dissension between them; in this regard they were on equal terms. The estrangement arose from their divergent views on politics; and it is highly significant of the low conception of patriotism entertained by the Italians of that age that Borgia the Spaniard was a better Italian patriot than Rovere the Ligurian.

---

[1] Vol. V., p. 257.

[2] Pastor, V., p. 258.

Although every courier from every section of Christendom brought letter upon letter to Pope Innocent pleading for the restoration of peace; though the Emperor and the King of Spain and the Duke of Brittany, and we know not how many more, expostulated and threatened the convocation of a General Council; though the King of Hungary went so far as to send troops to the assistance of Ferrante, his wife's father, the voice of Innocent, that is to say, of Giuliano, was still for war.

In the isolated condition of the Pope and his vizir one hope remained: France might be persuaded to intervene. The longheaded and much-calumniated Louis XI. had died in 1483; he had left a boy, Charles VIII., to succeed him. It might be possible to induce the French to revive the defunct Angevine pretensions to the crown of Naples. Fortunately for Innocent, Giuliano, on March 23, 1486, proceeded to Genoa in order to conduct the negotiations with France and the Duke of Lorraine at closer range. Whilst the Cardinal was occupied in this affair and in fitting out a fleet, his adversaries took advantage of his absence to dispose the timid Pontiff to peace, which was concluded suddenly on August 10. The terms were dictated by the Pope. Ferrante yielded every point at issue, all the more readily because he had determined to violate every concession as soon as the Papal army was disbanded.

"Looking at the conditions that Ferrante accepted, no one would have guessed that his was the victorious side. In this he can hardly have been actuated by the fear of France alone. The clue to his apparent amiability must rather be sought in his subsequent conduct, for his facility in making concessions on paper was more than counterbalanced by the skill with which he evaded the fulfilment of his engagements."[1]

Giuliano hastened back to Rome and exerted himself to the utmost to persuade the Pope that the treaty which had been concluded was a mere delusion. But Innocent had no desire to continue the struggle; and Giuliano, finding his efforts unavailing, retired to sulk in his fortress of Ostia. As he had foreseen, "the whole compact was as quickly broken as it had been concluded. There can hardly be found in all the annals of history a more scandalous violation of a treaty."[2]

It was not in the nature of the Rovere to remain inactive for any considerable length of time. On March 2 of the following year he was appointed legate for the March of Ancona, with the special duty of subduing a certain Guzzoni, who, during the troubles with

---

[1] Pastor, V., p. 264.

[2] Ibid.

Naples, had taken forcible possession of Osimo, and who, in order to retain power, had invited the Sultan to invade Italy. It took the Papal troops five months to reduce the place; and even then Guzzoni dictated his own terms. Meanwhile Giuliano wearied of his task, and was replaced by Cardinal La Balue.

It soon became apparent that Pope Innocent had passed out of the tutelage of Cardinal della Rovere and had come under the influence of a far more cautious politician. This was none other than Lorenzo de Medici, who for the remaining five years of this Pontificate (1487-1492) guided the Pontiff through his difficulties. Lorenzo had gained this influence by proposing a family alliance with His Holiness. He gave his daughter Maddalena in marriage to Franceschetto Cibò, whom Innocent had begotten when a youth of seventeen, before he had any thought of taking Orders. "The family alliance between the Medici and the Cibò," says Reumont,[1] "has this peculiarity, that in this case, for the first time, the son of a Pope was in some degree recognized and brought on the political stage, the sad beginning of a grievous error in the history of the Popedom." The price which Lorenzo demanded for this sacrifice of his daughter's honor and happiness was the elevation to the Cardinalate of his son Giovanni, a lad of fourteen, later Pope Leo X. In complying with this strange demand of his prospective ally, Pope Innocent retained enough sense of decency to stipulate that the boy should not take his seat in the Sacred College for three years, a condition which Lorenzo very unwillingly accepted, and which he subsequently made every effort to set aside. When we consider that the chief reason of the degeneracy of the higher dignitaries of Holy Church in that age was the bad example set by the Cardinals, who were chosen mainly by political influence, we can estimate the hollowness of the clamor for reform raised, as a rule, most loudly by those who were most responsible for the sad state of affairs.

But the immediate effect of Lorenzo's alliance with His Holiness was unquestionably beneficial; for the Medici was a wise and prudent statesman, and his tact served as a counterpoise to the impetuosity of Giuliano. Another war between Naples and the Pope seemed inevitable. Ferrante's violation of his treaty of peace was flagrant and insolent. "In the latter half of July (1487) Innocent held a consistory on the condition of affairs in Naples. The whole college of Cardinals agreed with him that the honor of the Holy See no longer permitted him to look on unmoved."[2] The nuncio whom the Pope dispatched to Naples was received with contumely and summarily dismissed. At this juncture Lorenzo wrote to his ambassador at Rome:

---

[1] Lorenzo, II., p. 265.

[2] Reumont, p. 270.

"The more I think over the matter, the more I am confirmed in my view, that the Pope must neither yield his rights to the king nor make war upon him. The way to avoid both extremes seems to me to be this: that the Pope should without delay take every measure to maintain his rights as to the question of homage, but on the other hand avoid everything that might lead to a passage of arms or to an interdict. We are not in a fit condition for making war, and the circumstances of Italy in general, as well as those of the States of the Church in especial, will not sustain a shock. An interdict unsupported by arms produces little effect; therefore I think for the present the matter is best left alone,"[1] with many more words to the same effect. The efforts of Lorenzo to prevent the renewal of war between Naples and the Holy See, efforts which were finally successful, form the most glorious title to fame of the Florentine statesman. As Reumont justly observes: "All the misfortunes that befell Ferrante's family and dynasty in 1495 (at the time of the French invasion) were provoked by his self-will of six years before. It was no thanks to him nor to his son, who was worse than he, nor to the Pope, that they were not overtaken then by the misfortune of which both parties—the one in his ambitious, tyrannical stubbornness, the other in his inconsiderate weakness—seemed to have no foreboding. That it was avoided for a time was chiefly owing to Lorenzo de Medici, a fact the merit of which ought to cover many of his sins."[2]

Pope Innocent's weakness was owing to his wavering between the restraining counsels of Lorenzo on the one hand and the aggressive suggestions of Cardinal Giuliano on the other. The Neapolitan ambassador openly lay the entire blame of the quarrel upon the Cardinal. He maintained that when the king in the negotiations for the peace had promised to pay the tribute, it was with the understanding that the Pope "would not insist upon it." "But no sooner was I away," continues the envoy, "(would to God I had not gone in such a hurry!) than Cardinal della Rovere arrived from Genoa, and thereupon they rearranged the conditions according to their pleasure."[3] The Neapolitan, of course, was not stating the entire truth; but he shows that his master recognized who was his most formidable adversary. We also feel that it was rather Giuliano than Innocent who was speaking when the Pope made the threat, if pushed to the wall, of retiring beyond the Alps and returning with an avenging army. This had been for some time, and constantly remained, the Rovere's drastic remedy for the ills of Italy; that is to say, until, as Julius II., he raised the contrary cry of "Out with the Barbarians."

---

[1] Reumont, p. 271.

[2] Lorenzo, II., p. 409.

[3] Reumont, II., p. 418.

Finally Ferrante came to terms; and with that sudden revulsion of sentiment so common in Italy, he became most demonstrative in his assurances of esteem for the Pope and the Cardinal. From the former he begged, as a great favor, the hand of a daughter of his daughter Theodorina for his grandson, the Marquis of Gerace. As for Giuliano, "he and the king ceased to oppose each other, for they needed each other. Nothing was wanting to their intimacy at the beginning of the next Pontificate, except the element of *duration.* For it was soon to happen that Giuliano della Rovere, disregarding every consideration of duty, should become the chief instigator of the foreign invasion which hurled the Aragonese monarch from his throne and plunged his Italian fatherland into misery and bondage."[1]

Giuliano's reconciliation with Ferrante was followed by his reconciliation with the Orsini, especially with Virginio, the same who had threatened to carry the Cardinal's head through Rome spiked on a lance.

The motive of this new-born affection was patent. The condition of Pope Innocent's health was such as to make it clear that the Chair of St. Peter, the sole object of Giuliano's ambition, would soon be vacant. The candidate for the Papacy could not afford to make for himself unrelenting enemies. On the other hand, the friendship of a candidate with Giuliano's ability and energy was worth cultivating.

As a matter of fact, Giuliano did not become Pope in 1492; and his career during the Pontificate of his successful rival, Alexander VI., will furnish ample material for a separate article.

J. F. LOUGHLIN.

Philadelphia.

---

[1] Brosch, Julius II., p. 49.

GOVERNMENT SECULARIZATION OF THE EDUCATION OF CATHOLIC INDIAN YOUTH.

ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1898. Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1898. Octavo, pages 1,062.

INDIAN AND WHITE IN THE NORTHWEST; or a history of Catholicity in Montana. By L. B. Palladino, S. J. With an introduction by Right Rev. John B. Brondel, first Bishop of Helena. Octavo, pages 409. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1894.

DOMINION OF CANADA. Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ended June 30, 1898. Octavo, pages 597. Printed by order of Parliament, Ottawa, 1899.

DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS. Details of expenditure and revenue for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1898, as contained in the Auditor General's Report. Octavo, pages 142. Ottawa, 1899.

WE have before us the report of William A. Jones, United States Commissioner of Indian Affairs, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898. It is an octavo volume of more than 1,000 pages; in it will be found the reports of every official connected with the management of the affairs of the nations, the tribes, the communities and the bands of American Indians living within the territory of the United States.

The important office of the United States Commissioner is under the control of the Department of the Interior. It is one of the richest plums at the disposal of the President-elect when inaugurated. Its desirability is not on account of the salary of the office, which is only $4,000 per year, but on account of the peculiar as well as the extensive patronage under its control.

Congress appropriates about $7,500,000, for purposes specifically designated each year, which is to be expended under the direction of the United States Commissioner, through his agents and subordinates, who are accountable to him in their respective departments. The appropriations for the fiscal year mentioned were:

Current and contingent expenses	$782,840
Fulfilling treaty stipulations	3,250,400
Miscellaneous support, gratuities	664,125
Incidental expenses	80,000
Support of schools	2,638,390
Miscellaneous	238,100
Total	$7,653,855

It devolves upon the Commissioner to see that the treaty stipulations are fulfilled each year, which include the payment of annuities in money and kind to all the tribes and communities comprised within the Indian population entitled thereto—from Western New York, North, South and West, to the shores of the Pacific. It devolves upon him to see that the rights of the weaker bands are not encroached by the stronger; and that the interests of both are protected against the unlawful schemes and the cupidity of the whites. The supreme control of the education of Indian youth is confided to his care, involving the outlay of $2,638,390 appropriated for Indian schools. So also has he supervision over the expenditure of about $1,000,000 more for miscellaneous support and contingencies. Under his control are the trust funds of the Indian tribes in the Treasury of the United States, deposited there according to treaties, which bear interest at four and five per cent. Congress has no control over these trust funds, which aggregate about $34,000,000, and yield an annual interest of $1,624,000.

Under his control are the lands ceded to the Government by treaty, the proceeds of which when sold are placed to the credit of the respective tribes and communities in whose possession these lands had been held, aggregating millions of acres and containing untold millions of forestal, mineral and grazing wealth. The Commissioner also controls the disposition of the reservation lands—when the advance of civilization renders their sale necessary and advantageous to their occupants.

Nor are all the tribes in dependent circumstances. The Osages of Oklahoma, comprising 906 full bloods and 855 of mixed blood, have on deposit in the United States Treasury $8,447,090, which yields an aggregate interest of $422,050 per annum. The Southern civilized and semi-civilized tribes, comprising the Cherokees, the Choctaws, the Creeks, the Seminoles, etc., have on deposit in the Treasury $7,718,000, about equally divided, which yields an annual interest of $382,190.

The different bands of the Sioux have $3,480,000, earning an aggregate of $174,000 interest annually; the Sissetons and the Utes, nearly $3,000,000, with an interest revenue of $134,000; the Cheyennes and the Arapahoes, $1,000,000, earning $50,000 yearly interest; the Chickasaws have $1,174,000, earning $84,335 yearly; the Sac and the Fox, over a million and a half, with annual interest of $76,500, while twenty-four other nationalities not so wealthy have an aggregate of $6,120,000, earning $301,000 yearly interest.

Subordinate to the Commissioner is the small army of agents, superintendents of tribes and of schools, who are appointed by him and whose tenure of office is usually four years. They exercise supreme control in their respective spheres over the Indian communities. Under these officials is another army of subordinates occupied in the local administration of the ordinary affairs of the respective bands and tribes. Besides the control of these functionaries, the Commissioner has the supervision of the allotment of the annual contracts for supplies of all kinds to be furnished the people of certain tribes in accordance with treaties, which aggregate a large sum, the details of which occupy 343 closely printed octavo pages of the annual report of the fiscal year. These supplies are distributed, as stated, according to treaty stipulation by the respective subordinate agents of the Commissioner, as well as the annuities to be paid in money, in the chief centres of the Indian communities.

A study of the articles in the contracts made during one year will give some idea of the immensity of the details in this one department. Nor should it be overlooked that the annuities in kind and in money are not donations given in relief, but for the payment of Indian lands ceded to the Government as a necessary consequence of the demands of settlers, growing out of the progress of white civilization. The Commissioner has under his control the leasing of reservation lands for grazing and for the cutting of timber. He has also to oversee the allotments of lands in severalty in the respective reservations, which is a progressive movement in the interest of the Indian towards citizenship.

All the functions detailed, which are but a part of the whole of what constitutes the power of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, are stated to show the great extent of his jurisdiction over what relates to the material interest of the American Indian. But he also has control over the intellectual and more or less of the spiritual interests of all the Indian youth. The Government to-day sustains in the Indian country, at Carlisle, in Pennsylvania, and at Mount Pleasant, in Michigan, 148 boarding and training schools, with an average attendance of 16,233 pupils, and 149 day schools, all of which two latter are in the Indian country, with an average attendance of 3,682 pupils.

This is an increase during the past two decades of the former class of 100 and of the latter of 47. It is at the Commissioner's discretion where the Indian youth shall be educated in Catholic schools and convents in the Northwest, according to the appropriation.[1] The Government schools are expensive, the total cost of the whole system during the fiscal year being $2,521,428—the salaries paid the superintendents of the boarding schools ranging from $1,000 to $2,000 per annum. The school at Carlisle, Pa., costs for salaries alone $40,880.

---

[1] The appropriation for Catholic education made each year limits the amount to be expended therefor.

There is a vicious feature in the appointment of the agents and superintendents, who, as stated, become the local rulers over the respective tribes and communities. These officials are appointed through the influence of Congressmen and Senators, as a reward for political services rendered. Their tenure of office, as stated, rarely exceeds four years, during which they seek to realize the perquisites obtainable in their respective positions. The exception to the rules generally controlling this class of appointments has been the appointment of army officers in certain important localities, who served without extra compensation and whose administrations have been intelligent, humane, strictly honest and satisfactory to the Indians as well as to the Government. Unfortunately the exigencies of the armies in Cuba and in the Philippines has necessitated the recall to their respective regiments of most of the officers detailed for such service, there being only four left in the Indian country.

The maladministration of agents and superintendents, despite the precautionary system of control by the United States Commissioner, has been so bad that certain aggrieved tribes have been driven to the verge of outbreak. In his report for the current year the Commissioner outlines the causes leading to the revolt of the Chippewas.

The tribes of this nation, he alleges, were outrageously swindled and their people grievously wronged; first, in connection with "liquor prosecutions," where deputy marshals "set up" prosecutions and cited the Chippewas to appear as witnesses at St. Paul, merely to realize on their official fees. In many cases the unfortunate Chippewas were arrested and taken to St. Paul, and then left to get home as best they could, having to beg for food on their way. An honest, watchful agent would have prevented this scandalous outrage.

But a more astounding fraud, probably the greatest in recent years, was perpetrated on the Chippewas by the estimators of the pine lands they had ceded to the Government by treaty, where $280,000 was charged against their fund. Such robberies as those connected with "liquor prosecutions" are derogatory to the integrity of the local agents, while they show a want of vigilance on the part of the Commissioner. It is his duty to see that the United States District Attorney in control prosecutes these deputy marshals and cause their dismissal from the Government service, which they have brought into disrepute.

But the gigantic robbery of nearly $300,000, paid out of the unfortunate Chippewas' fund for alleged inspection of pine lands, is inexplicable. The Commissioner must have signed the vouchers for these payments. The work was, or should have been, done by contract and bondsmen required; if the latter are responsible they should be made to pay the Government for the fraud and restitution in part made to the Chippewas. It is the duty of the Senators from Minnesota to probe this matter and bring the offenders to justice, whether the Commissioner takes action or not.

The appropriations made each year by Congress are according to the estimates submitted by the Commissioner, and they outline to some extent the policy to be pursued. The budget usually passes through the House of Representatives by a party vote. When it comes before the Senate it is referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, where it undergoes a close scrutiny.

Experienced Senators interested in the welfare of the American Indian race are zealous in opposing whatever might appear detrimental to the interest of the Indian and of his family.

We have said the Commissioner has control over the intellectual, as he has to a considerable extent, over the spiritual development in the education of Indian youth.

Fifty or more years ago the Rocky Mountain and Northwestern Indian nations were solidly pagan; not only on the American side of the boundary line, but across this line into the British Northwestern regions, where the same nationalities and kindred tribes ruled supreme. In Montana the leading nations of the "Rockies" lived in their wild state and were constantly at war among themselves.

Through the influence of the Flat Head nation, who were the elite of the Montana tribes, Father De Smet, S. J., made the long and dangerous journey from St. Louis, Mo., to the Flat Head village in 1841. He inaugurated the introduction of Christianity and prepared the way for the advent of the Jesuit Fathers from the Turin Province in Italy and from the Belgian Province.

The young Jesuit Fathers who subsequently came to continue the work of Father De Smet were among the brightest, the most intellectual and the most zealous as well as the most pious of the Catholic missionaries who during three centuries had left the refined circles of European life to cross the Atlantic and to engage in missionary work among the Indians of North America. The rendezvous of these young priests was at the Jesuit college of St. Louis. From this centre a perilous journey of 1,000 or more miles through a country traversed by hostile pagan tribes would have to be made before the scene of their apostolic labors would be reached. They brought with them lay brothers and scholastics who were skilful adepts not only in the mechanic arts, but also in agricultural knowledge. The history of their missionary work may not be recited in this article. Its details have been published by one of their illustrious members, Rev. Louis B. Palladino, S. J., in his "Indian and White in the Northwest."

The golden jubilee of the foundation of the Montana missions was celebrated in 1892. This work of the Catholic Church forms one of the most instructive and interesting chapters in the history of civilization in North America. Consider the wild tribes of the "Rockies" evangelized and brought under religious discipline. These are in alphabetical order: The Assiniboines, Blackfeet, Cœur d'Alénes, Cheyennes, Colvilles, Crees, Crows, Gros Ventres, Flat Heads, Kalispels, Kootenays, Missoulas, Nez Perces, Piegans, Pend d' Oreiles, Shoshones and Teutons.

What is most remarkable in this glorious chapter of Catholic Church history in the Northwest is that at the epoch of the Golden Period more than nine-tenths of the Indian population of Montana, young and old, were practical Catholics, whose heads of families had prospered and are now in fair circumstances. The prominence of the Catholic religion is in evidence. An apostolic Bishop, venerable clergy, religious orders of men and of women, academies, schools, churches, hospitals, asylums for orphan boys and girls, a House of the Good Shepherd, with a white population of Catholics, among whom "up-to-date" sodalities, confraternities and charitable societies of both sexes have good foundations.

To provide education for Catholic Indian children, the United States Commissioner made contracts with Catholic mission schools for a stated number at so much per capita, and for other children with sectarian missionary schools, all of which were officially known as contract schools.

What is meant by contract schools may be more fully explained as follows: In Montana, for instance, where the Indian population is solidly Catholic, there are boarding and training schools for boys and girls conducted by religious orders of men and women. In 1895 there were such institutions for the Blackfeet, the Crow, the Flat Head, the Fort Belknap and the Tongue River agencies.

For that year the United Commissioner made contracts with these Catholic missionary schools according to the funds appropriated for the education of pupils as follows in Montana:

Blackfeet, 100, at $125 each	$12,500
Crows, 85, at $108 each	9,180
Flat Heads, 300, at $150 each	45,000
At Fort Belknap, 135, at $108 each	14,580
At Tongue River, 40, $108 each	4,320
Number of pupils, 660. Total cost	$85,580

In 1899 the effect of the sectarian propaganda in Congress against the Government education of Catholic Indian children resulted in the following reductions:

Blackfeet, reduced to 34, at $108 each	$3,672
Crows, reduced to 34, at $108 each	3,672
Flat Heads, reduced to 161, at $108 each	17,388
At Fort Belknap, reduced to 49, at $108 each	5,292
At Tongue River, reduced to 26, at $108 each	2,808

Reduction in the number of pupils contracted for in Montana, 356; reduction per capita, 28 per cent.; reduction in total cost, $52,748.

Similar reductions were made in contract school education throughout all the Indian reservations and communities where Catholic Indian children were to be educated. Even in the little town of Baraga, on Lake Superior, founded by the saintly missionary Bishop of that name, where in 1895 the Government paid for the education of 45 pupils at $108 each per annum, this number was reduced in 1899 to 19, with a difference in the cost of $2,808.

In the Ottawa old time mission of L'Arbre Croche, now known as Harbor Springs, Michigan, the number of pupils was reduced from 95 to 34, with a diminished cost to the appropriation for the education of these Catholic Indian pupils of $6,528.

In the Dakotas, where all was Indian, the reduction was excessive, as it was also in the Chippewa reservations, where the reduction was 50 per cent. At Green Bay, Wisconsin, where 130 pupils had been educated at a cost of $108 each per annum, the number was reduced to 45, with a diminished charge to the appropriation of $9,240.

The Kate Drexel school in Oregon, where 60 pupils were paid for at $108 per capita, at a total cast of $6,000, has been reduced in number to 24 at $100 per capita, with a total cost of $2,400. In regard to the Hampton Institute, in Virginia, and the Lincoln Institution, at Philadelphia, Pa., both of which are provided for by special appropriations, 120 pupils were maintained in the former and 200 in the latter at a cost of $167 per capita, which is some $50 more than the average paid in the Indian country. It is needless to say these are non-Catholic institutions, whose pupils are brought from the boarding schools in the Northwest.

An exception to this peculiar feature in the Government system of the education of Indian youth is to be found in Oklahoma, where are the Osage reservations. These Osages are, as has been stated, "the richest people on earth." They are solidly Catholic, and they support missionary schools for the education of their children out of the interest on their funds on deposit in the United States Treasury.

In 1892 the appropriations for Catholic schools for Indian youth was $394,756, the highest reached after 1890, while for all other denominations the total was $216,814.

The general non-Catholic public could not understand the disproportion between the former and the latter; nor was the fact generally known that the majority of Indian youth to be educated were Catholic.

Taken in connection with the eclat of the golden jubilee of Catholicity in Montana, the large amount appropriated for Catholic Indian education excited the alarm of pessimistic non-Catholics, and then followed the crusade in Congress and elsewhere against the appropriation of public money for Catholic purposes. This propaganda has been detrimental to the educational interests of Catholic Indian youth. In 1893 the appropriation was reduced to $375,843; in 1894 it was $389,745; in 1895 it was reduced to $359,215; in 1896 it was cut to $308,471; in 1897 it was reduced to $198,228; in 1898 to $156,754; while for the year 1899 it is only $116,862. In the meantime the Presbyterian, the Congregational, Episcopal, Friends (Quaker), Mennonite, Unitarian, Lutheran, Methodist, etc., had disappeared from the list of contract schools.

It has become apparent that the United States Commissioner of Indian Affairs favors the policy of educating the youth of Catholic Indian parents in non-Catholic Government schools. In pursuance of this policy the number of Indian boarding and industrial schools and the number of day schools has been gradually increased, while the respective agents and superintendents of Indian communities have used their authority to influence if not to compel the attendance of Indian pupils. Whatever advantage there may be to the average Indian pupil attending the boarding and industrial schools, it is the opinion of many interested in the education of Indian children that the average day school is a costly and not altogether an advantageous system.

As a rule these schools are to the Indian child dismal affairs, and were it not that at noon the children are given a substantial meal there would be scant attendance.

It is apparent, moreover, that these schools in the Northwest are intended as nurseries for the boarding and training establishments, the pupils of the former being transferred to the latter by the power of the agents, in conformity with the design of making the education of Indian youth non-Catholic.

The present system of non-sectarian education costs an annual outlay of $2,500,000. Would it not be more advantageous to civilization, would it not be more just that Catholic Indian youth be provided with Catholic teachers, who would confirm them in morality and educate them also?

But this is not a principle recognized under the present Governmental system. In the process of the non-religious education of a

Catholic Indian boy or girl it will be miraculous if that boy or girl, who had been baptized by a Catholic priest and confirmed by a Catholic Bishop, does not graduate from the chilling atmosphere of a Government boarding or training school without the loss of the Catholic faith. But there is a still worse fate reserved for pupils of the schools mentioned.

Each year a certain number of pupils are transferred to the "universities" of the system of non-Catholic education known as the Carlisle, the Mount Pleasant, the Lincoln Institution and the Hampton Institute, the two latter during the past ten years having been maintained by special appropriations outside of the Indian budget of $33,400 and $20,000 respectively. If these four institutions, in so far as relates to the religious animus of their principals, be judged by that of the leading "university" of Indian education under the auspices of the American Republic, which is the Carlisle institution in Pennsylvania, costing at least $100,000 per annum, the hope that any Catholic pupil may graduate therefrom with his or her faith intact will prove groundless.

The principal of this leading "university" at Carlisle, Pa., which in 1898 contained 867 Indian boys and girls, is R. H. Pratt, as he officially signs: Major First United States Cavalry. To do him justice, Major Pratt, who has managed the Carlisle institution more than a decade of years, is outspoken in his antipathy to the Catholic religion. Apparently it would require a miracle as remarkable as that which converted St. Paul to remove the scales from the eyes of R. H. Pratt, Major First United States Cavalry and principal of the Carlisle Indian School.

The most outspoken official champion of opposition to the Catholic education of Indian youth, children of Catholic parents, was United States Commissioner of Indian Affairs T. J. Morgan. He made no secret of his anti-Catholic animus during all his administration; as such he was the representative of the Government of the United States. Unfortunately his methods were supported by a majority of United States Senators.

His first aggressive movement was his effort to break up Catholic ascendancy in educational work in Montana. In 1892 he addressed a letter to the Indian agents in Montana, informing them that a new Indian industrial and training school had been organized at the Fort Shaw reservation, with Dr. William H. Winslow, principal teacher at the Chilico Boarding School, as manager.

"It is intended," said United States Commissioner Morgan, "that a large number of children will be transferred from your reservation to this new school, and you are directed to coöperate heartily with Superintendent Winslow and with Supervisor Parker in their efforts to secure a large enrollment for Fort Shaw as soon as the school is ready to receive pupils. Children to be transferred should not be under 12 to 14 years of age, and they should have a fair knowledge of English. It is desirable that the children should have been previously in attendance at some other school." "We call the attention," says Father Palladino, "of all fair-minded people to the above, and that every one may be able to judge of its importance and pregnancy we have only to state here the simple fact that of all the Indian youth under 12 to 14 years of age in Montana, to say the least, nine-tenths are Catholics and nearly all in attendance at Catholic schools. This we know to be absolutely true, and a glance at the official Indian school statistics in Montana will convince any one of the fact and the accuracy of our assertion. With regard to the Jocko or Flat Head reservation, the case does not even admit of exception, as all the Indian children there are practical Catholics to a unit.

"It must, then, be evident to every one that the new Fort Shaw school can have no pupils, or that, if it is to have any, nine-tenths of the number must be drawn from the Catholic Indian youth in attendance at Catholic schools. In the first supposition the Fort Shaw school would seem unnecessary and has no reason to exist; in the second, it cannot but be an outrage and a crying injustice on the souls and consciences of these helpless Catholic Indian children. Will the Hon. Commissioner appoint some Catholic priest as spiritual director of his new Fort Shaw institution?

"Will he have a Catholic chaplain to instruct those Catholic Indian children and minister to them the comforts of their religion? One might sooner expect lambs to be protected by wolves than Christian instruction to be allowed these Indian children by Government officials of the Hon. Commissioner Morgan and Dr. Dorchester kind. The Fort Shaw school is a non-sectarian Government institution, and as such, of course, will be conducted on non-sectarian principles. We know the meaning of 'non-sectarian' both in the jargon of nothingarians and in the official language of Commissioner Morgan and his compeers. With the former it is exclusive of all religion; with the latter it simply means nothing in religion that is Catholic, and anything that is non-Catholic, or anything that is non-Catholic and anti-Catholic. This we know from the manner in which the non-sectarian Indian schools of Commissioner Morgan's own making are conducted throughout the land, and we challenge contradiction of our statement. Hence we necessarily conclude that in the Fort Shaw school there will be for our Catholic Indian children something worse than even simply no religious instruction; there will be a positive religious instruction, but of such a kind only as will be consistent with the non-sectarian character of the institution, of its master and managers, that is, *non-Catholic and anti-Catholic.* We now ask, what can such a school lead to but the practical de-Catholization of every Catholic Indian youth that will be forced to enter its doors?

"The Indian agents of Montana are officially directed to 'coöperate heartily in the efforts to secure a large attendance of pupils for Fort Shaw.' This explains itself and needs no comment at our hands. It can easily be surmised what this coöperation is likely to be; it will be both hearty and very heartless at the same time. What else can it be under the circumstances?

" 'Three acres and a cow' will be the price paid Indian parents to have them consent to the 'promotion' of their Catholic children to the new school or some other of the same kind. . . . But what the 'three acres and a cow' method, what bribes and well-known Indian 'tips' may fail to do, the suspension of rations, that is the *starving out process,* is sure to accomplish. An empty stomach, we all know, is a rather strong argument, and its reasonings are never without a peculiar convincing force of their own."

The new administration started out with the publicly avowed purpose to discontinue all Indian contract schools by the substitution of Government ones of the non-sectarian kind. That this policy was inaugurated and continued by the administration principally to do away with the Catholic Indian schools, is no longer a matter of doubt; it is on record and blazoned all along its course and tenure of office. It is true that in the twenty-third annual Report of the Board of Indian Commissioners of 1891, page 134, we find the following declaration from Commissioner Morgan: "In reference to the contract schools the present policy of the Government is to preserve the *statu quo* and not interfere with the schools already established;" and again: "That it will allow matters to take their own course." But these promises seem to have been forgotten or cast to the winds, and facts belie the words. The bulldozing by the Hon. Commissioner of the Catholic Indian Mission Bureau at Washington, established by the Catholic Hierarchy of the United States to look after the school and mission interests of our Catholic Indians, the diminished number of allowed pupils in Catholic Indian contract schools, the erection, unnecessarily and at a great expenditure of the people's money, of non-sectarian Government schools, side by side with and in opposition to the mission schools; school inspectors, school supervisors and school superintendents of pronounced anti-Catholic propensities, whose principal duty would seem to be to find fault with and run down whatever is Catholic, and the conduct of some of whom has been at times more noticeable for coarseness and shocking vulgarity than polite, gentlemanly breeding; all this, with more that could be added, is evidence enough that the *statu quo* is not being preserved; that the Catholic Indian schools, at least, are not only being interfered with, but slowly and gradually done away by a policy that aims their continuance practically impossible.

And yet, despite the odds against them, these schools are well conducted, efficient and successful, and as a matter of fact superior to the non-sectarian ones of the Government. And this they are, it would seem, not in the eyes of their friends alone, but in those even of the Government officials who have had occasion to visit them frequently, and who, far from being partial, are openly hostile. We positively know that some of these officials have, time and again, held up our Catholic schools as models and examples for imitation, and they have even directed matrons, teachers and other attaches of the Government Indian schools to acquaint themselves with and to follow Catholic methods. A like testimony from such witnesses is indeed more than a gratifying and unlooked for compliment in favor of our Catholic Indian schools; it is their best vindication.[1]

The outlook for the future of Catholic Indian education is gloomy; unless the policy of secularizing this education is interfered with, untold evil will result to the souls of Indian Catholic youth. We have shown that during the passing decade the appropriation for Catholic contract schools has been gradually reduced from $394,756 to $116,862. If this process continues, as it probably will continue, the secularization of the education of Catholic Indian children will have been made complete.

This prospect has probably induced the Bishop of Helena to make the situation known to his fellow-citizens and to the Christian world by the following communication:

HELENA, Montana, July 12, 1899.

To whom it may concern: I herewith submit to the consideration of the general public the official reports of the six Indian agents of Montana to the Indian Department at Washington with regard to the Catholic Indian missions. A short time ago there were 300 children of Flat Heads at school in St. Ignatius; 200 children of Gros Ventres and Assinniboines at school in St. Paul's; 200 children of different tribes at school in St. Peter's; 100 children of Crows at school in St. Xavier's; 100 children of Blackfeet at school in the Holy Family mission, and 65 children of Cheyennes at school in St. Labre's. First class buildings, mostly of stone and brick, were erected in the wildest parts of Montana at a cost of $400,000 and furnished with all the necessary and convenient equipments for boarding, lodging and schooling the Indian children of the respective tribes. Let it be taken into consideration that said expensive structures, etc., were erected in compliance with suggestions, if not demands, of the Government officials and inspectors, whose requirements for Indian school accommodations and equipment seemed to surpass what might have been considered more than sufficient in first-class schools for white children. Under such circumstances the action on the part of Congress in discontinuing to make appropriation for the funds which alone can make the running of said schools possible will hardly be considered as just and fair, more especially as it was at the urgent request of the administration that the Catholic Church en-

---

[1] "Indian and White in the Northwest," p. 236.

tered upon the work to the extent that it did. As the cause of this unexpected and unfair treatment is traceable to the fact that religion is taught to the children, it may not be amiss to state what is well known to every one acquainted with the work, that in order to successfully civilize the Indian it is necessary to Christianize him.

I hope and pray that this simple and short statement of facts may make the situation clear and induce the legislators at Washington to promote the welfare of the Indians by continuing to extend a helping hand to the devoted men and women engaged in bringing to Christianity and civilization the American Indian.

JOHN B. BRONDEL, Bishop of Helena, Montana.

Bishop Brondel quotes from the official reports of Indian agencies in Montana published in the annual reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1898:

Blackfoot Indian Agency—page 183—Education: "There are conducted on this reservation two schools—the Government boarding school on Willow creek, with an attendance of 103, and the Holy Family Mission, on the Two Medicine river, with an attendance of 45. At the Holy Family Mission school the building occupied by the Sisters and girls was destroyed by fire last February. A new building is under process of construction, which when completed will render the school thoroughly complete, where undoubtedly the past excellent work of the Holy Family Mission among the Indians will be continued."

The Crow Agency—page 188—Education: "The highest number in school attendance during the year was 238 pupils. Of these 158 attended the Government school at the agency and 80 the Catholic mission schools at the Big Horn sub-agency and the Pryor Creek sub-agency. The school at the latter place has been discontinued upon the alleged ground of gradual discontinuance of Government aid. This leaves the Indians on Pryor creek—some 500—without a school, and the nearest point where children from this band can attend school is the Catholic mission school at the Big Horn sub-agency, some fifty miles distant. Much complaint has been entered at this office by the parents of the Pryor creek children on account of the closing of the school at that point."

The Flat Head Agency—pp. 190-191: "I desire," reports the agent, "to mention the matter of increased school facilities that to me seem very necessary. For many years past (more than fifty) the education of the children here has been under contract with the Jesuit Fathers; but Congress having of late years deemed it wise to eventually discontinue all aid to sectarian schools, has been cutting down their appropriation. The past year the contract provided for 215 children; this year for 161. When it is borne in mind that there are 450 children on the reservation of school age, the necessity for additional school facilities is apparent. It would seem very desirable that a reasonable provision should be made for a boarding school plant at the agency and possibly one day school on Camas prairie. The only school upon the reservation is at St. Ignatius Mission, and it is maintained by contract with the Jesuit Fathers. The larger boys are taught by the fathers, while the girls are under the direction of the Sisters of Providence, the kindergarten being taught by the Ursuline nuns. The boys in addition to their school work have the benefit of practical work in the shoe, saddlery, tin, carpenter and blacksmith shops, together with farming and gardening. The girls are taught all kinds of housework, sewing and dairying."

The agent making the above report might have stated that the Flat Head Indians are solidly Catholic.

The Fort Belknap Agency—pp. 192-193-194: "There are on this agency 322 children between the ages of 6 and 18 years. The educational branch of the service on the reservation has been conducted by the industrial boarding school at the agency and the contract school, a Roman Catholic institution, at the Little Rockies. The contract school conducted by the Roman Catholic Church, under the supervision of the Rev. Charles Mackin, at the Little Rocky Mountains, has had a successful year, and did much good work in elevating and training the Indian children of that locality. Several improvements have been made at this institution during the year, and the general appearance of the plant is attractive and prosperous. The missionary work of the reservation is carried on by the Jesuit Fathers, who are faithful and diligent workers and are doing much good among the Indians. A new church is being built at the mission, which will be of great assistance to them in their work."

The Fort Peck Agency—p. 196: "There are 375 children enrolled of school age at this agency, of whom 183 attend school. The Presbyterian and Roman Catholic Churches maintain missionaries. Both are doing good work among the Indians. Considerable progress has been made in the past few years."

The Tongue River Agency—p. 198: "I sincerely trust," reports the agent, "that some steps may be taken in the near future relative to more adequate school facilities for these people. There should be a boarding school on this reservation large enough to accommodate at least 250 pupils. At present we have 384 children of school age. St. Labre's Mission, a contract school on Tongue river, can accommodate 65 pupils; the day school at the agency can accommodate comfortably about 30 pupils, which leaves 289 children without any school facilities whatsoever."

The apparent object of Bishop Brondel in bringing the attention of the American public to the educational status among the Indian tribes of Montana by the official reports of the Government agents was to show the effect of the non-Catholic crusade upon the educational interests of the Indians in that State, nine-tenths of whom are Roman Catholics. To those familiar with the glorious results of more than half a century's missionary toil in the Northwest among the wild tribes of the "Rockies," and the perfection to which the education of Indian children had been brought in the schools and convents under the charge of some of the most renowned religious orders existing, the great solicitude of the apostolic Bishop for the welfare of the endangered souls of so many of his spiritual children can be understood.

But United States Commissioner Jones is by no means satisfied with the present status. In his recent report for 1899 he urges more schools, more systematic methods, study of individual traits and consideration of subsequent environment in outlining studies in the Indian schools.

The entire educational system of the United States Indian Commissioner's office is predicated upon the final abolishment of the anomalous Indian reservation system, according to Commissioner Jones. But we doubt very much if during his natural life Mr. Jones will see the reservation system abolished.

The Seneca and Tuscarora reservations in Western New York, the remnant of the once extensive domain of these Iroquoian nations, have existed with reduced outlines from the close of the Revolutionary War to the present day, and they are likely to remain under the protection of American law.

Does Mr. Jones imagine he can force such Western nations as the Osage, the Ute and other wealthy Indian communities, who hold their reservations by treaties with the Government, to give up their hunting grounds in accordance with his theory?

Commissioner Jones states there are now 20,522 boys and girls in attendance on the various Indian schools out of an enrollment of over 25,000, the Indian population from which these are taken being 181,000. This population has remained stationary.

He feels, however, compelled to state that one discouraging fact is disclosed by the unsatisfactory results of the past nine years' trial of co-education of the Indians with the whites in the public schools. The results of this co-education are not commensurate with the expenditure. The idea theoretically is an admirable expedient for breaking down prejudices and civilizing the Indian, but the figures show it is not an unqualified success. The full-blood, who needs such contact most, is rarely secured, and the groundwork at least of Indian education must be laid under the Government's auspices and control.

Commissioner Jones urges *stronger measures for forcing the attendance on Indian schools.* Concerning the Indian territory, he severely arraigns nepotism, lack of management, demoralized conditions and a deplorable state of affairs generally in administering the schools and orphan asylums of the five Indian nations.

But a most pregnant statement emanates from the United States Commissioner's office in the admission that out of 21 of the costly boarding schools, not more than four of the high salaried superintendents are reported competent to teach the ordinary English branches, while financial mismanagement is especially complained of.[1]

It occurs to us to say in regard to the Indian reservation system, which the United States Commissioner hopes to break up, so as to acquire more autocratic control over the education of Indian youth, that it is more than probable that the Indians will see the advantage of taking land in severalty in their respective reservations; as tribal control is gradually disappearing and as the Indian, by the allotment process, becomes a citizen *de jure*, he will be entitled to regulate the affairs of his community in the same manner as his more civilized neighbors, the whites.

Over such communities the Commissioner of Indian Affairs can have no control. The educational interests as well as the religious interests of the Indian child reverts to the natural authority of the parent. We believe this will be the inevitable result.

The Indian population of the United States may be safely stated as 180,000. As has been seen, it requires an annual appropriation approximating to $7,500,000 for the management of our Indian affairs; this is exclusive of the annual payment by the United States Treasury of $1,624,000 for interest on the funds of the respective Indian communities on deposit in the National Treasury. The American Indian population does not increase. The official census of the Dominion of Canada shows a total Indian population of 100,093 souls in 1898. The same returns for 1897 gave a total of 99,364 souls, which shows that this population does not retrogade. But there are some wild unreclaimed tribes in the Northwest which are not included in the official census.

It cost the Canadian Government $1,001,305 for the management of its Indian affairs for the year 1898, or a per capita of less than $10, while it cost the American Government over $41.60 per capita.

The Canadian Indians include 16,448 Anglicans or Episcopalians, 1,054 Presbyterians, 8,885 Methodists, 1,581 of mixed denominations, 49,535 Roman Catholics, 15,615 pagans and 6,975 whose religion is unknown to the department, many of whom are Roman Catholics.

---

[1] Taken from an outline of the United States Commissioner's report recently submitted by the Washington correspondent of the Detroit *Free Press*, November 20, 1898.

Under the control of the Canadian Government there are several Indian nationalities in the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario of kindred stock with American Indians. Of the Iroquoian nationalities, Canada has the Catholic Mohawks at Caughnawago, on the St. Lawrence, who are descendants of the Christian families forced to leave their homes in the Iroquoian cantons by pagan persecution during the seventeenth century. Other Catholic Mohawks are to be found at the St. Regis reservation, while the Mohawks and other tribes of the Six Nations, who in the hegira from the Iroquoian cantons as a consequence of the War of the Revolution, followed Brant Thayandanega to Canada, who are non-Catholics, are domiciled on the Grand River reservation, which was given by the British Government to Brant and his followers for services rendered of that bloody kind which made their presence on American soil impossible. There are besides more than 2,000 Mohawks, Cayugas and Oneidas in other localities in Ontario. There are many bands of Chippewas on the Canadian frontier between Lake St. Clair and the head waters of Lake Superior.

There are over 5,000 Ojibbewas, solidly Catholic, on the coasts, islands and harbors on the Canadian frontier from the vicinity of Lake Huron to the head waters of Lake Superior, all of whom are kindred to our American tribes—besides the Missisaguas, Pottawotomies, Munsees, etc.

Of the 20,618 Indians in Ontario 6,404 are Catholics attended by missionaries. There are in this province 3,219 pagans. In the Province of Quebec there are 10,667 Indians, of whom 7,386 are Catholic, and included in this number are the Abenakis, the Hurons, the Micmacs, the Algonquins and the Montagnais, who have been Catholic during about three centuries.

In the Province of New Brunswick there are 1,627 Indians solidly Catholic. In the Province of Nova Scotia the Indian population is 2,027, composed of Micmacs who were converted by Catholic missionaries three centuries ago. In the Prince Edward Island there are 314 Indians, all Micmac Catholics. In British Columbia the Indian population numbers 2,635. Of these 1,066 are Catholics, 1,000 pagans and the others are Methodists and Presbyterians.

On the Fraser River reservation there are 3,165 Indians, of whom 2,740 are Catholic, 91 Episcopalians, 153 Methodists and 181 pagans. On the Babine and Upper Skeena River agency there are 2,840 Indians, of whom 1,755 are Catholics, 664 are Episcopalians, 247 are Methodists and the remainder pagans. At the Williams Lake agency there are 1,920 Indians, of whom 1,896 are Catholics and 24 are Episcopalians. On the Northwest Coast agency in the same Province of British Columbia there are 4,082 Indians, of whom 1,164 are Episcopalians, 1,901 are Methodists, 147 of other Protestant sects and 870 pagans. There are no Catholics enrolled at this agency.

Now we come again to kindred tribes; this time in the Northwest. The Indians at the Kootenay agency number 543, all solidly Catholic. At the Cowichan agency there are 1,913 Indians, of whom 42 are Episcopalians, 153 are Methodists, 55 of other Protestant sects and 1,663 Catholics. At the Kamloops agency there are 3,778 Indians, 1,542 of whom are Episcopalians, 2,235 are Catholics and 1 pagan. At the Kwawkewlth agency there are 1,587 Indians, 730 of whom are Episcopalians, 113 are Methodists, 102 Catholics and 652 are pagans.

This ends the enumeration in the Province of British Columbia.

In the Province of Manitoba we find the kindred tribes of our Chippewas, Crees, Saulteaux and Sioux. There are on the five agencies in Manitoba an aggregate of 6,716 Indians. Of these 2,536 are Episcopalians, 87 of other sects, 1,123 Catholics and 187 pagans.

In the Northwest Territory, which is of vast extent, we find again many kindred tribes of American Indian nationalities. The number enrolled is 14,600, of whom 2,365 are Episcopalians, 650 are Presbyterians, 1,381 are Methodists, 6,700 are pagans and 3,483 are Catholics. In ten other Northwestern and coast agencies, out of 11,673 Indians enrolled 2,064 are Episcopalians, 8,166 are Catholics and probably 2,400 are pagans.

The Episcopalian missions among the Canadian Indians are supported by a wealthy association in London, whose foundation dates back to colonial times. The Methodist and Presbyterian missions are supported by wealthy organizations in Canada. We hope the readers of the *Review* who have kindly given their attention to the Indian status in the Dominion of Canada will not have been wearied by the study. It is important, however, to show how the Canadian Government deals with the educational and spiritual interests of its Indian population. The Dominion Government is our near neighbor; while across its boundary line from east of Lake Erie to the regions of the Pacific Ocean many of the Indian nationalities, as has been shown, are allied in racial and tribal connection with the parent stocks of the race dwelling on American soil.

The Canadian Government officially recognizes and subsidizes 219 day schools in all the Dominion for the education of Indian youth. Of these 71 are in Ontario, 17 in Quebec, 8 in Nova Scotia, 6 in New Brunswick, 1 in Prince Edward Island, 27 in British Columbia, 46 in Manitoba, 34 in the Northwest territories and 9 are in localities outside treaty limits.

The religious classification of these respective schools, as given in the report of the Department of Indian Affairs for 1898, shows that 72 are Episcopalian, 37 Methodist, 1 Moravian, 6 Presbyterian, 70 Roman Catholic and 33 undenominational. Many of the Episcopalian schools are taught by ministers, while of the Roman Catholic schools 7 are taught by missionary priests and 15 by Sisters of religious orders. Most of the undenominational schools are maintained in the Iroquoian communities in the Province of Ontario.

There are 33 boarding schools in the Dominion, recognized and subsidized by the Government. Of these 16 are Roman Catholic; managed by four religious orders of women; 9 by Missionary Oblate Fathers and 3 by laymen. There are 10 Episcopalian institutions, 4 of which are managed by ministers and 6 by laymen. There are 2 Methodist schools managed by laymen and 5 Presbyterian, 2 of which are managed by ministers and 3 by laymen. Only one of these boarding schools, that at Fort William, is in Ontario, the 32 others are in the Northwestern territories and provinces between Lake Superior and the Pacific Ocean.

The Dominion Government recognizes and subsidizes 22 industrial schools, in which the boys are taught farming and different trades, and the girls sewing, knitting and general housework. Of these institutions 7 are classed as Episcopalian, of which 4 are managed by ministers and 3 by laymen; 9 are Roman Catholic and managed by missionary priests; 4 are Methodist and managed by ministers of that denomination.

A careful study of the reports of all the Indian agents in the Dominion of Canada shows that the system of management is wise and paternal. The tenure of office of these officials is not affected by political changes, and in most cases it is terminated only by death. A considerable number are local pastors and missionary fathers. There are no such scandals and frauds perpetrated upon the unsophisticated Indian tribes and communities as we read of in the reports of the American agents—while in regard to the welfare of the Indian youth in what relates to their intellectual and religious interest there is a marked contrast. On the American side of the line the Government has spent $20,000,000 of public funds during the past decade to secularize the education of American Indian youth. On the Dominion side the Canadian policy has been to subsidize such religious organizations as were most available according to the religious belief of the Indians in their respective localities. Among the subjects designated by the Superintendent of Indian Affairs of the Dominion of Canada, upon which each agent or principal of Indian schools is required to report, is "Moral and Religious Training."

To illustrate the working of the Canadian system, extracts from the reports of the principals of some of these educational institutions are submitted. The principal of the Brandon Industrial School, in the Province of Manitoba, Rev. John Semmens, a Methodist minister, states: "The following is a list of the services held for the moral benefit of the pupils of our school: Prayers after breakfast in the school room, studies opened with prayer and hymns sung during the day, public prayers every evening at 8 o'clock, prayers with sick children in the hospital room, pupils on Sabbath morning permitted to attend the church in the city, on Sabbath evenings a service of song and prayer and exhortation." These Indian children get a good deal of Methodism.

The principal of the Wikwemikong Industrial School, in Ontario, attached to the extensive missionary establishment of the Jesuit Fathers, which is Rev. G. A. Artus, S. J., states: "The pupils are instructed very carefully in morals and religion by the missionaries themselves, and I am pleased to say that the general conduct has been good, and but few punishments had to be administered last year. The discipline is enforced almost exclusively by means of religious exhortation, prizes and distinctions of honor. They attend all the religious services held in the parish church and receive twice a week special religious and moral instruction."

One of the largest industrial schools in the Province of Manitoba is that of St. Boniface, a Catholic institution. The principal of this school is Rev. J. B. Dorais, who states: "Being aware of the necessity and importance of developing the moral faculties of the children from their childhood, all efforts are made to teach them the principles of Christianity and their duty to God, to others and to themselves. They are brought up in the fear of God and in obedience to the authority which rules them. The pupils' conduct is all that can be desired."

One of the largest industrial schools in the Northwest territories is located at Battleford. It is an Episcopal institution and liberally subsidized. Its principal is Rev. E. Matheson, an Episcopal clergyman, who states: "Moral and religious training is carefully attended to as being the only sure foundation on which to build up a truly useful life; there are daily prayers morning and evening, Sunday services and Sunday school."

The only Presbyterian industrial school in the Northwest territories is at Regina. It is an extensive institution and subsidized by the Dominion Government to the extent of $19,500 per annum. It is in charge of Rev. A. J. McLeod, a Presbyterian minister, who states: "Great emphasis is laid on the religious training. Since the school opened 72 boys and girls have been admitted into the

Presbyterian Church by profession of faith. In this great work of character building all the members of the staff most cordially coöperate. Regular Sabbath services are held, including a Sabbath school in the afternoon."

The St. Albert Boarding School, in the Northwest territories, is one of the large institutions, of which there are several, which are managed by Sisters of Charity. The Mother Superior, L. A. Dandurand, states: "The greatest care is taken in forming the pupils' character and intellect and to avoid bad habits or influence."

Which of the two systems will conduce most practically to the welfare of the youth of the American Indian race? This race is identical in stock to a great extent on both sides of the national boundary line. On the American side the system of management which has failed to protect the Indian from periodical frauds, is tainted with political influence and interests, and has not been able to combat the efforts of sectarian bigotry to force upon the country the secularization of the education of Indian youth, while spending $41.60 per capita in the administration of the liberal annual appropriations made by Congress.

The system of management of the Dominion Government is wise and paternal. It is neither tainted by political influence nor has it been affected by sectarian bigotry. Where Indian communities are Catholic, educational and religious instruction are provided because of right and as a matter of policy. Where Episcopalian, Methodist or Presbyterian missionaries have won the Indian from paganism to Christianity, Government aid is freely given to advance this work of civilization, while among the semi-civilized communities in Ontario it is left to these communities to decide upon the cult of religious ministration.

Which of the two systems is the most humane, which the most advantageous to the American Indian, to his present, to his future status as well as to his eternal welfare? Is it not time that a change was made in the interests of humanity in the management and care of our Indian communities?

RICHARD R. ELLIOTT.

Detroit, Mich.

CONSTITUTIO DE IUBILAEI INDULGENTIIS.

I.

Suspensio Indulgentiarum et Facultatum vertente Anno Universalis Iubilæi Millesimo Noningentesimo.

LEO EPISCOPUS

SERVUS SERVORUM DEI

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.

QUOD Pontificum maximorum sanxit auctoritas, ut Anni sacri solemnia Romae potissimum agerentur, id quidem cum provisa divinitus dignitate et grandioribus muneribus almae Urbis est admodum congruens. Haec enim omnium, quotquot ubique sunt, christianorum patria communis: haec sedes sacrae potestatis princeps, eademque traditae a Deo doctrinae custos sempiterna: hinc ut abunico augustissimoque capite in omnes christianae reipublicae venas perenni communicatione vita propagatur. Nihil ergo tam consentaneum, quam catholicos homines vocatu Sedis Apostolicae huc certa per intervalla temporum convenire, ut scilicet una simul et remedia expiandis animis in Urbe reperiant et romanam auctoritatem praesentes agnoscant. Quod cum tam salutare ac frugiferum appareat, sane cupimus ut urbs Roma toto anno proximo maiore qua fieri potest frequentia mortalium celebretur: ob eamque rem peregrinationis romanae cupidis velut stimulos additurі, admissorum expiandorum privilegia, quae liberalitate indulgentiaque Ecclesiae passim concessa sunt, intermitti volumus: videlicet, quod plures decessores Nostri in caussis similibus consuevere, Indulgentias usitatas apostolica auctoritate ad totum Annum sacrum suspendimus: verumtamen prudenti quadam temperatione modoque adhibito, ut infra scriptum est.

Integras atque immutatas permanere volumus et decernimus.

I. Indulgentias *in articulo mortis* concessas:

II. Eam, qua fruuntur ex auctoritate Benedicti XIII. decessoris Nostri, quotquot ad sacri aeris pulsum de genu vel stantes *Salutationem angelicam,* aliamve pro temporis ratione precationem recitaverint:

III. Indulgentiam decem annorum totidemque quadragenarum Pii IX. auctoritate an. MDCCCLXXVI iis tributam qui pie templa visitent in quibus Sacramentum augustum quadraginta horarum spatio adorandum proponitur:

IV. Illas item Innocentii XI. et Innocentii XII. decessorum Nostrorum decreto iis constitutas, qui Sacramentum augustum, cum ad aegrotos defertur, comitentur, vel cereum aut facem per alios deferendam ea occasione mittant:

V. Indulgentiam alias concessam adeuntibus pietatis causâ templum sanctae Mariae Angelorum Ordinis Fratrum Minorum extra Assisii moenia a vesperis Calendarum Augusti ad solis occasum diei insequentis:

VI. Indulgentias, quas S. R. E. Cardinales Legati a latere, apostolicae Sedis Nuntii, item Episcopi in usu Pontificalium aut impertienda benedictione aliave forma consueta largiri solent:

VII. Indulgentias Altarium Privilegiatorum pro fidelibus defunctis, aliasque eodem modo pro solis defunctis concessas: item quaecumque vivis quidem concessae sint, sed hac dumtaxat causa ut defunctis per modum suffragii directe applicari valeant. Quas omnes et singulas volumus non prodesse vivis, prodesse defunctis.

De facultatibus vero haec constituimus et sancimus, quae sequuntur.

I. Rata firmaque sit facultas Episcopis aliisque locorum Ordinariis impertiendi indulgentias *in articulo mortis* eamdemque communicandi secundum Litteras a Benedicto XIV. decessore Nostro datas Nonis Aprilis An. MDCCXLVII:

II. Item ratae firmaeque sint facultates Tribunalis Officii Inquisitionis adversus haereticam pravitatem, eiusque Officialium: Missionariorum quoque et Ministrorum qui vel ab eodem Tribunali, vel a Congregatione S. R. E. Cardinalium negotiis propagandae Fidei praeposita, vel alias ab apostolica Sede ad id deputati fuerint: nominatim facultas absolvendi ab haeresi eos, qui, eiurato errore, ad fidem redierint:

III. Ratae firmaeque sint facultates, quas Officium Poenitentiariae Nostrae apostolicae Missionariis, in locis Missionum earumque occasione exercendas, concesserit:

IV. Item facultates Episcoporum aliorumque sacrorum Antistitum circa dispensationes et absolutiones suorum subditorum in casibus occultis etiam Sedi apostolicae reservatis, quemadmodum ipsis a sacra Tridentina Synodo, seu alias, etiam in publicis casibus, a iure communi ecclesiastico et ab apostolica Sede pro certis personis et casibus permissae dignoscuntur. Idem statuimus de facultatibus Antistitum Ordinum religiosorum, quaecumque ipsis in Regulares sibi subiectos ab apostolica Sede tributae sint.

Iis exceptis, de quibus supra memoravimus, ceteras omnes et singulas Indulgentias tam plenarias, etiam ad instar Iubilaei concessas, quam non plenarias, suspendimus ac nullas iubemus esse. Similique ratione facultates et indulta absolvendi etiam a casibus Nobis et apostolicae Sedi reservatis, relaxandi censuras, commutandi vota, dispensandi etiam super irregularitatibus et impedimentis cuilibet quoquo modo concessa, suspendimus ac nulli suffragari volumus ac decernimus. Quocirca praesentium auctoritate Litterarum praecipimus ac mandamus, ut, praeter Indulgentias Iubilaei, easque, quas supra nominatim excepimus, nullae praeterea aliae uspiam, sub poena excommunicationis eo ipso incurrendae aliisque poenis arbitrio Ordinariorum infligendis, publicentur, indicantur, vel in usum demandentur.

Quaecumque autem his Litteris decreta continentur, omnia ea stabilia, rata, valida esse volumus et iubemus, contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Earum vero exemplis aut transumptis, etiam impressis, Notarii publici manu et sigillo personae in ecclesiastica dignitate constitutae munitis, eamdem volumus haberi fidem, quae haberetur praesentibus si essent exhibitae vel ostensae.

Nulli ergo hominum liceat hanc paginam Nostrae suspensionis, decreti, declarationis, voluntatis infringere, vel ei ausu temerario contra ire: si quis autem hoc attentare praesumpserit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei ac beatorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli se noverit incursurum.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum anno Incarnationis Dominicae millesimo octingentesimo nonagesimo nono Pridie Cal. Octobris, Pontificatus Nostri anno vicesimo secundo.

C. *Card.* ALOISI MASELLA, *Pro-Dat.*
A. *Card.* MACCHI.

Visa de Curia: I. DE AQUILA E VICECOMITIBUS.
Loco † Plumbi.
Reg. in Secret. Brevium: I. CUGNONIUS.

II.

Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Leonis divina providentia PapaeXIII. Constitutio qua indulgentiae Iubilaei anni MDCCCC conceduntur monialibus; oblatis, tertiariis aliisque sive puellis sive mulieribus in monasteriis piisve communitatibus degentibus, eremitis, infirmis, carcere aut captivitate detentis, cum opportunis facultatibus circa absolutiones et votorum commutationes.

LEO EPISCOPUS
SERVUS SERVORUM DEI
Ad futuram rei memoriam.

Aeterni Pastoris infinitam caritatem animo reputantes, qui *proprias oves vocat nominatim,*[1] *ut vitam habeant et abundantius habeant,*[2] quique ipsarum adventum ad sui gremium non modo expectat, sed ipse saepe praevertit, consilium agitavimus de Apostolicae liberalitatis thesauro recludendo in proximum annum Iubilaei iis etiam, quibus sua conditio non sinit ut praescriptam peregrinationem ad almam hanc Urbem et ad beatorum Apostolorum limina suscipiant. Placuit igitur fructu vacuam non redire multorum fidem ac pietatem, qui huiusmodi iter summo cum studio essent aggressuri, nisi eos aut septa monasterii, aut ineluctabilis captivitas, aut corporis infirmitas impediret. Quae quidem relaxatio atque benignitas non istorum tantum necessitati aut utilitati prospiciet, sed in communem omnium salutem redundabit. Coniunctis enim tot hominum precibus et lacrimis, quos vel vitae innocentia et religionis ardor, vel poenitentia, vel calamitas segregavit a ceteris, divinae misericordiae placandae spem licebit multo validiorem fovere. Quamobrem vi praesentium litterarum opportunas rationes describere decrevimus, quibus quum viri tum mulieres in eremis, monasteriis et religiosis domibus assidue vitam degentes, vel custodiis et carceribus detenti, vel morbis aut infirmitatibus impediti quominus veneranda Apostolorum sepulcra et Patriarchales Urbis Basilicas adeant, permissarum absolutionum concessique plenarii Iubilaei fieri participes valeant.

Qui autem sub hac providentia comprehenduntur, hi sunt:

I. Moniales omnes, quotquot solemnia vota religionis ediderunt et in monasteriis degunt sub claustri perpetui disciplina; item quae tyrocinium exercent, quaeve in monasteriis, aut educationis aut alia de causa legitima, commorantur. Pariter Monasteriorum huiusmodi Moniales, quae stipis colligendae gratia septa religiosa egrediuntur:

II. Oblatae, vitae societate coniunctae, quarum Instituta fuerint ab Apostolica Sede vel ratione stabili, vel ad experimentum probata, una cum suis novitiis atque educandis puellis aliisque communi cum ipsis contubernio utentibus, quamquam severiori claustri lege non adstringantur.

III. Tertiariae sub uno eodemque tecto communiter viventes cum suis pariter novitiis atque educandis puellis, aliisque cum ipsis una degentibus, etsi severiore claustri lege minime teneantur, earumque Institutum nec unquam ad hunc diem ab Apostolica Sede approbatum fuerit, nec ut approbatum in posterum haberi debeat vi praesentis concessionis:

IV. Puellae ac mulieres in gynaeceis seu Conservatoriis degentes, quamvis nec Moniales, nec Oblatae, nec Tertiariae, nullisque claustri legibus obnoxiae sint. Has omnes, quas diximus, tam in Urbe quam extra, ubique locorum et gentium degentes, praesentis concessionis gratia et privilegio frui posse decernimus ac declaramus.

V. Idem concedimus Anachoretis atque Eremitis, non quidem eis qui nullis clausurae legibus adstricti vel in collegio et societate, vel solitarii sub Ordinariorum regimine certisque legibus aut regulis obtemperantes vivunt: sed eis qui in continua licet non omnimode perpetua clausura et solitudine deditam contemplationi vitam agunt, etiamsi monasticum aut regularem Ordinem profiteantur, ut Cistercienses aliquot, Chartusienses, Monachi et Eremitae sancti Romualdi solent.

VI. Ad utriusque sexus Christifideles eamdem concessionis gratiam extendimus, qui captivi in hostium potestatem versantur, ad eosque ubique locorum, qui ex civilibus aut criminalibus causis in carcere detinentur; item qui exilii poenam aut deportationis luunt; qui in triremibus aut alibi ad opus damnati reperiuntur; denique ad religiosos viros qui suis in coenobiis sub custodia retinentur vel qui ex rectorum praecepto certam habent sedem, quasi exilii aut deportationis loco assignatam.

VII. Eamdem concessionem communem esse pariter volumus utriusque sexus infirmis cuiusvis ordinis et conditionis, vel qui iam extra Urbem in morbum aliquem inciderint, cuius causa, intra Iubilaei annum, Urbem adire, medici iudicio, non possint, vel qui, licet convaluerint, non sine tamen gravi incommodo romanum iter aggredi possint, vel qui omnino dare se in iter imbecilla ex habitu valetudine prohibeantur. Horum denique numero senes haberi volumus, qui septuagesimum aetatis suae annum excesserint.

Itaque istos omnes et singulos monemus, hortamur et obsecramus in Domino, ut peccata sua *in amaritudine animae* recolentes eademque intimo animi sensu detestantes, saluberrimo Poenitentiae sacramento et congruis satisfactionibus suam quisque conscientiam expiare curent; tum ad caeleste Convivium ea, qua par est, fide, reverentia, caritate, accedant, Deumque optimum maximum, per Unigenitum Filium eius ac per merita augustissimae Virginis Mariae et beatorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli omniumque Sanctorum, iuxta Nostram Ecclesiaeque mentem enixis precibus orent pro sanctae Ecclesiae prosperitate atque incremento, pro extirpandis erroribus, pro catholicorum principum concordia, totiusque christiani populi tranquillitate et salute; in eumque finem visitationi quatuor Urbis Basilicarum, alia religionis, pietatis, caritatis opera devote sufficiant, quum voluntaria, tum praesertim a delectis sacri ordinis viris auctoritate Nostra iniungenda, prout infra edicitur.

Scilicet volumus ac iubemus ut venerabiles fratres Episcopi aliique locorum Ordinarii Monialibus, Oblatis, Tertiariis, aliisque superius memoratis sive puellis, sive mulieribus, Anachoretis, Eremitis, in carcere detentis, aegrotantibus et septuagenario maioribus, statuant ac praescribant sive per se, sive per prudentes Confessarios, congrua religionis ac pietatis opera iuxta singulorum statum, conditionem et valetudinem ac loci et temporis rationes: quorum perfunctionem operum pro visitatione quatuor Urbis Basilicarum valere volumus ac decernimus. Eamdem commutandorum operum facultatem concedimus Praelatis Regularibus, videlicet utendam erga Instituta et personas singulas quae in ipsorum iurisdictione sint.—Eodem genere personis quae in Urbe degant, designari opera sufficienda volumus per dilectum Filium Nostrum S. R. E. Cardinalem Vicarium eiusque vices gerentem, sive per se ipsos sive per prudentes Confessarios.

Itaque Omnipotentis Dei misericordia et Beatorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli auctoritate confisi, iis omnibus et singulis, quos supra memoravimus, vere poenitentibus et intra praesentem Iubilaei annum rite confessis ac sacra Communione refectis, Deumque, ut supra dictum est, orantibus, omnia denique implentibus alia iniungenda opera in locum visitationum, ac, vel inchoatis tantum iisdem operibus, si morbus periculosus oppresserit, plenissimam omnium peccatorum indulgentiam, veniam et remissionem, etiam duplici vice intra anni sancti decursum si iniuncta opera iteraverint, haud secus ac si praescripta communiter ceteris omnibus expleverint, de Apostolicae liberalitatis amplitudine largimur atque concedimus.

Monialibus earumque novitiis licere volumus, at prima dumtaxat vice, sumere sibi ex alterutro Cleri ordine Confessarios, qui tamen sint ad audiendas Monialium confessiones rite approbati. Anachoretis atque Eremitis supra dictis, itemque Oblatis, Tertiariis, puellis ac mulieribus in monasteriis piisque domibus vitam communem agentibus, quibus forte ordinario tempore eligendi sibi Confessarii libera facultas non sit, similiterque Christifidelibus captivitate, carcere aut custodia, infirmitate aut senectute impeditis, fas esse iubemus eligere sibi prima vice dumtaxat Confessarios quoscumque, dummodo ad confessiones personarum saecularium probati rite sint. Idem eisdem conditionibus liceat viris religiosis ex quolibet Ordine aut Congregatione vel Instituto.—Confessariis sic electis concedimus et tribuimus ut personas supra dictas, auditis earum confessionibus, absolvere possint a quibusvis peccatis, etiam apostolicae Sedi speciali forma reservatis, excepto casu haeresis formalis et externae, imposita poenitentia salutari aliisque iuxta canonicas sanctiones rectaeque disciplinae regulas iniungendis. Praeterea confessariis, quos moniales sibi elegerint, facultatem facimus dispensandi super vota quaelibet ab ipsis post solemnem professionem facta, quae regulari observantiae minime adversentur.

Simili modo Confessarios supra memoratos etiam dispensando commutare posse volumus omnia vota, quibus Oblatae Novitiae, Tertiariae, puellae et mulieres in communibus domibus agentes sese obstrinxerint, exceptis iis, quae Nobis et apostolicae Sedi reservata sint: factaque commutatione, a votorum etiam iuratorum observantia absolvere.

Hortamur autem Venerabiles Fratres Episcopos aliosque locorum Ordinarios, ut, Apostolicae Nostrae benignitatis exemplo, eligendis ad praesentium effectum Confessariis impertiri ne recusent facultatem absolvendi a casibus qui ipsis Ordinariis reservati sint.

Volumus denique ut praesentium transumptis sive exemplis, etiam impressis, manu alicuius notarii publici et sigillo viri in sacri ordinis dignitate constituti munitis, eadem ab omnibus adiungatur fides, quae ipsis praesentibus adhiberetur, si exhibitae forent vel ostensae. Ceterum harum decreta et iussa Litterarum rata, valida, firma in omnes partes esse et fore decernimus, contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Nulli ergo omnino hominum liceat paginam hanc Nostrae declarationis, hortationis, concessionis, derogationis, decreti et voluntatis infringere vel ei ausu temerario contraire; si quis autem hoc attentare praesumpserit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei ac beatorum Petri et Pauli Apostolorum eius se noverit incursurum.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum anno Incarnationis Dominicae millesimo octingentesimo nonagesimo nono Calend. Novembris, Pontificatus Nostri anno vicesimo secundo.

C. *Card.* ALOISI MASELLA, *Pro-Dat.*

A. *Card.* MACCHI.

Loco † Plumbi.

Visa de Curia: I. DE AQUILA E VICECOMITIBUS.
Reg. in Secret. Brevium: I. CUGNONIUS.

SUSPENSION OF INDULGENCES AND FACULTIES DURING THE YEAR OF UNIVERSAL JUBILEE 1900.

I.

LEO, BISHOP

SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD

For Perpetual Remembrance.

THE custom sanctioned by the authority of the Supreme Pontiffs, namely, that the solemnities of the Holy Year should be accomplished chiefly at Rome, is indeed appropriate in the highest degree to the divinely appointed dignity, and to the larger gifts of the Beloved City. For this is the common country of all Christians, whoever and wherever they may be; it is the chief seat of Sacred Power, and the everlasting guardian of the doctrine handed down by God; and from here, as from the sole and most venerable source, life is transmitted perennially through all the veins of the Christian Republic. It is, therefore, highly proper, that at the call of the Apostolic See, Catholics should gather here at certain intervals, in order that at one and the same time they may find in the City remedies suitable for the purification of their souls, and, by their presence, acknowledge the authority of Rome. So salutary and profitable does this seem, that We earnestly desire to behold multitudes thronging Rome during the entire coming year; and, to offer additional incentives to those wishing to make the pilgrimage to Rome, We will that the privileges which are freely granted by the indulgent liberality of the Church, for the expiation of sins committed, be suspended; that is to say, as has been the custom of Our Predecessors in similar cases, by Our Apostolic Authority We suspend the usual Indulgences during the entire Holy Year; with, however, the prudent modification and qualification hereinafter described:

We will and decree that there shall remain intact and unchanged:

I. Indulgences granted *in articulo mortis:*

II. The Indulgences which, by the authority of Our Predecessor, Benedict XIII., those may gain, who, at the sound of the church bell, shall recite, either while standing or kneeling, the Angelic Salutation, or other prayer proper to the season:

III. The Indulgences of ten years and ten quarantines granted in 1876 by the authority of Pius IX., to those who piously visit churches in which the Blessed Sacrament is exposed for adoration during the Forty Hours:

IV. The Indulgences granted by the decree of Our Predecessors, Innocent XI. and Innocent XII., to those who accompany the Blessed Sacrament when It is carried to the sick; or, who send a candle or a torch to be borne by others on such occasions:

V. The Indulgence heretofore granted to those who through piety visit the Church of St. Mary of the Angels, of the order of the Friars Minor, outside the walls of Assisi, from Vespers on the first of August to the setting of the sun on the following day:

VI. Indulgences which Cardinal Legates *a latere* of the Holy Roman Church, Nuncios of the Apostolic See, Bishops in Pontifical functions, or, when giving their blessing, or in any other accustomed form, are wont to bestow:

VII. The Indulgences of privileged Altars for the faithful departed, and others granted in the same manner for the deceased alone; and, also, whatsoever Indulgences may have been granted for the living, but with the express proviso that these shall be applied directly by way of suffrage to the dead. We will that all and each of these shall not avail the living, but the dead.

We ordain and decree the following regulations concerning faculties:

I. The faculty is ratified and continued by which Bishops and other Ordinaries of places grant the Indulgences *in articulo mortis*, and communicate the same faculty according to the letter given by our predecessor, Benedict XIV., 5th of April, 1747:

II. The faculties of the Tribunal of the Office of the Inquisition against heretical perverseness, and the faculties of its officials are ratified and continued; likewise, the faculties of Missionaries and Ministers who shall have been deputed, either by this Tribunal, or by the Congregation of Cardinals entrusted with the work of the Propagation of the Faith, or who shall have been otherwise deputed by the Apostolic See; especially the faculty of absolving from heresy those who have foresworn their error, and have returned to the Faith:

III. The faculties are ratified and continued, which the Office of Our Apostolic Penitentiary has conceded to Missionaries, to be used in and for the benefit of their respective Missions:

IV. Likewise the Faculties of Bishops and other Sacred Prelates in the matter of dispensing and absolving their subjects in secret cases, even in those reserved to the Apostolic See, in the manner provided for by the Holy Council of Trent, or otherwise, even in public cases, by the common Ecclesiastical Law, and by the Apostolic See for certain persons and cases. We decree the same with regard to such faculties of Prelates of Religious Orders as may have been granted them by the Apostolic See for the regulars subject to them.

With the exceptions mentioned above, We suspend and We order to be considered as null, all other Indulgences both Plenary, even those granted in the form of Jubilee, as well as Partial Indulgences. And, in like manner, We suspend, and We will and decree to be absolutely inoperative, all faculties and indults of absolving, even in cases reserved to Us and to the Apostolic See, of relaxing censures, of commuting vows, of dispensing in any irregularities and impediments, to whomsoever or in whatsoever manner these faculties and indults may have been granted. Wherefore, by the authority of the present Letters We direct and command that, excepting the Indulgences of the Jubilee, and those which we have especially named above, no others in any place whatsoever be published, proclaimed, or practised, under pain of excommunication to be incurred by the very fact, and under such other penalties as may be inflicted by the judgment of the Ordinaries.

We will and order that all the Decrees contained in these Letters be held as established, ratified and valid, all to the contrary notwithstanding.

We will that the same authority be attributed to copies of these Letters, even if printed, provided they be signed by the hand of a Notary, and confirmed by the seal of some one in Ecclesiastical dignity, as would be possessed by these presents if exhibited.

No man, therefore, may infringe or temerariously venture to contravene this document of Our suspension, decree, declaration, will. If any one shall so presume, let him know that he will incur the wrath of Almighty God, and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.

Given at St. Peter's in Rome in the year of the Incarnation of Our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine, on the 30th day of September, in the twenty-second year of our Pontificate.

C. *Card.* ALOYSIUS MASELLA, *Pro-Datary.*

A. *Card.* MACCHI.

Visa de Curia: J. DE AQUILA VISCONTI.

Registered in the Secretariate of Briefs: I. CUGNONI.

II.

OUR MOST HOLY FATHER

LEO XIII.

BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE

POPE.

Constitution in which the Indulgences of the Jubilee Year 1900 are granted to Nuns, Oblates, Tertiaries and others, whether girls or women, dwelling in Monasteries or Pious Communities, to Hermits, to the sick, to those detained in prisons or captivity, with suitable Faculties for Absolution and Commutation of Vows.

LEO, BISHOP

SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD

For Future Remembrance.

Recalling to mind the infinite charity of the eternal Shepherd, who *calls his own sheep by name* (John x., 3), *so that they may have life, and have it more abundantly* (Ibid., 10), and Who not only waits their coming to His bosom, but often Himself anticipates it, We have resolved to open the treasury of Apostolic liberality in the coming year of Jubilee, even to those whose condition does not allow them to undertake the prescribed pilgrimage to this Beloved City and *ad limina Apostolorum.* It has pleased Us, therefore, to avoid rendering fruitless the faith and piety of many who would with the greatest eagerness undertake a journey of this kind unless prevented either by monastic walls or unavoidable captivity, or bodily infirmity. This benevolent relaxation will provide serviceably not only for their need, but will redound to the common weal. For the combined prayers and tears of so many whom innocence of life and religious fervor, or penance, or misfortune, has set apart from others encourages Us to cherish a much stronger hope of appeasing the Divine mercy. Wherefore, by virtue of the present Letters We have decreed to make known the appropriate manner in which both men and women who live in hermitages, monasteries and religious houses, or who are detained in barracks or in prisons, or who are prevented by disease or infirmities, from visiting the venerated tombs of the Apostles and the Patriarchal Basilicas of this City, can become sharers in the absolutions offered to them in the Plenary come sharers in the absolutions offered to them in the Plenary Jubilee.

Those who are thus provided for are:

I. All Nuns who have made solemn vows of Religion, and who live in convents under the discipline of perpetual enclosure; as well as those who are making their novitiate, or who for purposes of education or for some other lawful cause dwell in such convents. Likewise Nuns of such Conventual Institutions who leave the precincts of their convents for the purpose of collecting alms:

II. Female Oblates living in common, whose Institutes have been approved by the Apostolic See, either permanently or temporarily, together with their novices, the children who are being educated by them, and others living under their roof, although they are not bound by the law of strict enclosure:

III. Female Tertiaries living in common under the same roof, likewise with their novices, the children they are educating, and others dwelling with them, even though they are bound by no law of enclosure, and even though their Institute has not as yet been approved by the Apostolic See, and should not be held in future as approved by reason of the present concession:

IV. Girls and women in Institutions, or dwelling in seminaries, although neither Nuns or Oblates or Tertiaries, nor in any way bound by the law of enclosure. We declare and decree that all these thus far mentioned, whether in the City or out of it, no matter where they live, or of what race they are, can enjoy the favor and privilege of the present concession:

V. We grant the same to Anchorites and Hermits, not indeed to those who, bound by no laws of enclosure, live either in community or solitary under the government of their Ordinaries, obeying certain laws or rules: but to those who lead contemplative lives in continuous, although not in all respects, perpetual enclosure and solitude, even though they profess a monastic or regular Order, as many Cistercians, Carthusians, Monks, and Hermits of St. Romuald are wont to do:

VI. We extend the same favor to the faithful of both sexes, who are held captive in the power of their enemies, and to those who in any part of the world are imprisoned either in civil or criminal cases; or who are undergoing the punishment of exile or deportation; who are condemned to hard labor in the galleys or elsewhere; finally, to male religious who are under restraint in their own monasteries, or who by the command of their Superiors have a fixed location assigned to them in lieu of exile or deportation:

VII. We likewise will that the same concession be granted to the sick of both sexes, of whatever rank or condition, who either outside the City shall have already contracted a disease which, in the opinion of their physician, prevents them from undertaking the journey to the City within the year of Jubilee, or who, although convalescent, cannot undergo the fatigue of the journey to Rome without serious inconvenience, or who are prevented by habitual ill health from attempting the voyage. We will that those who have passed their seventieth year shall be considered in the same category.

Therefore, we admonish, exhort, and beseech in the Lord, each and all of these, that recalling their sins in the bitterness of their soul, and detesting them from the bottom of their heart, they may be careful to purify their conscience by the saving Sacrament of Penance, and by condign satisfaction; and approach, with all due faith, reverence and charity the Heavenly Banquet, and pray earnestly to the Most High God, through His Only Begotten Son, and the merits of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, and of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul and of all the Saints, for Our intention and the intention of the Church, for the prosperity and spread of Holy Church, for the extirpation of all error, for concord among Catholic Rulers, and for the tranquillity and prosperity of the whole Christian people; and, to that end, devoutly substitute for the visitation of the four Basilicas of the City other voluntary works of religion, piety and charity, and especially such as are enjoined by Our authority by ecclesiastics delegated as hereinafter announced.

We will and order, namely, that our Venerable Brethren, the Bishops, and other Ordinaries of places designate and prescribe, either by themselves or through prudent Confessors, suitable works of religion and piety, according to the state, condition and health of each, and the circumstances of time and place, for Nuns, Oblates, Tertiaries and others mentioned above, whether girls or women, Anchorites, Hermits, Prisoners, the sick and septuagenarians: the performance of such works We will and decree to be equivalent to the visitation of the four Basilicas of the City.

We grant to Prelates regular the same faculty of commuting the prescribed good works in favor of their Institutes, and for the individuals who are under their jurisdiction.—We will that suitable works be designated for persons of this character who live in the City, by Our Beloved Son, the Cardinal Vicar and his vicegerents, either by themselves or by prudent Confessors.

Therefore, confiding in the mercy of Almighty God, and the authority of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, to each and every one of those whom We have named above, who being truly penitent, and within the present year of Jubilee, having duly confessed their sins, and been refreshed by Holy Communion, shall have prayed to God as above directed, and finally fulfilled all the other works enjoined in lieu of the visits, etc., and to those who may have fallen dangerously ill after having begun these same works, in the fulness of Apostolic liberality We bestow and grant a most Plenary Indulgence, pardon and remission of all their sins, even for a second time within the course of the Holy Year, if they shall have repeated the works enjoined, just as though they had complied with the conditions generally prescribed for all others.

We will that Nuns and Novices be permitted, but only once, to choose for themselves Confessors from either branch of the Clergy, provided, that these shall have been duly approved for hearing the Confessions of Nuns. We command that it be lawful for Anchorites and Hermits as above mentioned, likewise for Oblates, Tertiaries, girls and women living in community, in convents and in pious houses, who, ordinarily are not free to choose their own Confessors, and likewise to the faithful in captivity, in prison, or under restraint, impeded by infirmity or old age, to choose for themselves, but once only, any Confessor they please, provided that such Confessors shall have been duly approved for hearing the confessions of seculars. Under the same conditions, the same privilege is granted to male religious of whatsoever Order or Congregation or Institute. To the Confessors thus selected, We grant and give faculties to absolve the persons above mentioned, after hearing their Confessions, from any sins whatsoever, even from those reserved to the Apostolic See by especial form, except the case of formal and external heresy, a salutary penance being imposed, and others being enjoined according to the canonical sanctions and the rule of right discipline. Moreover, We give the Confessors whom nuns shall have chosen the faculty of dispensing from whatsoever vows these latter shall have made after their solemn profession, and which may not be opposed to the regular observance. In like manner, We will that Confessors above mentioned can commute, even by dispensing, all vows by which Oblates, Novices, Tertiaries, girls and women, dwelling in communities shall have bound themselves, excepting those which are reserved to Us and the Apostolic See: and, having made proper Commutation, they can absolve from the observance even of vows confirmed by oath.

We exhort Our Venerable Brethren, the Bishops and other Ordinaries of places, after the example of Our Apostolic benevolence not to refuse to give the Confessors chosen to carry into effect the present Letters, the faculty of absolving from cases which may be reserved by the Ordinaries themselves.

Finally, We will that the same authority be attributed to translations, or copies of the present Letters, even printed, provided they be signed by the hand of Notary, and confirmed by the seal of some one in ecclesiastical dignity, as would be possessed by these presents if exhibited. And We ordain that the decrees and orders of these Letters are, and shall be held as ratified valid, continued in full force in all their parts. All to the contrary notwithstanding.

No man, therefore, may infringe or temerariously venture to contravene this document of Our Declaration, Exhortation, Concession, Derogation, Decree and Will: if any one shall so presume let him know that he will incur the wrath of Almighty God and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.

Given at St. Peter's, in Rome, in the year of Our Lord, eighteen hundred and ninety-nine, on the 24th day of October, in the 22d year of Our Pontificate.

C. *Card.* ALOYSIUS MASELLA, *Pro-Datary.*

A. *Card.* MACCHI.

Visa de Curia: J. DE AQUILA VISCONTI.

Registered in the Secretariate of Briefs: I. CUGNONI.

Cathedral Library Association.

Scientific Chronicle.

A CURE FOR LEPROSY.

It is said, on what appears to be good authority, that a cure for leprosy has been really found. The matter is deemed of sufficient importance to engage the attention of the Government. A plant that grows in Venezuela is the agency which is said to possess the healing attribute. Surgeon General Wyman at Honolulu has had several specimens of the plant forwarded to him, and these are now growing under the observation of Dr. Carmichael, of the United States Marine Hospital. The authorities at Washington have requested him to watch the growth of the plants and make experiments with them. There is no description of them as yet—no name, botanical or vulgar, indeed; but it is claimed for the shrub that it has been found a cure in numerous cases. About a year ago it was stated that a priest had discovered a plant in some of the Pacific isles for which similar powers were claimed, but since the announcement was made no further particulars of any kind have been given to the world. We are left to conjecture whether the new claimant is the same as the previous one or not. The probability is that it is a different plant, since there is a cardinal difference in most cases between the flora of the South American region and that of the Melanasian islands, particularly in regard to essential characteristics.

THE UNPUNCTUAL NOVEMBER METEORS.

Great disappointment has been felt over the non-appearance of the Leonids last month, and still more at the failure of the astronomers to account for the failure of the celestial shoal to arrive on time. The assumption underlying this feeling is, of course, that the Leonids are an actually existent swarm of stellar material, not liable to extinction, absorption or organic change. This assumption may be entirely erroneous. The starry heavens tell of nothing more eloquently than of vast cataclysmal changes in the structure and composition of the matter of the universe. Who can tell whether the Leonids may not have been absorbed into the mass of some huge planet far beyond the range of our best telescopes? So far from this year being an *annus mirabilis,* from an astronomical standpoint, it was far inferior to the usual run in the matter of winter meteoric displays. Ordinarily November brings a considerable addition to the bedizenment of our nocturnal skies, but this particular November happened to be utterly insignificant in that respect. Among the various theories put forward to explain the disappointment one by Professor Pickering, of Harvard, appears to be the most plausible. His thesis is that the time has been wrongly computed, and that the shower is not due this year, but two years later, in 1901, and possibly three years later, in 1902! To reach this conclusion Professor Pickering went back to the year 902, when the first shower of Leonids of which there are preserved records took place. Every thirty-three and one-quarter years the shower reoccurred until 1602; that is, counting only by centuries, there were showers in 902, 1002, 1101, 1202, 1302, 1402, 1502 and 1602, and then there appears to have been a change in the orbit of the swarm, for instead of reappearing about one hundred years later, it reappeared ninety-six years later, in 1698, and since then the shower of Leonids has taken place not every thirty-three years, as is generally supposed, but every thirty-four years. There was a shower in 1833, and then the statement has been repeated many times of late that the next was in 1866. Professor Pickering admits that this may have been true in England, but it certainly is not a correct statement for America. There was a shower visible in 1866 in America, but it was not to be compared to the shower of one year later, 1867, when it may have been cloudy in England and therefore unnoted. And since that change in the orbit of the swarm in the seventeenth century it has appeared at intervals of thirty-four years. The error that astronomers all over the world have made lies in the fact that they computed from the early records without consulting carefully all the statistics of the centuries as Professor Pickering has just done. According to his calculation, then, the shower should arrive in 1901.

One fact seems to have been pretty generally overlooked in all the scientific explanations that we have seen. Those who remember the magnificent swarm of 1867 may recall the fact that the more brilliant ones usually burst like sky rockets. The cause of this was said to be their contact with the earth's atmosphere. Why may not have our planet overtaken the Leonids and passed them by at a comparatively short distance, supposing them to be still in existence? The failure to strike our atmospherical envelope might account for their invisibility. If they be subject to variations in their orbit, as Professor Pickering tells us, there is no good reason why our failure to see them last November may not be attributed to another change like that in the interval from 1602 to 1698.

CANCER AND VACCINATION.

The alarming hypothesis has been broached that the great increase in that frightful malady cancer is due to the practice of vaccination. The theory was put forward by Dr. W. B. Clarke, of Indianapolis, in a paper read a short time ago before the State Society of Homœopathic Physicians. Commencing with the fact that cancer is a disease characterized by rapid growth of abnormal cell-structure, he said: "It takes twenty-one years or more to make ease characterized by the rapid imposition of cells, I ask you is it safe a man, and but three or four to make a cow. As cancer is a disease characterized by the rapid imposition of cells, I ask you is it safe to put the rapid-growing cells or protoplasm of a diseased animal into the slow-growing cells of man, as is done in vaccination?" Dr. Clarke believes that we are reaping the harvest of the seed so generally introduced forty to fifty years ago, and that deaths from cancer are more numerous in England and Prussia, simply because the pernicious practice (of vaccination for smallpox) was generally introduced so much earlier there.

This is something for the out-and-out vaccinationists to ponder over. Dr. Clark's inferences seem to be borne out to some extent by Dr. Lambert Lack, a London physician, who has for a considerable time been investigating the reason for the abnormal ratio of increase in cancer cases. He gave his views and basic reasons to the *Lancet* a short time ago. He had long believed that the epithelial cells of cancer were themselves the sole infective agents; that this cancer epithelium was practically normal epithelium, only out of place, and that from the very commencement of the cancer it was growing in the lymph spaces. "I thought from this," he goes on, "that if the normal epithelium by some accidental means should obtain entrance into the lymph spaces it would find no barrier to its continued growth and would produce all the phenomena of cancer. At present I have performed but a single experiment to test this view. I obtained an emulsion of the epithelial cells from the healthy ovary of a healthy rabbit and placed them in the animal's peritoneum. The animal died fourteen months afterward, and on examination masses of growth were found in the abdominal and thoracic cavities having the characteristic features of typical ovarian cancer."

Dr. Lack undertook to furnish the results obtained from further experiments in this direction, and until this information is forthcoming it would be rash to predicate acceptance of these somewhat startling statements about inoculation from animals.

A CETACIAN CURE FOR RHEUMATISM.

According to the *British Australian*, several persons suffering from rheumatism have arrived at the Kiah whaling station, in the Eden district, New South Wales, for the purpose of undergoing the whale-bath cure. The treatment requires the patient, divested of his clothing, frequently to remain for a long time in the interior of a dead whale. Some remarkable cures are said to have been effected by the treatment. This feat recalls a somewhat similar one which gained for a distinguished Dublin surgeon a knighthood. He treated a Lord Lieutenant for a cutaneous disease, and the method he adopted was to get him into the interior of a cow freshly killed and still warm. It was heroic, but, as the story goes, perfectly successful, and the grateful viceroy, beside a munificent fee, bestowed on the surgeon the knightly accolade. In old medicine such remedies were frequently resorted to; and many more of a still more repulsive character. The pendulum of therapeutics seems to be swinging back to the ancient ideas, and perhaps in due time we may witness the reintroduction of astrology as one of the subjects to be taken in the preparatory medical course.

A NAVIGABLE AIR-SHIP AT LAST.

It seems to be beyond all doubt that the dream of the aëronauts, a balloon or air-ship that can be steered like a marine vessel and driven even against the wind as a steamer, is at last realized. To France, the natal place of the air balloon, belongs the palm of success in this marvelous undertaking. The inventor is M. de Santos Dumont. His balloon is twenty metres in height and 7½ metres in diameter. It is inflated with five hundred cubic metres of gas. In this machine M. Dumont has made several ascents with complete success. He has circled in it about the Eiffel Tower, guiding it around the structure in an upward spiral movement and coming down with the greatest ease whenever he desired. The whole weight of the balloon, basket and steering apparatus is barely seventy-five kilos. The propellors and engines are of aluminum. The motor, the inventor says, is a modification of the De Dion type, and has double the power of an ordinary one, being provided with two cylinders, one over the other, and two pistons united by a bar passing through the top of the lower cylinder. The engine which gives motion to the propeller was invented by M. Dumont, but for a very different purpose. He used it first in an automobile race in Paris last year, and after that he bethought him of applying it to the propulsion of a balloon. All the scientists to whom he broached the subject shook their heads when they heard the suggestion of fire as an agency in connection with a balloon, but M. Dumont went ahead and carried out his idea. Although very satisfactory results so far has attended the experiments, he desiderates still better ones, and hopes to attain these by alterations in the propeller and the basket and getting a more powerful motor. The steering apparatus he finds so satisfactory that he intends to leave it as it is. Next year, when the weather clears, he intends making ascents along the shores of the Mediterranean, beginning at Nice or Monte Carlo. It is to be noted that Mr. Maxim, the famous inventor, was very sanguine of being the first to perfect a navigable balloon. He had done wonders in reducing the weight of the motor in the air-ship. In the first rude essays at human flight the only available source of power was that of the human muscle, which meant at least a thousand pounds per horse-power, if continued for any considerable time. Giffard's steam-engine and boiler taken together weighed, according to his own report of September, 1852, one hundred and ten pounds per horse-power. Some years later Mr. Stringfellow constructed a small model which is said to have weighed only thirteen pounds per horse-power. While both scientific and unscientific writers were debating the possibility of ever constructing a large motor of like efficiency, Mr. Maxim went resolutely to work and at one step reduced the weight to less than ten pounds per horse-power. Mr. Maxim expressed the belief further that a useful working steam-engine and boiler could be constructed to weigh but five pounds per horse-power! "I am of the opinion," he said, "that with a generator and engine especially constructed for lightness a naphtha motor could be constructed which would develop one hundred actual horse-power and not weigh more than five hundred pounds including the condenser, and still have a factor of safety quite as large as we find in locomotive practice." It will be seen that even these sanguine predictions have been surpassed by M. Dumont's actual achievements. So, too, with regard to the question of speed, M. Dumont calculates on being able to obtain, with his improved machinery, a velocity of sixty miles an hour in his aërial flights. This is beyond the wildest dreams of the previous experimentalists. One of the most eminent of these, Mr. Giffard, after the success of his first experiments, prepared the plans of a mammoth vessel which was to be propelled at a speed of forty-four miles an hour even with the engines he could then command. So confident was he, indeed, that he obtained a patent for and meant to venture the expense of constructing a balloon nearly two thousand feet long—a work he would undoubtedly have attempted had not blindness overtaken and prevented him. The Tissandier brothers, who for many years labored arduously in the cause of aëronautics, became convinced that it was only necessary to increase the size of the balloon to insure its success. But M. Dumont's remarkable results show that these eminent scientists had been looking for success along a mistaken plane. His balloon is comparatively small, and the great speed he believes he can attain is the result of the application of more efficient methods in the machinery of propulsion.

NON-ALCOHOLIC ANTIDOTES FOR SNAKE BITE.

So much has been published regarding the virtues of alcohol as an antidote for various kinds of poisoning, animal and mineral, that it is pleasing to hear of efforts made to discover remedies of a different character. The homœopathic principle is taken by some experimentalists as a basis in these investigations. Recently there appeared statements respecting an interesting series of experiments carried on by Professor F. R. Fraser, F. R. S., to establish the truth of a theory that the bile of certain animals will act as an antidote to the venom of serpents and against the toxin of such diseases as diphtheria and tetanus. The bile of noxious serpents is found to be a powerful antidote against the venom of serpents, and in the efficiency of its action is closely followed by the bile of innocuous serpents. Carrying the research still further, Professor Fraser found that the bile of animals without venom-producing glands—such as man, the ox, pig and rabbit—was definitely antidotal, but less so than that of serpents. In his experiments on the toxins of the disease it was found by Professor Fraser that the venomous serpents furnished bile that had much stronger antidotal action than that of the nonvenomous serpents, while among the non-venomous animals the bile of the rabbit was found to be efficacious not only against the toxins, but also the venoms.

SOME FALLACIES ABOUT READING DISTANCE.

The majority of readers labor under the belief that ease and comfort in this delightful mental exercise are to be best had by holding the book or newspaper which yields it quite close. It may be this pernicious habit which is responsible for the great prevalence of short vision among the people of to -day. Dr. Norburne B. Jenkins, who has made this subject a special study, recently laid down, in the *Medical Record,* some useful suggestions, founded upon laws which he had previously outlined. They seem applicable to the average case, though it seems to some that the capabilities of different classes of vision ought to be taken into account. The nearer objects approach the eyes, he finds, the greater will be the necesssary muscular effort and the sooner will the muscles refuse to perform their functions; the farther the type is held from the eyes, the less is the requisite muscular effort; hence it is probable that the farthest point at which distinct reading-vision is possible is the proper distance for continuous reading. Probably this point is more than thirty-five centimetres (fourteen inches) distant from the eyes, and is dependent upon the strength of the muscles, habit and the visual acuity.

PROGRESS IN ARTIFICIAL DIAMOND PRODUCTION.

The distinguished inventor of whom we have spoken in the preceding article, if he has been outdistanced in the race for the prize of the air, has his compensation in other directions. Besides his triumphs in the field of scientific slaughter, he has others more satisfactory to lovers of peaceful science. Amongst these is the artificial production of diamonds. He has devised a process for making a species of carbon which closely, if not completely, resembles diamond, and will be far less expensive than the natural diamond. The substance, when obtained, is used in the manufacture of filaments for high voltage incandescent lamps, which require a carbon possessing a high resistance and made of a highly refractory material. Acting on the principle that carbon dioxide may be kept in a liquid condition at a pressure of from 500 to 600 pounds to the square inch, but when converted into carbon monoxide requires a much greater pressure to confine, Mr. Maxim places in a strong, tightly closed vessel carbon dioxide in a liquid or solid state and some form of carbon, such as gasoline or other hydrocarbon. Decomposition is then effected by the electric arc, and part of the oxygen of the carbon dioxide unites with the carbon and furnishes carbon monoxide. The pressure thus becomes very high, and the carbon at or near the conductors is converted into a very hard substance in the form of diamond scales. The carbon produced by this process is reduced to a fine powder and then made into filaments in the usual way. The one formidable difficulty which confronted previous experimentalists in this field was to find a material for a jar so fireproof as to be able to withstand the enormous pressure from within generated by the terrific heat required for the process of converting the carbon into the mineral. This difficulty Mr. Maxim appears to have overcome, but by what method we have yet to learn. There is no statement as yet as to the nature of the material which he has found to answer his onerous requirements.

Book Reviews.

SOME RECENT BOOKS FROM THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO., CHICAGO:

THE DAWN OF A NEW ERA. By *Dr. Paul Carus.* Pp. 50.

SCIENCE AND FAITH. By *Dr. Paul Topinard.* Translated from the French by Thomas J. McCormack. Pp. vi., 361.

HISTORY OF MODERN PHILOSOPHY IN FRANCE. By *Lucien Levy-Bruhl.* Pp. x., 500.

"All the publications of the Open Court Publishing Company are brought out with a very practical end in view, which is nothing less than the reconstruction of religion upon the broad basis of modern science." This statement is authoritative. It emanates from Dr. Paul Carus, who is probably the head and, as we may judge by his works, the soul of the firm. The statement is found on the thirty-first page of *The Dawn of a New Era.* The "old traditional dogmas will have to be revised and thoroughly remodelled," we are told, and "the basis" on which the revision and remodelling is to be effected is "the doctrine of evolution" which we are informed "is one of the most important fundamental religious truths" (ib.). If any one be curious to know what special need there may be just now for the Open Court to take in hand "the reconstruction of religion," let him learn that "there are two kinds of Christianity. One is love and charity; it wants the truth brought out and desires to see it practically applied in daily life. It is animated by the spirit of Jesus and tends to broaden the minds of men" (p. 5). This kind the Open Court, everybody will be glad to know, will not reconstruct. "The other [kind] is pervaded with exclusiveness and bigotry; it does not aspire through Christ to the truth; but takes Christ as tradition has shaped His life and doctrines, to be the truth itself. It naturally lacks charity, and hinders the spiritual growth of men. It has always been looked upon as orthodox and the only true Christianity. It has been fortified by Bible passages, formulated in Quicumques, indorsed by Œcumenical Councils and by Papal Bulls" (ib.). This kind of Christianity Dr. Carus is persuaded needs "reconstruction." We agree with him. But whilst waiving his equivocal use of the term "kinds of Christianity," might we venture to remind so scientific a writer as Dr. Carus of the first rule for the demonstrative syllogism: *let the disjunctive members be completely enumerated?* We fear, *pace tanti viri,* he has, unwittingly of course, fallen into a sophism. There are three, not two, "kinds of Christianity." The third "kind" includes all the perfection of the first and positively excludes all the monstrosities of the second. This kind is Christ's Christianity—as gleaned from historical documents, our only present natural means of knowing it. It is of this kind that its Founder said: "He that believeth not shall be condemned." Of it, too, one of Christ's own commissioned ambassadors spoke when he pronounced anathema on any one, "even an angel from heaven," that "should preach any other Gospel." Dr. Carus considers these "harsh terms." Still we read in the first record of primitive Christianity that the very listeners to Christ's doctrine found His "words hard." And yet the Master altered them not one jot or tittle. But Dr. Carus brings another charge against "orthodox Christianity" besides its "exclusiveness, bigotry and uncharitableness," or rather he finds the exclusiveness so excessive that it will not tolerate even Monism. He says: "In order to substantiate the so-called orthodox conception of Christianity, our ecclesiastical instructors have gotten into the habit of telling us again and again that there is no religion save such as is *theistic*, and [Italics ours] that there is no *theism* save such as is a belief in a personal God, and a personal God means a distinct individual being with an ego-consciousness like that found in man, only in an infinitely higher plane—a view which we [Dr. Carus] call anthropotheism" (p. 33). And so the Open Court endeavors to so "reconstruct religion" that it shall include no "belief in a personal God." A less broad-minded thinker than our author might wonder what "kind" of a religion that might be; but the synthetic soul of our author readily takes in the religiosity of Monism. Another element that is to disappear in the reconstructing process is the *paganism* of Church Christianity, for the second kind "is not as yet free from paganism." By paganism the author understands "a belief in the letter of parables or allegorical dogmas to the detriment of the spirit; and tradition and habit combine to make our theologians worship the letter that killeth. A one-sided training warps their judgment. Their notions of God, the sacraments, miracles, inspiration, prayer, Christ's sonship and other religious ideas are as a rule more pagan than they themselves are aware of. The constitutions of most churches are so formulated as to make a belief in the literal meaning of symbols the test of orthodoxy and Christians are urged to set their trust upon myths. For the higher education of the clergy we would propose, therefore, that every theologian should study at least one of the natural sciences or mathematics. It would be the best way, perhaps the only way, to teach them the sternness of truth to dispel their anthropomorphic notions of God" (p. 49).

It is not the purpose of *The Dawn of a New Era* to point out all the deficiencies, not to say vices, of "orthodox" Christianity, much less to set forth the entire programme of its "reconstruction." It is the aim and object of the Open Court Publishing Company to carry on this dual task—critical and constructive. The little pamphlet is just one out of many stages in the general undertaking. It offers here a short eulogy on the liberal spirit that prevailed at the *World's Parliament of Religions*. There is also a brief article on the *New Orthodoxy* and another somewhat longer on the late Professor Romanes' *Thoughts on Religion.*

The extracts given above will no doubt abundantly suffice for our readers to perceive the *critical* side of the author's design, as a contribution to the general reconstructive work of his company. It is not quite so easy to illustrate the positive side of his purpose. On the whole it may be said that the aim is to make "religion scientific." "Science" and "scientific" are terms ubiquitous in the Open Court publications; and they seem to indicate an ardent love for truth that is quite inspiring. One could wish, however, that this love had kept the author from using the terms so frequently in such connection as to express or imply an opposition on the part of "orthodox" Christians to genuine science.

A writer as scientific as Dr. Carus must be observant and cautious enough to notice that there are very many eminent men who whilst thoroughly "scientific" recognize a goodly number of truths which transcend "science" both in their origin and in their object-sphere. Moreover, so religious a man as our author has surely in his soul the charity and the modesty which should prompt him to suppose that these his eminently scientific brethren do not yield their intellectual assent to such truths blindly and without a thoroughly objective reason. In view of this knowledge on his part of the recognition, by very competent scientists, of a transcendent order of truth, he will not require his readers to agree with him in the following fervid description of the relation of science, in the proper sense of the term, to true religion: "There is no peace of soul for him whose religion has not passed through the furnace of scientific criticism where it is cleansed of all the slag and dross of paganism. If God ever spoke to man, science is the burning bush; and if there is any light by which man can hope to illumine his path so as to make firm his steps, it is the light of science. Let us therefore make religion scientific and science religious. Let us on the one hand imbue religion with the spirit of science, with its rigorous criticism, strict exactness and stern devotion to truth; and on the other hand let us open our eyes to the moral and religious importance of the results of scientific inquiry. Let the light of science illumine both our minds and our sentiments, for science is holy and the light of science is the dwelling place of God" (p. 50). The scientific writer must not be refused the stimulating elixir of rhetoric, and we may charitably presume that here our author used his privilege too freely.

One is surprised, not to say pained, at finding so sensitively a religious man as Dr. Carus speaking insultingly of St. Paul. He characterizes the Apostle's conception of marriage as "low, not to say vulgar and unchristian" (p. 43). The terms do not reflect any very deep humility nor even charity in our author's religiousness. These deficiencies, however, one may overlook in one so devoted to the scientific elements of religion. But this devotion will hardly excuse him from not having investigated more fully the circumstances which prompted St. Paul to write as he did to the Corinthians. For the rest, if Dr. Carus will read carefully the fifth chapter of the Apostle's letter to the Ephesians, he will find there the purest and most sublime conception of matrimony ever expressed in human language. Dr. Carus should have known and pondered over that conception. He would have found his challenge to "any orthodox clergyman to defend" the Pauline conception quite uncalled for. It is just possible, however, that a mind so absorbed in science as his may not be able fully to appreciate the transcendentally spiritual thought of the Apostle in likening the union of man and wife to the mystical alliance of Christ with the Church, especially as such a thought does not lend itself to scientific criticism, the supreme criterion of our author's religion. Still this lack of spiritual insight will not excuse his gross calumny of St. Paul.

We have said enough to make clear the general intention of the Open Court Publishing Company, as set forth by the *New Era.* The second work at the head of this paper is the most recent serious effort at realizing that intention. A glance through the book shows that it is not only based upon, but is permeated through and through with "the doctrine of evolution" on which "the old traditional dogmas will have to be revised and radically remodelled."

The author is most true in his speculation to the sub-title of his book, *Man as an Animal.* The essay begins and ends with this conception. The man-animal is declared to have evolved into a social animal; but sociality marks in the author's view no more than a variation in degree, not in kind, of man's nature. One seeks in vain throughout the book for any justification of this application of the doctrine of evolution to the entirety of man's being. The position is taken *a priori,* and then analogies drawn from comparative anatomy are made to do service for proof. This sweeping of all the higher elements of human nature—intellectual, volitional, social, moral and religious—under the causality of cerebral activity cannot be justified as a legitimately "scientific" procedure. In view of this summary *apriorism* running through the work, one is prepared to meet with other similarly "scientific" positions, such, for instance as the statements concerning the process of evolution of primitive man from his Anthropoid or Pithecoid ancestry. It is a little surprising to read how familiar the author shows himself with this process. His descriptions are so vivid one easily fancies Dr. Topinard to have been actually an eye-witness of the transformation. His narration of the way in which, for instance, the mere gesture-language of the primeval savage passed over into the spoken word is particularly graphic. "It was natural," we are told, "for primitive man, as his gesture-language became more precise, to make an effort to accompany it with sounds in some way connected with what he desired to express. Unconsciously at first and then consciously, he modulated his utterances by his larynx and then progressively articulated them with his mouth. He thus soon attained the power of calling out in moments of danger, of commanding in the management of his household, or in the chase, and even of recounting during the evenings his adventures after the manner of the howling monkeys, but better" (p. 147). This is a fair specimen of the "science" with which the book is filled from cover to cover. Looking through it all one may fairly ask, Is this the kind of "science" on which religion is to be "reconstructed," the old truths of faith "radically remodelled?" In the name of "science" Dr. Carus deprives religion of its supreme object, a personal God, and substitutes the abstraction, or the world-soul, or impersonal force of Monism. Dr. Topinard comes along and takes from man a spiritual and immortal soul and gives him instead a nervous mechanism some degrees more complexly constructed than that of the monkey. Upon these monstrosities "science," aided by phantasy and emotion, is to construct a religion. Even Dr. Topinard is sceptical of the result. Some years ago, he tells us, he was looking about for the scientific basis of ethics, "the principle of justice and the distinction between good and evil, the principle of altruism, and so forth." He had reached the conclusion that they must be accepted without discussion "as dogmas or articles of faith." This conclusion, he says, was "distressing" to him, and he ceased not "to ponder on them." Then he "searched for some property of living beings possessing a nervous system that would give body and objective reality to these dogmas." He reread Herbert Spencer and other writers, amongst whom was Dr. Paul Carus. Then he adds: "The doctrine which Dr. Paul Carus upholds is alluring. Will it convert the masses, which it is our aim to lead into the ways of righteousness? Will it prove sufficient as a sanction of the moral obligation? That is the question." (P. 2.) That indeed is the question, become infinitely more a question in the light, or rather the darkness of a "science" which leaves for man neither a God nor a soul, in any sense of the terms that can supply a rational basis for a moral life.

Dr. Topinard's book is entitled *Science and Faith.* The latter term occurs several times in the book, on the first and the last two pages. The concluding paragraph of the work deserves quoting as an illustration of the author's conception of science, but especially of faith. He has spoken much of science, he says, and very little of faith. "The reason is that the two mutually exclude each other. Science is knowledge; faith is belief. Science considers things objectively, and accepts only what is demonstrated by observations *perpendæ et numerandæ,* and by generalizations and inductions which go with it, stopping at agnosticism." One cannot help wishing that the author had furnished in his own speculation an illustration of this definition of science; that he had found farther back than his exaggerated theory of *Transformism* that healthy agnosticism "which should acknowledge the unknown when facts abandoned him," and ere he fell into "nebulous hypotheses" where "positive and objective facts" were not forthcoming.

"Faith," he goes on to say, "is subjective, individual and dependent on cerebral sensibility, as the latter has been constituted by heredity, education, habits and temperament of the subject. Orators who, like Père Didon, seek to demonstrate the compatibility of the truths established by science and the beliefs dictated by faith, only shatter the latter: a faith which is examined and shown to be in accord with facts ceases to be faith." The author does not deny "the utility of extolling certain articles of faith;" at least at the present day, and indeed even he himself "is not far from admitting that the four or five principles, especially justice, which society takes for its base and ideal, should be converted into articles of faith" (p. 361). The reason of this admission we saw above is that he has been unable as yet to discover any "property of living beings possessing a nervous system that would give body and objective reality to these dogmas." Thus we see another of the essentials of religion eliminated in the reconstructing process. First a Personal God is rejected and His place given to an impersonal force, an abstraction. Then man is deprived of a spiritual soul and assigned an aggregate of forces and states in a complexly constituted and convoluted brain. Lastly, faith is stripped of its real bases and objects and reduced to subjective fancy and feeling, the resultant of "cerebral sensibility." Truly this is "reconstructing" religion; but is it done on the "broad basis of science?" If the contents of this book and many of the other publications of the Open Court Company be *science,* may Heaven prevent humanity from trusting either to the foundations or the superstructure! The "broad basis of science" ought surely be "facts" and principles, objectively verifiable, not of course by sense, but by intellect, the only natural interpreter of sense perception in our possession. Now when we seek for the "facts" of Dr. Topinard's science we find them distorted or colored by an unfounded and unverifiable theory, viz.: that man is a mere animal, even though social; and that man, with his soul and all his intellectual, moral and religious endowments, has been evolved from purely animal ancestry. "What is *certain*," says our author, "is that man by all his characters is descended from some Primate. The brain, the hand and all that relates to his way of standing, with the exception of the foot, are proofs of it." (P. 20.) Now certainty (certitude) is based on *evidence*. Where is the evidence for this proposition? The majority of the most cultured intellects of the human race, past and present, has not been able to discover it, though many modern scientists take the proposition as a "working hypothesis." Have Dr. Topinard and his school some specially keen instinct for evidence which has enabled them to discover a ground of certainty in a proposition which the larger number of thoroughly scientific men hold as either untrue or at best hypothetical? Another of the author's *a priori* statements is that concerning *faith*, cited above. Is it a "fact" that faith depends on "cerebral sensibility," etc.? What "broad basis of science" underlies this theory? Surely Dr. Topinard's modesty will not allow him to arrogate to himself a monopoly of knowledge as to the nature, object and genesis of faith. He cannot but know that very many eminently scholarly and "scientific" minds, including if he will Père Didon, find quite a firmly objective sphere and motive of faith apart from "cerebral sensibility," etc.

We might cite, as another illustration of "scientific" accuracy, the author's remark concerning the origin of the doctrine of the Divine Trinity. (P. 237.) But we have said enough to show upon what "scientific basis" the work of "reconstructing religion" is being pushed forward.

We have no space left to treat of the third work on our list—a work in which there is some, though not so much of this kind of reconstructive science exemplified in Dr. Topinard's essay. We might add, by way of conclusion, that there is just enough of such "science" in the Open Court publications to catch the mind of half-educated youth who have had a smattering of some "ologies" and the "science" diluted for the popular literature of the day. Without religious or philosophical training they are unable to detect the poisonous sophistry pervading these works. Swallowing it all, they lose appreciation of supernatural and even supersensible truth.

Their "metaphysical sense" becomes completely atrophied. The story of the consequences of a "scientific religion" in which there is neither a personal God, a spiritual soul, nor genuine faith is written large in the prisons, asylums and death morgues of our cities, in the headlines of our newspapers flashing out the daily record of crime and scandal, and yet more in the diseased bodies and ruined lives of victims unknown to the outside world. F. P. S.

Fra Girolamo Savonarola. A Biographical Study, based on Contemporary Documents. By Herbert Lucas, of the Society of Jesus. 8vo, pp. xxxii., 474. London: Sands & Co. St. Louis: B. Herder.

Readers of the London *Tablet* will recognize in this volume a series of articles which appeared in that periodical from April to December, 1898. They were universally admired, widely quoted and somewhat sharply criticized. The author's name was not mentioned, but every one admitted that he was well equipped, and that he had access to the best sources of information. Before many numbers of the series had appeared it was evident that he had studied the subject thoroughly, and his fair presentation of the facts, together with his calm, dispassionate conclusions, showed that he was no partisan, and that he desired only the truth. Altogether the *Tablet* series formed the most important addition to Savonarola literature in the fifth centennial year of his death.

This volume, however, is not merely a reprint of the *Tablet* series. The articles have been carefully revised, and more than half the work has been rewritten and very much enlarged.

The author's account of how he came to study the subject is interesting. He received for review a brochure on Savonarola by Dr. Ludwig Pastor, entitled *Zur Beurtheilung Savonarolas,* which was a rejoinder to some critics of his treatment of the Florentine Reformer in the third volume of his *Geschiehte der Päpste im Zeitalter der Renaissance,* and especially to Dr. Paolo Luotto's *Il vero Savonarola e il Savonarola di Lodovico Pastor.*

While preparing himself for this review, Father Lucas learned of the mass of documentary evidence which existed on the subject, scattered through many volumes, and inaccessible to the general English reader. Then the thought came to him that it would be much better to bring this evidence into compendious form, and within the compass of a single volume, than to sit in judgment on two experts. This thought was acted upon, and the result was the excellent series of papers in the *Tablet,* and this still more excellent book.

The writer needed no such apology as is contained in the following words which appear in the preface: "Whatever the judgment to be ultimately passed upon Savonarola may be, it will hardly be questioned that he occupies a position in ecclesiastical history so conspicuous and important as to make it desirable that all, or substantially all, that can be known about him should be placed within the reach of those students of history who have neither the leisure, nor perhaps the opportunity, to ransack a library in quest of the whole truth."

The purpose of the writer is sufficient. "The purpose of this biography is, primarily, to set before the reader the fact of Savonarola's life, and a summary of the documentary evidence bearing thereon; and, secondly, to express with, we trust, becoming moderation and reserve, our own judgment on such points as have given rise to a divergence of views upon his actions, his words, his aims and intentions, and on the actions and motives of those who, in greater or less measure, took part in the conflict which issued in the final catastrophe of his condemnation and death."

An excellent feature of the work, and very rare, is short explanations of the character of many of the works quoted, a full list of which is placed in the beginning. J. P. T.

The Catechism Explained. An Exhaustive Exposition of the Christian Religion, with special reference to the present state of society and the spirit of the age. From the original of Rev. Francis Spirago. Edited by Rev. Richard F. Clarke, S. J. 8vo, pp. 720. New York: Benziger Brothers.

English-speaking Catholics, lay and cleric, were never so well supplied with treatises on Christian doctrine as they are at the present time. The Catechism of Perseverance by Gaume in four volumes is an exhaustless storehouse, with a wealth of information and illustration that has never been excelled. For many years it was the only full exposition of Christian doctrine in English. But within the last two years several other excellent works on the same subject have appeared.

The first was an "Exposition of Christian Doctrine" in three volumes, published by McVey, of Philadelphia. The two volumes which have already been published have received a most flattering reception. Then came the "Catechism of Rodez," translated by Father Thein, of Cleveland, and published by Herder, of St. Louis. It had proved its worth in the original by exhausting many editions without lessening the demand, and the translation sprang into favor at once.

Now we have this new treatise, with its simple but suggestive title, "The Catechism Explained." It is intended for the preacher, the catechist, the teacher and the family. It is really what it claims to be, the catechism explained. But in that explanation lies its excellence. The illustrations, comparisons and quotations from the Scriptures, the fathers and other writers make it very full, very clear and very attractive. At this time especially, when persons outside of the Catholic Church are getting farther and farther away from truth, books of this kind are most welcome. There is no excuse for any one being ignorant of God's truth, but least of all for a Catholic. He has the true Church of Christ to teach him at all times—the Church which the Son of Man established for that very purpose, and to which He gave His own authority. The Church discharges her high office by preaching the Gospel, by placing printed copies of it in the hands of her followers, but most of all by teaching the fundamentals of Christianity to children through the catechism, which is a compendium of all Christian truth.

In books like the one before us, the compendium is enlarged, the upper structure is built on the same foundation and the number of teachers is multiplied. If parents could be induced to get copies of such books and with their assistance explain the catechism to their children, how much more faithfully they would fulfil their obligations to the little ones whom God has committed to them, and how much more successfully they would earn the love and respect of their offspring. The Catholic public in general should show its appreciation of the labors of editors and publishers who make these books by patronizing them. J. P. T.

Daily Thoughts for Priests. By *Very Rev. J. B. Hogan, S. S., D. D.*, President of St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Mass. 12mo., pp. x., 202. Boston: Marlier, Callanan & Co.

This book has been written by a man of piety, learning and experience. This is said not to praise the man, but the book. The combination is so rare in authors, that it is well worthy of note. We have books by pious men, and by learned men, and by men of experience, but books by pious learned men of experience are rare. This is one reason, and a very important one, why we do not profit more by spiritual books. They are good, they are filled with truth, but it is generally abstract, or it is made practical by comparisons and examples that are remote and ancient, and that fail to bring it home to the student.

Every one admits that in order to live a spiritual life a man must feed on spiritual food. He does this by meditation and pious reading. But it is freely conceded that on account of the mode of life of the majority of priests who do not live in community, anything like regular order is hard to follow. The varying demands that are made on the missionary priest, the constant change of hour for different duties, the ease with which others may intrude themselves on us, and the many distractions of the world about us, make it very difficult indeed for us to follow a strict rule of life, such as we all acknowledge we should follow.

A pious man does not understand our difficulties, and he continues to prepare books of meditation for us that are very good and very long, but that we do not use. The learned man writes to convince us that we must use those books if we wish to be spiritual. But the practical man sees the difficulty and tries to overcome it.

This is what the author of the book before us has done. He does not deny the excellence of meditation in the strictest sense, and no one knows better than he the many good books of meditation that have been written, but he takes into consideration all the circumstances of the occasion, and he provides for those who are prevented from following the best course.

"Daily Thoughts" are short, practical treatises on divine truths which may be taken up at any spare moment in the day and assimilated. Each subject is introduced by a text generally from the words of Christ, and is ushered out by some quotation from the Imitation, the Fathers or some other authorized source. They are so practical and so clearly and concisely put that no effort is required in reading them. Indeed, one cannot get away from them who meets them at all. With this book on his table a priest need never be spiritually hungry. J. P. T.

SACERDOS RITE INSTITUTUS PIIS EXERCITATIONIBUS MENSTRUÆ RECOLLECTIONIS. Auctore *P. Adulpho Petit, S. J.* Series Prima, Secunda, Tertia, Quarta et Quinta. 12mo. Typis Societatis Sancti Augustini, Bruges et Insulis.

The meditations contained in these five little volumes were begun in the "Etudes Ecclesiastiques," and they attracted such wide attention that many readers of that periodical asked the author to put them into book form, in order that they might be better preserved and made more easily accessible to a larger number of readers. The request was granted, and the first series was published.

The purpose of the author, as the title indicates, is to provide priests with material for a retreat each month. Hence he chooses subjects which are particularly suitable for the sacerdotal state, and which are not generally found in books of meditation. He treats them very much at length, so that a person may find material for several days' meditation, if he have so much time to devote to his retreat. He so arranges his matter that it may be used for spiritual reading when several persons are making a retreat together, and he writes always rather with a view to clearness than to brevity.

To each meditation proper he joins another by way of supplement, which is a preparation for death and judgment. The former is more speculative, the latter more practical. Finally, in answer also to the request of readers, he adds a special examen in each instance on the virtues and duties of the priest.

In the beginning the author intended to publish only the first series, but the work was so well received and so widely read that the demand for more was too strong to be refused. Hence the second and following series until the fifth came from the press. The earlier volumes have already run through several editions.

One need not search for the reason of such a demand and such high commendations as have been bestowed on the work. The author has that peculiar keen analytical spiritual insight that fits a man to think for others. It is rare. Most books of meditation impress one as being made up of the meditations of some one else. Such books are not of much real service to their readers. We rarely find a book in which the writer has really prepared *our* meditation for *us*. This is the characteristic of Father Petit's book.

The volumes are so small, so light, so beautifully and clearly printed in easy graceful Latin that they tempt one to use them. As they become better known they will surely be highly appreciated.

J. P. T.

D. DIONYSIUS CARTUSIANUS ; ENARRATIO IN CANTICUM CANTICORUM SALOMONIS. Monstrolii, Typis Cartusæ S. M. de Pratis. N. D. des Prés, Montreuil-sur-Mer. France. Pp. 512.

The editors of the new issue of the works of Dionysius the Carthusian are doing wisely in publishing apart from the *Opera Omnia*, individual writings of the great theologian. One of these detached opuscula is presented in the pretty little volume here under notice. A neat little book it is, done up in the excellent manner which makes the newly collected works so attractive. A book for the pocket, a *vade mecum* for the priest or religious whose mind and heart are attuned to the spiritual harmonies that found so apt an instrument in the soul of Dionysius. Only a purified spirit such as his could produce an accompaniment in right accord with the sublimest of canticles. It needs the far-seeing wisdom, the close touch with the Divine, the delicate spiritual sense that comes of abiding life in the unearthly atmosphere of religion, to realize and present to less gifted souls the mystic meaning hidden under the luxuriant symbolism of the Song of Songs. In his commentary on the Canticles, Dionysius shows to evidence those spiritual endowments that were so singularly his—the blending of intellectual insight into the truths of faith, the accurate technical knowledge of scientific theology and especially the abiding consciousness of the bearing of all religious truth and communication on its first and last end, the union of the rational creature with its Creator. Here learned exegesis and subtle scholasticism are seen in their proper objective relations to a sound unexaggerated mysticism.

If we might venture a suggestion to the Dionysian editors, it would be that they anticipate the publication in the larger form of some of the opuscula that illustrate other sides of the author's mind. Such, for instance, as the *Compendium Philosophiæ*, the *De Venustate Mundi* or *De laudibus superlaudabilis Dei.* Students not drawn by Commentaries on the Sacred Text might be stimulated to a taste for these most wholesome works by the reading of the more original, spontaneous outpouring of the great Carthusian's soul.

THE LIFE AND WORKS OF DANTE ALLIGHIERI, being an Introduction to the Study of the "Divina Commedia." By the *Rev. J. F. Hogan, D. D.*, Professor, St. Patrick's College Maynooth. 8vo., xii., 352. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

"This work does not and could not profess to be an exhaustive treatment of the life and works of Dante. Composed, as it is in the main, of certain lectures delivered to the students of Maynooth College, it is intended chiefly for those who have neither the time nor the inclination to become specialists in the study of the 'Divina Commedia.'"

The book is intended to be an introduction to Dante. It is pretty generally conceded that such a work is not only useful, but almost essential, for those who use English translations as well as for those who read the original.

The notes that accompany translations are not sufficient to prevent many students from being discouraged and sometimes repelled. It is said that Sir Walter Scott and Cardinal Newman gave up Cary's translation. If this be true, how much more necessary it must be to provide helps for younger readers of less ability.

In the narrative system which the author of this work follows he gives a descriptive account of the contents of each part. His comments, interspersed through the poet's narrative, touch only the salient features of each canto. He has abstained purposely from quoting many opinions and authorities, because such a course was foreign to his purpose.

The book is timely, for the English students of Dante are increasing rapidly, and it ought to help them very much to understand and appreciate this great production which has not been dimmed by time nor forgotten by fickle man.

The Sibylline Oracles. Translated from the Greek into English Blank Verse. By Milton S. Terry, D. D., LL. D. New edition revised after the text of Rzach. 12mo, pp. 292. New York: Eaton & Mains.

The conspicuous place which the Sybils occupy in the traditions and history of ancient Greece and Rome makes them interesting subjects for every student. The bibliography of them is very extensive and ancient, but their oracles had not been accessible in English dress until Dr. Terry made his first translation in 1890. A translation of the first eight books was published by Sir John Floyer in London in 1713, but it has been out of print for many years. The present edition is intended to supercede the previous translation by the same author, and is based on the Greek text of Aloisius Rzach published at Vienna in 1891. Dr. Terry speaks of the text of Rzach as the best extant, and refers to the book as a product of indefatigable labor that is not likely to be soon superseded.

In the present instance the metre is pentameter instead of hexameter, as in the Greek, because the author thinks that the latter is somewhat foreign to the genius of the English tongue.

The work is very carefully done. A short table of contents is given at the beginning of each book, and also a short sketch of its history or supposed history. There are numerous explanatory footnotes and references to the Christian Fathers who have quoted the text.

In the appendix much additional valuable information appears, and at the end, besides a full bibliography, there is an index of the fathers who quote the Sibyls, with reference to the lines in the text that are quoted. It is a very pretty book, the workmanship being beyond reproach in every particular.

What is Liberalism? Englished and adapted from the Spanish of Dr. Don Felix Sarda y Salvany, by Condé B. Pallen, Ph. D., LL. D. 12mo, pp. 176. St. Louis: B. Herder.

We cannot better make known the purpose and excellence of this book than by quoting from the preface the history of the original:

"In 1886 there appeared in Spain a little work under the title *El Liberalismo es Pecado:* 'Liberalism is a Sin,' by Don Felix Sarda y Salvany, a priest of Barcelona and editor of a journal called *La*

Revista Popular. The book excited considerable commotion. It was vigorously assailed by the Liberals. A Spanish Bishop, of a Liberal turn, instigated an answer to Dr. Sarda's work by another Spanish priest. Both books were sent to Rome praying the Sacred Congregation of the Index to put Dr. Sarda's work under the ban."

The answer was a great surprise. In a letter which the Sacred Congregation wrote on the subject we read:

"The Sacred Congregation has carefully examined both works and decided as follows: In the first, not only is nothing found contrary to sound doctrine, but its author, Dr. Felix Sarda, merits great praise for his exposition and defense of the sound doctrine therein set forth with solidity, order and lucidity and without offense to any one." In regard to the other book, the Sacred Congregation says that in matter it needs corrections, and that its offensive personalities merit rebuke. The author is advised to withdraw it from circulation as far as possible.

Dr. Sarda's work is indeed excellent, and Dr. Pallen has caught the spirit of the Spanish author so well that one mind only is visible in the American book. It is particularly suited to American readers and will do immense good in the hands of young men and women who are most exposed to the danger of which it treats.

CARMEL IN ENGLAND: a History of the English Mission of the Discalced Carmelites, 1615 to 1849. Drawn from documents preserved in the archives of the Order. By *Father B. Zimmerman*. 12mo., pp. xvi., 379. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Here is an important addition to English Church history which in recent years has received many contributions from able pens. It is the very best way to write history. No one man has the time or ability, nor does any one live long enough to write a complete history of the Church in any country where she has existed as long as in England. But if the members of the different religious communities will gather together the materials which are at hand in the archives of each one, and compile from them the history of the saintly founders and distinguished members who have labored so faithfully for the spread of the Gospel, we shall soon have all the links of the chain ready to be welded together by some master hand. The work before us is one of those links covering that important period of English history comprised between the years 1615 and 1849 and dealing with St. Simon Stock, the founder of the English branch of the order, and with his many saintly followers, it is both interesting and valuable. The work has been compiled from documents preserved in the archives of the order, and it has been very carefully done. It adds one more chapter to that glorious history of sanctity and heroism which distinguished the Catholic Church in England for so many centuries, and which promises to encourage the wandering children of the faith to return again to the true fold from which they have wandered.

STUDIES IN LITERATURE. Some Words about Chaucer and Other Essays. By *Maurice Francis Egan, A. M., LL. D.* 12mo., pp. 130. St. Louis: Herder & Co.

The author of these essays tells us that they might be called "Studies for Lectures," and that they are all united with the "Sanctity of Literature" for their keynote, although their titles seem to separate them from one another. Their titles are: "Some Words About Chaucer," "On the Teaching of English," "The Sanctity of Literature," "Some Aspects of an American Essayist," "The Ode Structure of Coventry Patmore," "New Handbooks of Philosophy." Mr. Egan has been identified with literature so long, both as a writer and a teacher, that he needs no introduction to American readers. In recent years he has frequently appeared on the lecture platform, and his merits have been more prominently brought before the public. All that he does bears the stamp of the student and the scholar, and his name is a guarantee of orthodoxy, which is a high recommendation.

THE HOLY BIBLE, translated from the Latin Vulgate. The Old and the New Testament. 8 vo., pp. 1400. Baltimore: Murphy & Co.

This is the best one volume edition of the Bible that we have seen. It is compact and the type is unusually good for a book of the size. For general reading, no one should try to find a one volume edition of the whole Bible, but for reference, when one must have many books at hand in order to work rapidly, this one will be very useful. We have not been making Bibles to be proud of, and we are glad to notice any advancement in that field of book-making which our neighbors have worked so admirably.

SACRA LITURGIA TOM. II. TRACTATUS DE RUBRICIS MISSALIS ROMANI. Opera J. F Van der Stappen. Mechliniae: N. Dessain. Pp. 361.

We called attention in the July number of the *Review* to the first volume of this work on Sacred Liturgy, treating of the Rubrics of the Breviary. The present volume deals with the Rubrics of the

Missal in the same method. The matter is cast into the form of question and answer, thus adapting the work for its didactic use as a text-book in Ecclesiastical Seminaries. Clearness and exactness of style and the mechanical arrangement of the material are excellencies in the same direction.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

GESCHICHTE DES DEUTSCHEN VOLKES VOM DREIZEHNTEN JAHRHUNDERT BIS ZUM AUSGANG DES MITTELALTERS. Von *Emil Michael S.J.* Vol. II. describing the religious and social conditions, education and instruction in Germany during the thirteenth century. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder: 1899.

EXHORTATIONES DOMESTICÆ VENERABILIS SERVI DEI CARDINALIS ROBERTI BELLARMINI: Bruxellis: 14 Rue des Ursulines, 1899.

THE FRIARS OF THE PHILIPPINES. By *Rev. Ambrose Coleman, O. P.* 12mo., pp. 152. Boston: Marlier, Callanan & Co.

LOYAL BLUE AND ROYAL SCARLET; a story of '76. By *Marion Ames Taggart.* 12mo., pp. 233. New York: Benziger Bros.

PEGGY. By *Laura E. Richards.* Illustrated by Etheldred B. Barry. 12mo., pp. 308. Boston: Dana Estes & Co.

ESSAYS EDUCATIONAL AND HISTORICAL ON SOME IMPORTANT EPISODES. By a Member of the Order of Mercy. 12mo., pp. 408. New York: O'Shea & Co.

CHISEL, PEN AND POIGNARD; or, Benvenuto Cellini. His Times and His Contemporaries. By the author of "The Life of Sir Kenelm Digby." With nineteen illustiations. 8vo., pp. 157. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

THE SAINTS—SAINT AMBROSE. By the *Duc de Broglie,* of the French Academy. Translated by Margaret Maitland, with a Preface by G. Tyrrell, S. J. 12mo., pp. vii., 169. London: Duckworth & Co. New York: Benziger Brothers.

A ROUND TABLE OF THE REPRESENTATIVE FRENCH CATHOLIC NOVELISTS. With Portraits and Selections. 12mo., pp. 315. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC
QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXV.—APRIL, 1900.—No. 98.

IMPERIALISM IN THE PHILIPPINES.

THE policy adopted by the Spanish monarch in the first occupation of the Philippines was told in a recent number of this magazine. It also described the results obtained by that policy in practice. It is instructive to compare it with the new imperialism which has been forced on them in the name of American civilization during the past year.

When Legaspi, in the sixteenth century, raised the Spanish flag in the uncivilized archipelago of San Lazaro, the objects proposed were clearly laid down in his instructions. They were: First, the conversion of its savage population to Christianity; second, their organization, when converted, on the model of the Spanish people of the time, and thirdly, the establishment of the supremacy of the Government of Spain among them, with the same powers as it exercised in Europe. That a civilized nation might justly take control of unorganized savage lands was generally admitted then, as now; but the limits of that control were much more clearly defined by public opinion. Savages were recognized as men, with the same rights to liberty, life and property as their civilized brothers. A Christian power had no right to impose its authority on strangers, except for their own real benefit or by their free consent. If imposed for any other cause it was regarded as tyranny and not to be tolerated by Christian conscience. Such was the doctrine laid down to the Span-

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1899, by Benjamin H. Whittaker, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

ish court and the Spanish universities by Las Casas, and endorsed by the Spanish rulers themselves. It is not to be thought that these principles were always carried out, in practice, any more than the general laws of the United States are observed by all American citizens to-day; but at least they were recognized, and Spanish statesmen tried, in general, to put them in practice. Philip II. and his Governor, Legaspi, did so in the Philippine settlements. The latter before his death was able to claim with truth that he had obtained recognition of Spanish authority through the whole Philippine archipelago without war or bloodshed. It is a rare boast in the annals of colonial settlements by Europeans. Penn at Philadelphia and Calvert in Maryland are the only similar cases in our own land of former colonies. The peaceful character thus imprinted on the Philippine Government was little changed during the three centuries after Legaspi's death. There was only one really serious insurrection among the native converts in all that time—that of Silan, in 1759, after the capture of Manila by the English.

The course of the American occupation so far has been very different from Legaspi's. If directed by any definite policy, that policy has never been published, either to the natives of the islands or the citizens of the United States. Congress declared war on Spain without specifying any reason for such action. It declared, further, that the war was not made for the purpose of seizing territory, and especially Cuban territory. As the action of Spain during the war was strictly defensive, one cannot see on what grounds this intention could not be carried out; but it was certainly abandoned, without hesitation, by the Administration as soon as Congress had adjourned. Commodore Dewey's fleet entered Manila Bay, destroyed the weaker Spanish fleet, without loss of a man to itself, and threatened to lay the defenseless city in ashes if its Governor attempted any further resistance to American arms. It was not occupied by force for several months because there were no troops to garrison it if occupied. Meanwhile an insurrection, of especially ferocious character, was stirred up by representatives of the United States. Our Government had no policy at the time on the subject of territorial occupation. It had nothing to fear from the Spanish troops on the islands, yet its representatives deliberately involved the hitherto peaceful population in a civil war carried on with savage atrocity. Unarmed Spaniards, and especially priests, were treated with a barbarity unknown in civilized war. More than fifty priests were murdered and several hundred imprisoned and tortured. Churches were plundered and desecrated, and armed bands, recruited in part from the jails, were sent through the islands to rob and slay at will under the tacit protection of the American fleet and army. Though Aguinaldo was furnished with arms by American officers and obeyed generally the suggestions of our commanders, it does not appear that a word of reprobation was addressed by any of them to him on the atrocities done on prisoners, especially non-combatants. Indeed, Mr. Wildmann, our Consul General, urged the starvation or semi-starvation of the Spanish prisoners on his friend Aguinaldo. The spirit which prevailed was like that in which the English Government, during our own War of Independence, stirred up the Mohawks to the massacre of Wyoming. It was less excusable, as the Filipino cutthroats were not savages by condition, but a hitherto peaceful people stirred to savagery by reckless promises and the demoralization of plunder held out to them by American agents.

The misery inflicted on a peaceful population of many millions by setting a band of reckless adventurers over them to overthrow the whole social system at a blow seems not to have cost a thought to either American officers or our Administration. A few months before the American press and Congress were denouncing with fervid eloquence the horrors of civil war in Cuba and calling imperatively on the Spanish Government to sacrifice everything for its cessation in the "interests of humanity." A population four times larger than Cuba's was deliberately plunged into a similar condition by American officials for the sake of inflicting some injury on the power of Spain.

The war had been begun without alleged motive, and when the Spanish Government, after the destruction of its fleets, asked for its cessation our Administration appeared equally uncertain as to what terms it should ask as the price of peace. Its policy was like that of the old Norse Vikings in their descents on the coasts of France or England; but it hardly knew what ransom would best suit its own interests. The idea of any principle of international right or justice beyond the right of the strongest to take whatever he pleased, seems never to have been thought of. Still it was hardly worth while to send a fleet to burn the towns of Spain for the mere pleasure of destruction, so a "protocol" of peace was granted, by which Spain not only withdrew from Cuba, but ceded Puerto Rico and Guam to this country. It was provided further that the question of the Philippines, which had been raised solely by Admiral Dewey's entry into Manila Bay and destruction of the Spanish fleet there, should be settled later on, when Mr. McKinley should have made up his mind as to his own interests. The day after this protocol was signed the commanders of the American forces thought well to storm Manila, though its surrender for the time had been actually granted by the Spanish Government. Manila was stormed, accordingly, after a kind of sham battle which cost a number of lives without the shadow of necessity. An army, made up mostly of new levies with three months' military training, was placed in absolute control of a city of three hundred thousand people. It proceeded to rule it with all the confidence born of ignorance of the people, and even their language, that might be expected from such an army. In the words of a correspondent who belonged to one of the volunteer regiments, "The rifle, revolver and club did wonders in reforming the population," on the ideas of the new militia. The feelings of the people themselves towards the reform and reformers may be imagined.

In the meantime the rest of the islands were left a prey to anarchy. The greatest part of the Spanish troops were kept prisoners in Manila. The others were shut up in a few towns, and without supplies or orders were wholly unable to maintain order. Robber bands pillaged Panay and Mindanao while our Administration was thinking whether it had better withdraw from the islands altogether, keep Manila, demand the cession of Luzon, or that of all the Philippines. The last was finally decided on, and the Spanish Government, of course, was powerless to resist. The whole Spanish garrison in the islands had been less than fourteen thousand. That little force had preserved peace and order among a population of seven millions besides the outlying savage tribes. It was decided to send at once from forty to sixty thousand American troops to establish American authority there. At the same time the Administration was quite uncertain what form the new institutions ought to have. It was only sure that bayonets in plenty were needed for their introduction.

When Legaspi, on his landing in Cebu, was attacked by the native chiefs he drove his assailants off by discharges of artillery in the air, as he wanted to avoid bloodshed. The provisions he had to take by force he afterwards paid for at full value. When the natives sued for peace and offered tribute in price for it the Spanish Governor granted the first and declined the second. He was satisfied with the acknowledgment of the sovereign rights of the Spanish Crown, and on his part he recognized the right of the natives to govern themselves by their own laws. It cannot be said that the American imperialist policy shows to advantage beside Legaspi's.

When the late Emperor of France negotiated the annexation of Savoy and Nice by the Sardinian Government he considered it only just to take a vote of the population itself on the question of change of government. It is strange to find our Republican Administration, ruling on the principle that government is only of the people and for the people, paying no attention to the will of the people in the Philippines when changing their government of over three hundred years' standing. The new imperialism regards the popular will as having no place in the selection of rulers, at least outside the American continent. The ideas that it professes are wholly foreign to the habitual American ideas of government under which this nation has been formed.

What was the condition of the people of Manila under the military despotism set over them in the name of American liberty can be judged from the accounts published in the San Francisco papers before Aguinaldo came into collision with our troops. A correspondent of the *Call*, of that city, who was a corporal in one of the volunteer regiments, thus told it in December, 1898. It must be remembered that the soldiers he speaks of were all new recruits and almost all ignorant of the language or customs of the people whom they were authorized to rule at discretion:

"The Minnesota boys, when we first entered the city, were given the task of looking after its policing, and they have filled the bill to the limit, incidentally filling the Coroner's office at the same time. The native population had conceived something nearly akin to contempt for the American soldier, not being able to disassociate *kindness and justice* from weakness and cowardice. As soon as the boys got to work they started in to convince them of their mistake, and have, I imagine, succeeded fairly well. To give an idea of the methods employed I will relate a little occurrence of yesterday morning:

"There is a large market just at the foot of the Colquante bridge which is the rendezvous of a rough gang. There gambling is carried on much in the same manner as it is in Chinatown at home—behind closed doors. Yesterday a Minnesota policeman, a mere boy, hearing the chink of coin, started in to investigate, and entering one of the many shacks came upon a game running with a forced draught. He ordered the proprietor to close the place and come with him; but the Filipino instead of obeying made a grab for the young fellow. The Filipino died right then and there. Then the young fellow *turned loose on everything in sight.* A tremendous crowd gathered. Three members of the California guard hurried to the scene and waded through the mob with butts and bayonets, leaving sore heads and bleeding flanks to mark their path. When they reached the shack they found it filled with smoke, through which they perceived Filipino bodies lying where the wounded fell, while the Minnesota guard was discovered sitting on a table munching an orange while waiting for some one to come and clean up the debris.

"A few such instances have served in a great measure to teach the anarchy loving Malay the error of his ways."

The flippancy with which these murders are described and the admiration for the coolness of the soldier who "sat munching an orange" over the bodies of three or four unarmed victims of his revolver, tells sufficiently its own tale. The brand of "anarchy loving" gratuitously affixed to them is also noteworthy. The writer continues to tell how the Island of Panay, which had not yet been ceded to the United States, was faring under the new régime of delay:

"While these pacific measures are progressing in Manila the people of Iloilo are having a regular monkey-and-parrot time. That unfortunate city is in a state of chaos. The insurgents are besieging it on the outside, while the native population is rioting within the walls. The Spanish garrison, worn out by long and constant service, suffering from wounds and sickness, lacking food and medicines and utterly without hope of succor from its own government, continues to fight with the desperation born of the knowledge that a massacre will follow capitulation. Business is entirely suspended. The stores are closed, residences are barricaded and soldiers and civilians pray that there may soon come to their relief those same American troops which only a few months ago they so affected to despise. It is probable that a few days will see a couple or three regiments sent down there to put things to rights."

This was "substituting the mild sway of justice for arbitrary rule," as President McKinley modestly called it in his proclamation of the 5th of January. There is a touch of Mephistopheles about that proclamation which almost tempts one to credit the writer with a grim, if cynical, sense of humor. It declares that the military power must be absolute over the whole of the islands, until the legislation of the United States should see fit to change it, and as the President's own part in making the burthen easy, he adds:

"In performing this duty the military commander of the United States is enjoined to make known to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands that in succeeding to the sovereignty of Spain, in severing the former political relations of the inhabitants and in establishing a new political power, the authority of the United States is to be exerted for the sovereignty of the persons and property of the people of the islands and for the confirmation of all their private rights and relations. It will be the duty of the commander of the forces of occupation *to announce and proclaim,* in the most public manner, that we come not as invaders or conquerors, but as friends, to protect the natives in their homes, in their employments and in their personal and religious rights. All persons who either by active aid or honest admission coöperate with the Government of the United States to give effect to these benefits and purposes will receive the reward of its support and protection. All others will be brought within the lawful rule we have assumed, with firmness if need be, but without severity so far as may be possible.

"Within the absolute domain of military authority, which necessarily is and must remain supreme in the ceded territory until the legislation of the United States shall otherwise provide, the municipal laws of the territory, in respect to private rights and property and the repression of crime, are to be considered as continuing in force, and to be administered by the ordinary tribunals as far as possible. The operations of civil and municipal government are to be performed by such officers as may accept the supremacy of the United States by taking the oath of allegiance, or by officers chosen, so far as may be practicable, from the inhabitants of the islands."

What the effect of the proclamation of good intentions thus solemnly ordered would have in reconciling the population to the rule of rifle and revolver in the hands of the volunteer police as above described may be easily guessed. It is not easy for even an American familiar with English to make out the sense of this wonderful document. How "the authority of the United States is to be exerted for the *sovereignty of the persons and property* of the people of the islands" passes comprehension. How people can "coöperate by honest admission with the Government to give effect to these benefits *and purposes*" is equally bewildering. The classification of the future judges and officials into "those who may accept the supremacy of the United States," or others "chosen from the inhabitants of the islands" is a still more brilliant flower of rhetoric. It may be added that the islands at this time were not American territory and no oath of allegiance could be lawfully accepted from them at this time.

This was, indeed, a change from the peace of the older time under the so-called tyranny of Spain; but there was worse in store for the ill-starred population, whose fate had been suddenly changed, because American politicians were horrified over the alleged cruelty of Spanish warfare in Cuba. Though the American occupation was confined to Manila, pending the ratification of the peace treaty, a collision occurred with Aguinaldo's soldiers outside its walls on the 4th of February. Three Filipino soldiers crossed into the American lines, and an American sentry shot and killed one of them, in much the same spirit as the young soldier, above described, emptied his revolver into the native cardplayers. The comrades of the slain man at once opened fire on the American lines. The result may be best described in the words of one of the participants, a Californian soldier in the Third Artillery, whose letter was published in San Francisco shortly afterwards. He writes:

"A small body of insurgents had attempted to cross San Juan bridge and was driven back. It returned with reinforcements, and the second volley followed its attack upon the line. A few seconds after the second report every regiment in Manila was lined up outside its quarters, waiting impatiently for the signal to move. And of all the cheering you ever heard in your life! It showed that every soldier in Manila was 'just dying' for a chance to get at the black devils.

"The next morning the Americans charged over the trenches and swept everything before them. Our boat then steamed up to the firing line and started to shell the towns on the river. We struck Santa Ana, the insurgent headquarters, first, and after an hour's hot work we had the town in flames and what was left of the Filipinos running like frightened sheep.

"When we stopped shelling Santa Ana the First California Regiment entered, and what we had not burned they finished with a vengeance. Their motto, as well as that of the other regiments, is: *'The only good Filipino is a dead one; take no prisoners, as lead is cheaper than rice.'* At times we could hardly see one another through the powder smoke. We could tell, though, by the sound and by the regularity of the volley firing that our boys were giving them hades, and could see that the Americans in the other part of the town were pursuing the same course as we—that is, burning everything around them.

"The Tennessee men were on the right, and an orderly came aboard and reported that they were killing every native in sight, *whether a soldier or not.* We were then recalled by General Otis and had to remain in front of the place guarding it, while the rest of the boys were *enjoying themselves shooting 'niggers' on the run.* All along the river we could see the corpses of the natives lying on the banks or floating down the river. The Idahos at one place were burying the natives, and at one hole I saw them throw in sixty-five bodies.

"Our own battery did not do much Saturday night, but the next morning they made one of the grandest charges of history. They charged a cemetery that was full of natives and piled them up till you couldn't count the dead. They say our major bears a charmed life. He rode at the head of the column, urging the men forward and telling them to spare not even the wounded, thrusting his own sword through every wounded insurgent he passed."

Ten days later a Washington volunteer described the result to the families around Manila thus in the Seattle *Times:*

"The native women and children in our neighborhood and beyond, as well as the old men and sick, are absolutely starving to death. Their husbands and fathers have been killed, wounded, captured or driven back to Malolos, their houses burned to the ground with all their earthly possessions, and they are left with no means of subsistence. They attempt to come into the American lines by thousands, but have to be turned back. We cannot feed them."

On the 28th of February another California volunteer, Simon by name, told the subsequent events thus:

"After leaving troops in the captured towns we made a complete circuit and burned about twenty towns, making about ***a hundred thousand people homeless.***"

On the 29th of March an *Examiner* correspondent tells how the work proceeded then:

"The country between Marilao and Manila presents a picture of desolation. Smoke is curling from hundreds of ash heaps, and the remains of trees and fences torn by shrapnel are to be seen everywhere. The general appearance of the country is as if it had been swept by a cyclone. The roads are strewn with the furniture and clothing dropped in flight by the Filipinos. The only persons remaining behind are a few aged persons too infirm to escape. They camp beside ruins of their former homes and beg passers-by for any kind of assistance. The majority of them are living on the generosity of our soldiers, who give them portions of their rations. The dogs of the Filipinos cower in the bushes, still terrified and barking, while hundreds of pigs may be seen searching for food. Bodies of dead Filipinos are stranded in the shallows of the rivers or are resting in the jungle where they crawled to die or were left in the wake of the hurriedly retreating army. These bodies give forth a horrible odor, but there is no time at present to bury them. An old woman was found hidden in a house at Meycuayan yesterday just dead, apparently from fright and hunger."

The Peace Commissioners in their recent report add their experience. They write of Manila:

"The situation of the city when we got there was bad. Incendiary fires occurred daily. The streets were almost deserted. Half the native population had fled, and most of the remainder were shut in their houses. Business was at a standstill. Insurgent troops everywhere faced our lines, and the sound of the rifle fire was frequently audible in our house. A reign of terror prevailed. Filipinos who had favored Americans feared assassination, and few had the courage to come out openly for us. Fortunately there were among this number some of the best men of the city."

This ghastly record speaks for itself. It is true that accounts of this kind are no longer permitted to pass the censor's office in Manila established by General Otis, but there is little ground for hoping that the same ruthless destruction is not still going on. The sole principle that seemed to be recognized by either the American officers or the American administration was that absolute submission to the will of Congress was the condition on which this carnival of blood and fire could be stopped. Professor Schurman, of the Peace Commission, on the 22d of May offered what he was pleased to call "terms" to the natives in arms as follows:

"While the final decision as to the form of government is in the hands of the Congress, the President, under his military powers, pending the action of Congress, stands ready to offer the following form of government:

"A Governor General, to be appointed by the President; a cabinet, to be appointed by the President; the heads of departments and Judges to be either Americans or Filipinos, or both, and also a general advisory council, its members to be chosen by the people by a form of suffrage to be hereafter carefully determined upon.

"The President *earnestly desires that bloodshed cease* and that the people of the Philippines at an early date enjoy the largest measure of self-government compatible with peace and order."

This while the blood-shedding was almost exclusively the work of the American troops! !

The Filipino Commissioners asked for a truce until they could lay these propositions before their people, but that was rejected as preposterous. Professor Schurman told the Filipinos they had no means of gathering the people together, as the Americans control most of the ports. He also reminded them that a *liberal form* of government was offered them, and pointed out that it was better than the conditions existing under Spanish rule.

How even so learned a man as the professor could suppose peace proposals would be accepted without the consideration of the men asked to accept them is as incomprehensible as his unctuous assertion that the war was unavoidable, though the attacked natives were asking a truce to settle terms if possible.

The war went on in this purposeless, savage way while the Peace Commission was proclaiming pompously "that the aim and object of the American Government, apart from the fulfillment of the solemn obligations it has assumed towards the family of nations by the acceptance of sovereignty over the Philippine Islands, is the well-being, prosperity and happiness of the Philippine people, and their elevation and advancement to a position among the most civilized peoples of the world. The President believes this felicity—the perfection of the Philippine people—is to be brought about by the assurance of peace and order, by the guarantee of civil and religious liberty, by the establishment of courts of justice, by the cultivation of letters, the sciences and liberal and practical arts, by the enlargement of intercourse with foreign nations, by the expansion of industries and the pursuits of trade and commerce, by the multiplication of improvement in the means of internal communication, by development with modern mechanical inventions of the great natural resources of the archipelago and, in a word, by the uninterrupted devotion of the people to the pursuits of useful objects and the realization of those noble ideals which constitute the higher civilization of mankind." Such was the promise while the luckless natives were being shot down.

A few days before this proclamation the *Examiner's* correspondent described the operations of General Wheaton's flying brigade, which had just made a tour around the bay. "About four thousand of our troops moved over the country, firing tens of thousands of cartridges at two or three hundred retreating men. The village of Cainta was burned. We lost a few men killed and a great many wounded and we cleared a great stretch of thicket, hill and flat country of the insurgents. *We may have killed a thousand* in the whole movement, but there were only *a few score of bodies to show* for it. We took 300 prisoners, but we captured few arms. But what was it all worth? When we burned all the houses in the country and withdrew our lines to the river, the insurgents returned to their old places. General Otis complains that the insurgents will not concentrate. That was the complaint of General Weyler in Cuba. Our army is on the defensive. These sallies here and there *may furnish good material for war despatches* to Washington, but they do little to end the war. Meanwhile property in the island is being destroyed in every direction. Look where you will and columns of smoke darken the horizon. Unless we move against the main insurgent army, the agricultural population will become homeless vagabonds."

Another correspondent, Mr. Brooks, described the details of the methods used in a spirit too remarkable to be overlooked. He wrote to the San Francisco *Bulletin* with chuckling brutality:

"The Church of Caloocan is a wreck, and stands an example of what an American gunner can do with some of his long-distance guns. The bombarding vessels were fully three miles away in the deeper waters of Manila Bay, but the Monadnock dropped one of those thirteen-inch terrors through the corner of the church with the neatness of a target practice at short range. This killed a large number of refugees and nearly finished the large stone edifice, but there are plenty of evidence of other shots, including the artillery efforts. The church, rearing above the tall trees of the village, *made a capital target*. The city prison was also subjected to quite rough treatment by the shells, and its stone dungeons well shaken up. Caloocan is said to have contained 5,000 people. To-day there is not a thatched hut nor a man left. The troops found it absolutely necessary to burn the buildings in order to prevent them from being used as places of refuge for Filipino sharpshooters. There was accordingly a holocaust that could be seen for miles, and even after darkness fell the flames lit the skies. There are half a dozen villages similar to Caloocan between Manila and Malolos. Many of them are within gunshot of the bay, and unless something unexpected happens they will suffer the same fate as their sister village."

In the light of these burning villages, what is a man to think of the Peace Commissioners unctuously telling the Filipino people "that the United States are not only willing, but anxious, to establish in the Philippine Islands an enlightened system of government under which the Philippine people may enjoy the largest measure of home rule, and the amplest liberty consonant with the supreme ends of government, and compatible with those obligations which the United States has assumed toward the civilized nations of the world? The United States is striving earnestly for the welfare and advancement of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands. There can be no real conflict between American sovereignty and the rights and liberties of the Philippine people, for just as the United States stands ready to furnish armies and navies and all the infinite resources of a great and powerful nation to maintain and support their rightful supremacy over the Philippine Islands, so it is even more solicitous to spread peace and happiness among the Philippine people, guarantee them rightful freedom, protect them in their just privileges and immunities, accustom them to free self-government in ever-increasing measure and encourage them in those democratic aspirations, sentiments and ideals which are promised and are fruitful to national development."

In the same document the Commissioners tell what the insurgent natives had demanded of Spain two years earlier; namely, Parliamentary representation, freedom of the press, religious toleration, economic autonomy and laws similar to those of Spain. The abolition of the power of "banishment was demanded, with legal equality for all persons in law and equality in pay between Spanish and native civil servants." The Commissioners comment with calm assurance that these demands had good grounds because "in practice every Spanish Governor did what he saw fit, and the evil deeds of men in the Government were hidden from Spain by strict press censorship." No Spanish Governor had left a hundred thousand natives homeless, or slaughtered a thousand fleeing insurgents as a military exhibition of gunnery. The recklessness of truth displayed by the Commissioners is scarcely less revolting than the horrors of the war itself.

To describe the action of Americans in the Philippines as having anything in common with the free institutions which are the proudest boast of our country is a simple falsehood. From the beginning the framers of our Government jealously guarded against the power of military force at home. The present administration makes it absolute in the Philippines. If such be American liberties, they are not different from those enjoyed by the subjects of the Sultan of Turkey.

The system of government which had directed the Philippines for over three hundred years and under which its civilized population of seven million people had grown from some scattered savage tribes was abolished at a stroke of the pen by the American administration. It had absolutely nothing to substitute for it at the time. It was quite uncertain whether the real interests or even the popular sentiment of our country demanded the possession of the islands thus left to anarchy. What the seven million Filipinos wished, or even what manner of a people they were, was treated as of no importance whatever. A military officer without experience of legislation or civil administration and unacquainted with the language, habits or institutions of the country was vested with absolute powers to rule the islands and furnished with a force of new recruits double the whole strength of our national army two years ago. A commission of two college professors, one of whom had written a book on the Philippines, an old politician who had been our Minister to China, and the commanding general and admiral, was charged with due solemnity to "facilitate the most humane and effective extension of authority throughout the islands, and to secure with the least possible delay the benefits of a wise and generous protection of life and property to the inhabitants."

This remarkable description of the only measure thought of by American statesmen to provide for the government of a population as large as that of the late Confederate States is taken from President McKinley's own message of the 5th of December, a full year later. It need scarcely be added that the commission effected absolutely nothing. Its civilian members visited Manila, held meetings, interviewed some natives and gravely forwarded a report to Washington in November, which set forth at length its own benevolent intentions, but had only to suggest as a form of government "that the Filipinos are not a nation, but a variegated assemblage of different tribes and peoples, and their loyalty is still of the tribal type. As to the intellectual capacities of the Filipinos, the commission is disposed to rate them high. But excepting in a limited number of people, these capacities have not been developed by education or experience. The masses of the people are uneducated. That intelligent public opinion on which popular government rests does not exist in the Philippines. And it cannot exist until education has elevated the masses, broadened their intellectual horizon and disciplined their faculty of judgment. And even then the power of self-government cannot be assured without considerable previous training and experience under the guidance and tutelage of an enlightened and liberal foreign power. For the bald fact is that the Filipinos have never had any experience in governing themselves."

One attempt had been made, the commission said, at setting up a civil government after the retirement of Spain from the islands. "In Negros Island the natives had adopted a local form of government, including a Congress, and had raised the American flag. They believed themselves capable of managing their own affairs, and asked for a battalion of troops to hold in check a mountain band of fanatics. The battalion was furnished, but the people proved themselves unable to carry out their programme owing to ill feeling among their own officials. The Americans remained popular. At the request of General Otis, a new and simplified scheme of government for the island, giving the people a large voice in their affairs, *but placing an American in full control,* was put into operation. It brought about satisfaction (to the American possibly), and public order is better in the island to-day than at any time during the last twenty years." Summing up, the commission says: "The flat failure of this attempt to establish an independent native government in Negros, conducted as it was under the most favorable circumstances, makes it apparent that here as well as in less favored provinces a large amount of American control is at present absolutely essential to a successful administration of public affairs."

Flat failure to give even one island in the archipelago any tolerable government except a military despotism is the acknowledged result of our first experiment in colonization on the new "imperial" policy. Sixty thousand American troops have been employed for a year in chasing natives and burning the houses and fields of a population that was unknown to the majority of Americans two years ago. The cost to this country cannot be less than a hundred millions. Every soldier on foreign service costs the American people fifteen hundred dollars a year, and there are now over sixty thousand in the Philippines. The whole annual revenue under the Spanish Government did not equal a tenth of the amount already spent by the Administration in its attempt to establish American rule on anti-American lines in the Philippines. The Spanish force which maintained peace before numbered less than ten thousand and cost about three millions annually, yet it did not need to reduce the country to a desert to preserve order—as even the Peace Commissioners admit.

A more grotesque if less bloody illustration of the folly of trying to establish American institutions by military despotism is yet to tell. It comes from Guam, the island in the Ladrones which had been seized as a useful coaling station more than eighteen months ago. There was no insurrection there. A population of a few thousands had been living in peace under the rule of a Spanish officer with a dozen of police before the war. The President deemed it necessary to "Americanize" them in the imperialist manner by appointing a Military Governor, with absolute power over their liberties and properties. This gentleman, a Captain Leary, set about his task in the spirit of a Turkish Pasha. He found nine Catholic priests employed in their ordinary duties among this Catholic population. The Governor ordered eight of them to be banished, as he thought their influence might be hostile to his own régime. There were neither charges nor trial, other than the captain's ukase. The treaty, signed by our Government with Spain, had guaranteed all Spaniards the right to remain in the ceded islands, and also full freedom of religion. The captain in the fullness of his authority treated the stipulations as beneath his notice and deported the priests, as likely to obstruct the "Americanization" of the country. What his own ideas of American institutions are may be learned from the sympathetic description of his reforms given by a correspondent of the New York *Tribune* on the 20th of November. The writer tells gravely that "Governor Leary, of Guam, is having novel experiences for an American in an altogether unique community. One of his recent reports gives a terse résumé of affairs in the captain's dominion. It shows that the islanders are inordinately lazy, having acquired the habit of raising only such crops as will keep their bodies and souls together, and that they cannot be *easily induced to value money* or *exercise their earning power*. The most interesting part of the report relates to *reforms* begun, of which the Governor says: 'Having disposed of the priests' reign, rapid progress was made and no further resistance will be encountered.' The first of these reforms is calculated to compel each adult native to contribute to the support of the government by engaging in food production. The order directs all who have no trade to plant cereals, vegetables, etc., under more or less severe penalties. It is stipulated that each citizen *shall have at least twelve hens, one sow and continue in possession of them indefinitely*. They must bring eggs, chickens and vegetables to sell to the Governor's house and barracks at stated intervals, and they must pay their taxes. The other order demands that concubinage, which was general all over the island, shall stop immediately." In this order Governor Leary moralizes as follows: "The existing custom of raising families of illegitimate children is repulsive to ideas of decency, antagonistic to moral advancement, incompatible with the generally recognized customs of civilized society, a violation of the accepted principles of Christianity and a most degrading injustice to the innocent offspring, who is not responsible for the conditions of his unfortunate existence."

This is not an extract from Sancho Panza's history in Barataria, but an actual statement of the rule introduced into a long settled island as American civilization. It is told in all serious admiration by an American newspaper correspondent as the doings in peace of the first Governor appointed by President McKinley. The final climax is added to finish the picture:

"The Governor, in conclusion, commanded immediate wedlock for the whole population, and made the license and civil ceremony free until November 3. As a result, the officers in charge of the licenses and marriages were worked half to death until nearly everybody on the island was legally married. There was a rush to obey the order, and in fact the people have shown a disposition to be obedient to any suggestion from their Governor."

If any exercise of despotic power like this is told in the Arabian Nights, we do not know of it. The supposed "general concubinage" which shocked the Governor is, it is needless to say, a figment of his own imagination. Similar stories were told of the Philippines a few months ago, though marriages are more numerous proportionately there than in any European country. Mr. Leary may hold a civil ceremony essential to valid marriage, but such is not the belief of Catholics, and the people of Guam are all Catholics. The audacious pretense to regulate the most intimate family relations by the ukase of a sea captain is unparalleled in the history of America. It is noteworthy that it is highly approved by the *Tribune* correspondent. Catholics of America may well ponder on this and ask how long will freedom of conscience be left to themselves if the new theory of establishing free institutions by military despotism is tolerated by the American people.

It would be childish in the face of this action of Captain Leary, which has as yet received no condemnation from our Administration, to say there is no danger of persecution of Catholics under American rule. Its likelihood seems much greater at the present moment than it would have been two years ago to believe that the sympathy in the sufferings of the Cuban "reconcentrados" expressed by the American press would end in the reign of terror among the Filipinos that has been just described. If any people, be it French, English or American, lets its government be guided by impulse of the moment, not principle, it is impossible to say what it may not attempt. The recent experience of Admiral Dewey, welcomed to New York as a hero by seven millions of American citizens and hissed in public a few weeks later, is a modern object lesson of what popular favor is worth in this country as in others. Two years ago it would have been a joke to suggest the extension of American principles of government to other islands by military despotism. We have seen the experiment tried in Guam and the Philippines, and few seem to find it strange to-day. Would the New York *Tribune* find a new Culturkampf in America against the Catholic Church here, if suggested by an American administration, materially different from the lawless expulsion of the Spanish friars from Guam, which its correspondent describes with such unctuous, if idiotic, approval?

There are a few cardinal principles on which the stability of government so long enjoyed by these United States rests. It is not republican institutions in theory alone. A dozen at least of other lands have equally perfect theoretical constitutions, yet cannot maintain peace within their boundaries. Those principles are that the will of the people, expressed by fixed methods of election, shall be supreme in naming the administrative and other rulers of the community; that the standing army shall be kept in such limits as shall preclude the risk of a military dictator overruling the civil order of law, and that the civil government shall not interfere in matters of religion among its citizens. The first and second have already been set aside in the Philippines, and that, too, on the pretense of extending American ideas there. The third has been flagrantly disregarded in Guam by an officer dependent for his petty authority entirely on the President of the United States. Its extension to the seven million Catholics of the Philippines has been unblushingly advocated in many quarters. The expulsion of the Catholic priests, who had been guaranteed the full right to remain there by solemn treaty, was urged before the Treaty Commissioners at Paris by an English adviser, who was deemed worthy of consultation by our Commissioners. The confiscation of the property, held for centuries, for the support of Catholic seminaries, colleges and charities is commonly called for by a section of the American press. Even a sober publication like the *Outlook*, of New York, asked lately for a court of law, properly constituted, "to get round the possessory titles" of the Catholic orders in the Philippines. It went on to add with frank ignorance of the existence of any law courts in the Spanish colonies "that possessory title is gained by what is known as 'adverse possession;' that it is well settled that such adverse possession must be actual, visible, notorious, distinct and hostile, and that it may well be doubted whether the courts (American) would hold that such a title had been gained in a country where notoriously there were no courts or processes by which the title could be contested." As the courts of Manila have been in existence for over three hundred years, the meaning of this astounding argument can only be that no rights of property have any existence in the islands. Confiscation thus would only be the exercise of the rights of an American Governor to seize Catholic Church property at will.

How ready a large number of Americans are to act on this theory, without even the formality of a court, has been only too clearly shown during the past year. Plunder of every kind taken from the churches built by Catholic piety in the Philippines has been carried through the country by the returning volunteers of the army of occupation. Chalices, vestments, paintings, bells, statues and crucifixes in thousands have been exhibited in the tents of the returned soldiers without any attempt on the part of the military authorities to interfere with the robberies. The Peace Commission calmly contented itself with dismissing the question, and other advocates openly maintained that no robbery had been done by American soldiers because "strict orders had been issued against plunder." Orders "issued" are apparently regarded as all the protection the Catholics of the Philippines have a right to expect under the new imperialism. In the same way the treaty with Spain assured the right of all Spanish residents to reside in the ceded islands. Therefore the eight priests exiled from Guam by Captain Leary had no grounds for complaint. This, indeed, is Cromwell come again. "I meddle with no man's conscience, but I will not permit the Mass where the English Parliament rules."

The danger that some American Catholics may let themselves be hoodwinked as to the real meaning of this threatened attack on their religion in the Philippines is a most serious one. It has been shown by numerous utterances in the press. At the beginning of last year the New York *Herald* professed to give "a prominent Catholic clergyman" of that city as saying:

"If the islands are to be held by the United States, it is to be expected they will be placed under the hierarchy of the United States. The Government will not look with favor on the proposition *to allow the Spanish priests to remain* in power and office in these islands. While they are cordially disliked and even hated by a large body of the natives, they are still very influential and *their presence* there would be *a constant menace* to the interests of this country and *a hindrance to the work of Americanizing* the islands."

If the author of this statement be really a Catholic priest, he must have forgotten everything of Catholic rights in his anxiety for Americanizing the islands, whatever that may mean. Is the presence of Catholic priests among a Catholic people dependent on the favor of Government or is it a right of conscience? We heard a good deal of native Americanism and similar phrases in former years in this country, but it is strange, indeed, to find a Catholic describing the Catholic influence of the priests who have formed the Catholic population of the Philippines as a menace to American interests. The English Government, after its failure to root out the faith of the Irish people by the penal laws, endeavored to secure a veto on the nomination of the Irish Bishops from the Holy See. That attempt was baffled by the determination of the Irish Catholics in 1814. It was felt that any favor of a non-Catholic Government in politics or any support for the clergy would not compensate for the danger of its interference in the choice of spiritual guides. It looks as if a veto on the appointment of Catholic Bishops and priests, too, in the Philippines is being thought of as a development of the new imperialism. We do not believe that the Catholics of America can or will tolerate a subjection of their Church to the policy of the Administration at Washington any more than the Irish Catholics of the days of George III. would permit the veto to an English monarch.

The expulsion of the Spanish priests from the Philippines would mean that nearly six millions of Catholics should be deprived of the means of divine worship. It would leave them absolutely without the moral guidance which, during ten generations, they have been accustomed to receive from their priests during the whole course of their lives. When the American fleet entered Manila Bay the whole clergy of the country numbered little over two thousand.

Thirteen hundred, or two-thirds, belonged to the religious orders, and this thirteen hundred had the spiritual guidance of five and a half millions of Catholics. Baptisms, marriages, administration of the other sacraments, the celebration of Mass and other divine services, instruction in the Christian doctrine and the moral conduct of life were all supplied for that population by the friars whom it is so lightly proposed to expel, lest they might be a "hindrance to Americanization" of the people raised from barbarism to civilization by their labors and those of their predecessors in the same orders. Of the secular clergy about one-half are of Spanish birth. If they, too, had to be sacrificed, there would remain about four hundred priests of Filipino race to minister to a population larger than the Dominion of Canada. What the result would be may be guessed from the state of Negros and Panay as told by the Peace Commission and American correspondents in preceding pages. It would in all likelihood be the utter demoralization of the mass of the Philippine people.

The duty of Catholic citizens in this matter is clear. The people are sovereign by law, at least as yet, in these United States. Every citizen has a share in that sovereignty and is responsible for his exercise of it. It is at election time that this sovereign power can be used by the citizen of the United States without any superior but his own conscience. He must, then, clear his conscience as the Dominican missioners of San Domingo called on the Spanish King to clear his conscience of injustice to the Indians. For persecution directed against the Church of God no Catholic can give his aid without practical apostasy. To any violation of the American Constitution or any policy which sets justice and humanity aside he is bound in conscience to offer resistance to the fullest of his powers as a citizen. There can be no middle course. If the honored name of American liberty or the shelter of the American flag is given by faithless administrators of government of any grade, to rapine or slaughter or to war on the rights of conscience, every Catholic voter, every honest citizen of any creed is bound, as far as his power goes, to prevent such maladministration. It is a sworn duty to uphold the Constitution of our country and to obey its laws in all not contrary to conscience. It is a higher duty to follow the law of God for man as taught by his own Church or imprinted on the human heart by natural reason. We trust that this duty will not be forgotten by any Catholic.

Bryan J. Clinch.

San Francisco.

THE RELIGION OF SHAKESPEARE.

THE question of Shakespeare's religion has been much discussed. The most recent contribution to this department of Shakespearean literature is the learned and scholarly volume, entitled "The Religion of Shakespeare," which we owe to the pen of Father Sebastian Bowden, the distinguished London Oratorian. Father Bowden has made it clear that Rationalism can lay little claim to Shakespeare and Protestantism even less, and that, if Shakespeare's religion may be gathered from his writings the evidence is all in favor of his having been a Catholic.

We say, if Shakespeare's religion may be gathered from his writings, for it is on this kind of evidence that Father Bowden chiefly relies. Father Bowden does not indeed neglect what he calls "external evidence." He shows that Shakespeare's mother was a Catholic. He gives good reason for believing that Shakespeare's father was a Catholic, and, in this connection, upholds with considerable ingenuity and force the genuineness of the Catholicly worded "last will and testament" that has been ascribed to John Shakespeare. He argues, as he reasonably may, that if Shakespeare's parents were both Catholics, the inference must be, until the contrary is proved, that Shakespeare himself was a Catholic. He shows that the contrary has never been proved, that there is no evidence whatever of a satisfactory kind of the poet's acceptance of the new religion. He points out that tradition is in favor of Shakespeare's Catholicism. He quotes in testimony to this the declaration of the Rev. Richard Davies, who, writing in the latter part of the seventeenth century, asserts that Shakespeare "died a Papist."

That external evidence of this kind carries with it considerable weight is acknowledged by such critics as the Rev. Professor Shuttleworth, who, in an address delivered at St. Nicholas Cole Abbey on April 23, 1899, admitted that "a strong argument in favor of his (Shakespeare's) Catholicism was the fact that his mother belonged to one of the oldest and most famous Catholic families in England—the Ardens of Warwickshire—some of whose members had figured as martyrs for that creed." Another well-known Shakespearean critic, Mr. Halliwell Phillipps, remarking on the statement of the Rev. Richard Davies that Shakespeare "died a Papist," points out that the statement represents the local tradition of the latter half of the seventeenth century, and is "the testimony of a sober clergyman who could have had no conceivable motive for deception in what is evidently the casual note of a provincial hearsay."

But while Father Bowden gives due weight to the external evidence, he finds in Shakespeare's writings the most convincing proofs of the poet's Catholicism. It would be impossible for us in the course of a short paper to set forth Father Bowden's arguments in detail. All that we can attempt is to indicate the lines on which his arguments proceed. We limit ourselves to the inquiry whether the religion with which Shakespeare in his writings shows his sympathies is the religion of the so-called Reformers, or the religion of the Catholic Church. If it can be shown that all Shakespeare's sympathies were with the teaching and practice of the Catholic Church, it will follow that Shakespeare was no Rationalist, and thus we may omit any reference to the direct arguments by which Father Bowden has convincingly shown the futility of the attempts made by Professor Caird and other recent writers to claim Shakespeare for Rationalism.

What had the so-called Reformers abolished? The Sacrifice of the Mass, the sacraments of the Holy Eucharist, Penance and Extreme Unction, Purgatory and prayers for the dead, the homage paid to Our Lady and the saints, the intercession of saints, the veneration of relics and holy images, the sign of the cross, vestments, satisfactory works, meritorious works, celibacy, the religious state with its three vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. All these had been abolished by the "Reformers," and they were all reëstablished by Shakespeare, who speaks of them and of other beliefs and practices of the Catholic Church, as Father Bowden has shown, in a spirit of the profoundest reverence. Indeed we marvel at the *audacity* (there is no other word for it) with which Shakespeare pays open reverence to these proscribed beliefs and practices. Dr. Stubbs, the Dean of Ely, might well say, as he did when preaching the Shakespeare anniversary sermon, in the Collegiate Church of Holy Trinity, Stratford on Avon, on April 23, 1899, that there were "some things in Shakespeare for which, had he been a theologian, he might have been burned."

Compare man as viewed by the "Reformers" with man as viewed by Shakespeare, and (1) in respect to his nature. In the words of the authorized Lutheran Confession of Faith, man is characterized by the "intimate, profound, inscrutable and irreparable corruption of his entire nature, and of all his powers, especially of the superior and principal powers of his soul." (Solida Declaratio I., 31.) How does that compare with: "What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason; how infinite in faculties! In form and moving how express and admirable! In action how like an angel! In apprehension how like a God!" (Hamlet II., 2.) (2) In respect to free will and responsibility. According to Luther, man, in regard to the work of his salvation, is "like the statue of salt into which Lot's wife was turned; like to a trunk or a stone, having the use neither of eyes, nor mouth, nor any of the senses, nor of the heart." (In Genes. cxix.) But with Shakespeare man is free and responsible. His conscience is as a lamp to his feet. He may follow its guiding light, but he is not constrained to do so. If he do follow, peace and blessing are his portion. If he refuse to follow, his soul is rent by remorse and fear. (3) In respect to grace. *Sanctifying* grace, with the "Reformers," was little more than a name. The sinner, in their teaching, was justified extrinsically only, and in consequence of his faith. Once a sinner, always intrinsically a sinner. *Actual* grace, in their teaching, was irresistible. In the illustration of Luther, the soul is like to a mule, and is now ridden by God, now ridden by the devil. Its rider always determines its course. When actual grace is given, God is riding the mule, and the mule *must* go as God is directing. With Shakespeare, on the other hand, as appears from Father Bowden's pages, *sanctifying* grace is no mere extrinsic denomination, but a state or habit of the soul, an inherent, supernatural quality of the soul. *Actual* grace has no necessitating force. It may be accepted or set aside. And, like sanctifying grace, it is not the effect of *fides fiducialis*, but is won by earnest prayer.

Compare Shakespeare and the "Reformers" in their respective views on philosophy. Any abuse that the "Reformers" could spare from the friars and nuns they showered upon the philosophy of the schools. Wicliffe, "the Morning Star of the Reformation," had called the schools the "camps of Cain." Luther, improving on this, had called them "the unclean houses (lupanaria) of anti-Christ." Calvin, who was never to be outdone in amenities, called the great scholastic doctors "horned asses," "two-legged beasts," etc., etc. But, with Shakespeare, Aristotle is a name to be held in high honor. And when he manifests his mind upon such important points of philosophy as, *e. g.*, the genesis of knowledge, the nature of knowledge and its claims to objectivity, the formation of habits intellectual and moral, the claim of the will to freedom, the root of the distinction between man and brute, his views are always scholastic.

Certain critics, unable to deny the appreciative spirit in which Shakespeare writes of the beliefs and customs of the Old Religion, have endeavored to explain away the significance of this by asserting that the stage in Shakespeare's day was free from religious rancor. This explanation is at once inadequate and inaccurate. (1) It is inadequate. The mere absence of bigotry might account for a neutral attitude on the poet's part. But it could never account for the intense sympathy which Shakespeare everywhere manifests with Catholic rites and doctrines. It would account for his not describing Confession as, in the elegant words of Luther, "a most bloody torture" (cruentissima carnificina); but it would not account for his laying stress on the consolation and peace which the Sacrament of Penance affords. It would account for his refraining from ribald stories concerning monks and nuns; but it would not account for his holding up monks and nuns as models of conscientiousness and purity. (2) The explanation is not simply inadequate; it is positively false. The truth is, as Father Bowden has shown, that the stage in Shakespeare's day was the arena for fierce religious controversy. In 1589, shortly after Shakespeare's arrival in London, the Puritans and Prelatists were reviling each other, in plays written in the interests of their respective parties, with such rigor that Harte, the Mayor of London, felt obliged, in the interests of the public peace, to intervene. But there was no Mayor, or other official, to intervene in the interests of the Catholics, and, in a rapid succession of plays, they were slandered and lampooned with impunity. George Peele, in his "Farewell to the Famous and Fortunate Generals of Our English Forces" (1589), invites Norris and Drake to lead their armies "to lofty Rome, and there deface the power of anti-Christ, and pull his paper walls and popery down." Lodge and Greene, in their jointly written play, the "Looking Glass for London" (1591), call upon London to repent of its sins, lest, in punishment, it fall again under the dominion of "Romish anti-Christ." In Greene's "Maiden's Dream" (1593), Sir Christopher Hatton is held up to admiration because "He hated anti-Christ and all his trash, and was not led away by superstitions." Marlowe in his "Faustus" (1593), exhibits at length the superstition, luxury and mummery of the Pope, and of the "bald pate friars whose *summum bonum* is belly cheer;" and in his "Massacre of Paris" (1593) the same poet represents the Pope as ratifying whatever is done by murder and tyranny, and the Duke of Guise as declaring that he has a "Papal dispensation" for the murder of all Protestants, which is to be effected by 30,000 friars and monks from the monasteries, priories, abbeys and halls. Marston's "Scourge of Villainy" sets before us "peevish Papists" crouching and kneeling to "dumb idols," and enlarges upon the "monstrous filth" of Douai Seminary. Dekker, in the introduction to his "Whore of Babylon" (1600), informs us that the purpose of his play is to set forth "the inveterate malice, treasons, machinations, underminings and continual bloody stratagems of the purple whore of Rome." Other instances of this kind might easily be given; but we think that proof sufficient has already been furnished that in the works of Shakespeare's contemporary dramatists the bitterness and rancor of Protestant bigotry was aggressively manifest. In the writings of Shakespeare, on the other hand, there is not a single word in disrespect of the ancient Church, its beliefs, its practices, or its institutions. Shakespeare does indeed use the expression which gives the title to Dekker's play; but only to place it in the mouth of the dissolute, drunken Falstaff, as he tosses on his death bed without a word of prayer, or a single token of repentance. Shakespeare, instead of assailing the Church, defended it, as we have already said. Candid Protestant critics have admitted this. "In an age," writes Mr. Knight (Biography of Shakespeare, p. 183), "when the prejudices of the multitude were flattered and stimulated by abuse and ridicule of the ancient ecclesiastical character, Shakespeare always exhibits it so as to command respect and affection."

Not only did Shakespeare carefully refrain from introducing anything anti-Catholic into his original compositions, but he further rigorously eliminated all the anti-Catholic elements from the plays which he remodeled. One of the plays remodeled by him was "The Troublesome Reign of King John." The aim of this scurrilous production was to glorify Protestantism and vilify the ancient faith. As Shakespeare was well aware, all that he needed to do in order to secure the popularity of his adaptation was to retain, or better still, to emphasize its furious attacks on the Church, and its ribald stories of monks and nuns. But Shakespeare instead of retaining or emphasizing acted as though he were a censor appointed by the Church. In the original play, when the sentence of his excommunication is made known to him, John contemptuously replies: "So, sir, the more the fox is curst, the better it fares; if God bless me and my land, let the Pope and his shavelings curse and spare not." A *censor deputatus* would never let that pass. So Shakespeare strikes it out. In the original play John threatens to "rouse the lazy lubbers (the monks) from their cells and send them as prisoners to the Pope." Thunders of applause must have greeted these words when spoken before an Elizabethan audience. But Shakespeare runs his pen through them, all the same. The original play gives expression to the current calumny that, according to Catholic teaching, an oath "made with a heretic" has no binding force. Shakespeare not only strikes this out, but is careful also to substitute in its stead, and place in Pandulph's mouth, a detailed and elaborate disquisition on the nature of an oath, in complete accordance with the Church's genuine teaching on the subject. In the original play John, after his victory over the French, hurls jeers and invectives at "the mischievous Priest in Italy, who calls himself God's Vicar," and is now hard at work with Dirges, Octaves and Requiems to assuage the flames of Purgatory for those who have fallen in battle, and covers with abuse those princes "who formerly bore the yoke of the servile priest." All this is carefully suppressed by Shakespeare. In the original play there were certain filthy cloister scenes. According to Gervinus these abominable scenes, with their vile and slanderous attacks on monks and nuns, were "certainly very amusing to the fresh Protestant feelings of the time." No doubt they were; but Shakespeare did not permit a single line of them to remain. In the original play Pandulph, the Papal Legate, is represented as a hypocrite, a crafty, double-dealing, unscrupulous politician. But in Shakespeare's "King John" he appears as an experienced, far-sighted, broad-minded statesman, and a true ghostly father withal, full of sympathy for the afflicted. In the original play a compliment is paid to Henry VIII. John declares that his sins have made him unworthy to fulfil the exalted task of driving "Pope and Poperie" from the realm of England, but that one day a king will be raised up great and good enough to receive so noble a commission. Shakespeare quietly put his pen through this. In the original play the prophecy of the Five Moons is given an anti-Papal interpretation. In Shakespeare's "King John" it is stripped of this interpretation. In the original play John is defiant to the last, and dies cursing Rome and prophesying its downfall. In Shakespeare's "King John" the King dies desolate and despairing. Was there ever a more careful *censor deputatus* than Shakespeare proved himself to be? But we must admit an apparent exception to the general vigilance of his censorship. When Pandulph, as Legate of Pope Innocent III., called King John to account for refusing to permit Archbishop Langton to take possession of his See of Canterbury, and for appropriating the revenues of that see, the King bade the Legate inform the Pope "that no Italian priest shall tithe or toil in our dominion; but, as we under heaven are supreme head, so, under Him, that Great Supremacy, where we do reign, we will alone uphold, without the assistance of a mortal hand: So tell the Pope, all reverence apart to him and his usurp'd authority." (King John III., 1.) This speech, which is undoubtedly a very bitter one, has been often quoted in anti-Catholic declamations by Prime Ministers, Lord Chancellors and Archbishops in our own times. But the question is whether this bitter speech really represents the mind of Shakespeare. Many critics, as might have been expected, have asserted that it does, and, all other proofs failing, have pointed triumphantly to these lines as a convincing proof of Shakespeare's Protestantism. But these critics, as Father Bowden has pointed out, have been somewhat overhasty in reaching their conclusion. To discover a dramatist's mind it is not sufficient to consider the sentiments that he expresses; we must further consider the mouth through which he expresses him. We may lawfully seek the poet's ideal in the character which he draws on heroic lines; but we surely do him an injustice if we seek for his ideal in the "villain of the piece." King John speaks the words in question. Now what manner of man is John as he appears in Shakespeare's play? Does the poet portray him as a hero, or does he portray him as a villain? He portrays him most emphatically as a villain. "John," says the Protestant critic Kreysig, quoted by Father Bowden, "begins as an ordinary and respectable man of the world, and he ends as an ordinary criminal; he is not only a villain, but a mean villain. The satanic grandeur of an Edmund or a Macbeth is wholly beyond him." (Vorlesungen I., 462.) But not only was John, in Shakespeare's delineation, "a villain, and a mean villain;" he was further an unsuccessful villain. All his curses recoiled upon himself. His bold defiance to the Pope proved to be nothing more than mere sound and fury. He ended by eating his own words. He humbled himself to the dust before the Legate, and as a penitent received again his crown from the Legate's hands, and his kingdom in fief from the Pope. The anti-Catholic speeches then which Shakespeare places in the mouth of King John no more prove that Shakespeare was a Protestant than the words "There is no God," which David represents the fool as saying "in his heart" prove that David was a skeptic.

Shakespeare does indeed manifest his scorn for one form of religion. But that religion was not the Catholic. It was the religion which strove to oust the Catholic religion; the religion which cast aside authority and scoffed at tradition; which bade every man take the Bible and interpret it for himself. Professors of this religion find their place in Shakespeare's pages. Jack Cade and his followers, Costard and Holofernes, Quince and Bottom; but, above all, Falstaff—such are the representatives of the "reformed" doctrine, as they appear in the writings of Shakespeare. Father Bowden is of opinion that, in the character of Falstaff, Shakespeare was portraying Sir John Oldcastle, otherwise known as Lord Cobham, the notorious Lollard leader whom Bale and Fox had canonized as a Protestant martyr. There is certainly a striking resemblance between Oldcastle and Falstaff. In both of them we find sanctimoniousness and the habit of quoting Scripture on the one hand, and obscenity and depravity on the other. Indeed, Shakespeare would seem to have given his audience something more than a hint that Falstaff was drawn from Oldcastle, for Prince Henry styles Falstaff in almost the first words that he addresses to him, "My *old* lad of the *castle*," and these words supplied the title under which the play was first produced. But, whether Shakespeare intended to portray Oldcastle in Falstaff or not, there can be no doubt that the public accredited him with this intention, and in November, 1599, a play, written by Anthony Munday in collaboration with others, and entitled "The History of Sir John Oldcastle, the Good Lord Cobham," was put on the stage with the view to rehabilitating Oldcastle in popular esteem. The words of the prologue, "It is no hampered glutton we present, nor aged counsellor to youthful sin; let fair truth be graced, since forged invention former time defaced," are an evident allusion to Shakespeare's description of Falstaff: "That villainous, abominable misleader of youth, Falstaff, that old white-bearded Satan," and the delineation that it is supposed to contain of Lord Cobham. But whether Falstaff stood for Oldcastle or not, the professors of the "reformed" religion met with scant courtesy from Shakespeare, who drew his ideal expounders of religion from the representatives of the ancient faith. This is acknowledged even by Protestant critics. Thus Mr. Thornbury, whom Father Bowden describes as "a very strong Protestant," writes: "To judge from Sir Oliver Martext and Sir Hugh Evans, the parish priests (Protestant) of Shakespeare's day were no very shining lights, and the poet seems to fall back, as in 'Romeo and Juliet' and 'The Two Gentlemen of Verona,' on the ideal priest of an earlier age. It is indeed true that he always mentions the old faith with a certain yearning fondness." (Shakespeare's England, Vol. I., p. 211.) Shakespeare does indeed utter a reproach against Cardinal Beaufort, and his picture of Wolsey is far from a favorable one. But his reproach against Beaufort is one that any Catholic might have lawfully made, while his portrait of Wolsey is actually copied from the description given of the famous Cardinal by B. Edmund Campion, the first Jesuit martyr, in his "History of Ireland." Of Shakespeare's treatment of Pandulph we have already spoken. The remaining Catholic prelates whom Shakespeare put on the stage were, in the words of the Protestant critic Thummel, "recruited from the highest houses in England, and represent a stately array of political lords in priestly robes, of noble descent, true priests and Englishmen to the backbone." (Tahrbuch, 16, 361.)

Once Shakespeare does seem to be leading up to an attack on the Church. "The world is deceived by ornament," he makes Bassanio to say. Bassanio speaks first of ornament as deceiving in the law, and then turns to ornament as deceiving in religion. Surely here at least can come no attack on the "Reformers." Whoever accused the spoilers of churches, the whitewashers of mural decorations, the renders of vestments, the melters of ecclesiastical vessels of gold and silver of excessive love of ornament in religion? Surely now will come an onslaught on vestments, incense, lights, processions and the like papist trumperies and mummeries. Yet, once again, not the gorgeous ceremonial of the Catholic Church, but the Protestant treatment of the Bible is the object of Shakespeare's scorn. "In religion," continues Bassanio, "what damned error, but some sober brow will bless it and approve it with a test, hiding the grossness with fair ornament."

What were the themes which Shakespeare chose? Protestants might celebrate, as Bale and Spencer did, the downfall of the Papal supremacy; or, like Ben Jonson, the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot; or, like Dekker, the destruction of the Armada; or might sing, like Fletcher, the glories of Elizabeth. But Shakespeare has not a single word to say on these subjects. His muse is almost exclusively occupied with the men and women, and the spirit and temper of Catholic times.

Where does Shakespeare find his heroes. We know where the "Reformers" found theirs. They found them in King John, in "bluff King Hal," in "good Queen Bess." Shakespeare writes of John and Henry. We have seen what John was in Shakespeare's delineation—"a villain, and a mean villain," with all his curses on the Pope recoiling on his own head. How does Shakespeare write of Henry VIII.? Had Fletcher, Munday, Marlowe or any other Protestant dramatist written on such a theme, the "Reformation" would have been set before us as the heroic act of Henry's reign, and Catherine and her daughter Mary would suffer by contrast with Anne Boleyn and Elizabeth. But Shakespeare's treatment of the subject is the very opposite to this. Shakespeare exposes the Tudor tyranny in its worst features. He excites all our sympathy in behalf of the pious Catholic Queen, "whose afflictions, virtues and patience," says Mr. Spedding, "he elaborately exhibits," and arouses all our indignation at the shameless wrong that has been done her. Henry he represents as a melodramatic, pretentious, arrogant, oily hypocrite. He scoffs again and again at Henry's "conscience," that conscience which had divorced a lawful wife, married an adultress and forced upon an unwilling nation the curse of the "Reformation." One who scoffed at the "conscience" which had divorced Queen Catherine, and celebrated with all his matchless power the virtues of that deposed Queen, was clearly not the man to sing the glories of Elizabeth. And, in truth, when Elizabeth died, Shakespeare alone of the contemporary poets and dramatists refused to compose a single line in honor of her memory. Chettle taxed him with this. "Nor doth the silver-tongued mellicent drop from his honeyed muse one subtle tear to mourn her death." But Shakespeare obstinately remained silent.

Shakespeare's ideal Prince is King Henry V. And this ideal Prince of his, this man whom he would set before the world as the great national hero of England, he draws as a devout Catholic. Of the King's piety Shakespeare leaves us in no doubt. "We are in God's hands, brother, not in theirs," remarks Henry when the Duke of Gloster has expressed his apprehension lest the French should attack at a moment when the English were unprepared. Henry warns a private soldier whom he meets by chance, and who is unaware that he is speaking with the King, that a soldier in the wars should, like a sick man on his bed, "wash every mote from his conscience;" thus prepared "death is to him advantage." Before the fight commences Henry invokes the aid of heaven. When the victory is gained he gives the glory to God. "Praised be God, and not our strength for it," he cries, when first he hears that the field is won. And when he later learns how complete the victory has been, he prays: "O God, Thy arm was here; and not to us, but to Thy arm alone ascribe we all. . . . Take it, God, for it is only Thine." And then he proclaims as the order of the day: "Do we all holy rites; let there be sung 'Non nobis' and 'Te Deum.'" In the same spirit of humility, Henry refused the request of the lords that he should have borne before him "his bruised helmet and his bended sword," on his triumphant entry through the streets of London; for he was ever "free from vainness and self-glorious pride, giving full glory, signal and ostent, quite from himself to God." And this devoutly-minded King, this "mirror of Christian knights" is depicted by Shakespeare as an earnest and fervent Catholic.

Before the battle of Agincourt he implores God not, when deciding what shall be the issue of the contest, to think of his father's complicity in the murder of Richard II., but to think rather of the measures which he himself has taken to expiate his father's crime. He provides from year to year for five hundred aged poor who "twice a day their withered hands hold up towards heaven to pardon blood;" and he has built two chantries "where the sad and solemn priests sing still for Richard's soul." "These two foundations," writes Father Bowden, "were situated on the opposite banks of the Thames. That on the Surrey shore at Sheene was given to the Carthusians. The other, Sion House, facing it on the Middlesex shore, was bestowed on Bridgettine nuns."

On the supposition that a dramatist's views may be gathered from his writings, we may confidently say that Father Bowden has proved to demonstration that Shakespeare's sympathies were entirely with the beliefs and practices of the ancient faith. But may we make this supposition? Some of the non-Catholic reviewers of Father Bowden's work, seeing clearly that, if the supposition be admitted, Father Bowden's conclusion must remain incontestable, have denied his right to make the supposition. A dramatist, they argued, speaks only in character, and his writings are, in consequence, no index to his personal views. The answer to this contention is manifold. (1) It is quite in accordance with custom to judge of a dramatist's views on life and religion from the manner in which he expresses himself on these all important subjects in his writings. The personal beliefs and inmost convictions of all great dramatists from Eschylus to Milton (for Milton's greater poems are, in truth, dramas) have been discussed in the past, and are still the subject of discussion, though the data of this discusssion are taken, in most cases, from their dramas alone. (2) There are not a few critics at the present day, like Professor Dowden, Professor Caird and Mr. Tyler, in England, and Kreysig and Dr. Vehse, in Germany, who profess to prove from Shakespeare's dramas that Shakespeare was a Rationalist. If, then, it be lawful to argue from the writings of dramatists generally to the religious beliefs of the dramatists themselves, why are we to make an exception in the case of Shakespeare? And if it be lawful to attempt to prove from Shakespeare's writings that Shakespeare was a Rationalist, why is it not lawful from those same writings to attempt to prove that Shakespeare was a Catholic? (3) Father Bowden, in his inquiry, has been guided throughout by the canon of criticism laid down by Aristotle to the effect that we are, when endeavoring to ascertain a dramatist's views, to consider not simply what the dramatist says, but also the character by which he says it. The reasonableness of this rule is apparent. The language and action of a hero may be supposed to represent the poet's type of what is good and noble, and therefore of what he would wish his own language and action to be. The sentiments of a scoundrel, on the other hand, are intentionally drawn as false, base and treacherous, and therefore presumably not those of the poet's ideal self. Now, though Shakespeare may place anti-Catholic sentiments in the mouth of one portrayed by him as "not only a villain, but a mean villain," like King John, he is careful to draw those characters whom he evidently reveres and loves as devout and earnest Catholics. We have been able to present Father Bowden's arguments only in their broad, general lines. For the full elaboration of these arguments we refer our readers to Father Bowden's interesting and scholarly volume.

William L. Gildea.

London.

THE YEAR OF JUBILEE.

A JUBILEE, or Holy Year, is a year in which a Plenary Indulgence is granted to all who visit certain churches, and perform certain good works, with proper dispositions, and Confessors receive extraordinary powers with regard to absolution in reserved cases, and censures, and in the commutation of vows.

Several reasons for the institution of the Holy Year are given by the Popes in their Constitutions: the compassion of Mother Church offering a remedy to those who are oppressed by sin, to stir up and renew the devotion of the faithful, to venerate SS. Peter and Paul by frequent visits to their basilicas, and to honor the city, Mother, Mistress and Head of all the Churches, which is consecrated by the tombs of the two Apostles and the blood of so many martyrs.

The Jubilee of the Christian Church has a parallel in the observance prescribed in Leviticus (ch. xxv.), "Thou shalt sanctify the fiftieth year, and shalt proclaim remission to all the inhabitants of the land: for it is the year of Jubilee. Every man shall return to his possession, and every one shall go back to his former family." The Mosaic Jubilee was announced by sound of trumpet, for it came laden with redemption to all, debtors were relieved, and those who had been forced in the straits of poverty to sell their land resumed possession. Just as the Hebrews received, every fifty years, restitution of mortgages; as the debts of their poor were cancelled and slaves were set at liberty, so the faithful in the year of Jubilee obtain remission of the penalty of their offenses by the Indulgence, and those who are in the bonds of sin are freed through the merits of Christ.

In the Divine economy man's instruction in spiritual and invisible mysteries is conveyed to him by visible and material signs: the wisdom of God condescending to his capacity, to lift him up, by the help of figures and symbols to a comprehension of the august realities. What were the sacrifices and ritual observances of the Old Law but aids to human intelligence, confined in its ken by sense and matter, giving expression to spiritual thoughts in visible and material actions? The Church, God's vicarious Teacher, does not neglect this method. The institution of the Holy Year and the rites that solemnize it, like all the ceremonies of her liturgy, are material symbols that speak to the senses, but raise the soul into the region of spirit.

The characteristic ceremony which distinguishes the Holy Year is the opening and shutting of the *Porta Santa*, or Holy Door. It was suggested by the ordinance appointed for the Jews in Ezechiel (ch. xlvi.), "The gate of the inner court, that looketh toward the east, shall be shut the six days, on which work is done, but on the Sabbath Day it shall be opened, yea and on the day of the new moon it shall be opened."

The Porta Santa is one of the five doors of the basilica of St. Peter, and of the three other Patriarchal basilicas, St. Paul, St. John Lateran and St. Mary Major, which is only opened during the year of the Jubilee and walled up till the next. The ceremony with which it is opened and shut is a link with the ancient discipline of the Church dealing with penitents. At the beginning of Lent it was the custom solemnly to exclude from participation in the sacred mysteries, and even from the church's precincts, those who by the canons were subject to public penance. On Good Friday, if duly repentant, they were absolved, and admitted again to communion with the faithful. The Jubilee rite indicates the opening and closing of the Church's spiritual treasury, the satisfaction and merits of the Redeemer, from whose bounty pardon of sin and remission of punishment are dispensed to those who qualify themselves, by fulfilling the prescribed conditions, to receive the indulgence of the Holy Year.

It is sometimes said that the observance of the Holy Year, or Jubilee, was a contrivance of the Papal Court to bring, with a concourse from all parts of the world, an increase to its exchequer. So far was the first institution of the Jubilee from being an invention of the Popes, that the proclamation of the first historically authenticated Jubilee by Boniface VIII. cannot be described as a spontaneous act of that Pontiff. At Christmas of the year 1299 Rome was invaded by extraordinary crowds from places far and near, who came to visit the Basilica of St. Peter, and on the first day of the new year they arrived in still greater numbers, all full of hope to obtain some great indulgence and spiritual favors they had heard of and were led to expect. For two months this concourse continued to increase, and Pope Boniface was induced to order search to be made in the Church's registers for any trace of a grant to justify the popular expectation. Nothing could be discovered; even if a document ever existed, its loss was not to be wondered at in the perpetual wars of foreign enemies and the troubles of domestic faction. Tradition was investigated, and the evidence of the oldest living, whose fathers had been alive a hundred years before. Nonagenarians were found to certify that they had heard from their parents who had come as pilgrims to Rome at the beginning of the century that at every hundredth year Indulgences were to be gained by visiting the Churches of St. Peter and St. Paul, but nothing could be ascertained as to the nature or extent of the privileges claimed; on this, testimony was not concurrent.

It was then that Boniface, after consulting his Cardinals, issued the famous Bull of 22 February, 1300, in which he implicitly sanctioned the tradition, and determined the conditions for gaining the spiritual favors. To all the faithful, who during the year 1300, or on each hundredth year following, should visit the basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul on thirty different days, if resident in Rome; or fifteen days, if pilgrims or strangers, he grants a Plenary Indulgence. This decree may therefore be regarded as the revival and solemn ratification of a traditional persuasion of the Christian people, based on their practical faith in the power of the Keys, and the Headship of Rome, and testified to from the earliest times by pilgrimages of laymen and churchmen, of noble and simple, made to the tomb of Peter.

The publication of the Bull at this critical period was most opportune. Civil faction, the political revolutions in Italy and the turbulent ambition of foreign invaders who aimed at domineering over the Church, had been bringing discredit on Religion, sapping the popular faith and multiplying excesses and crimes.

The announcement of the Jubilee drew to Rome extraordinary multitudes from every part of Christendom. Giovanni Villani, who was present, says that during the year there was a continuous population of 200,000 souls, and in the course of twelve months two millions were calculated to have arrived. Among these Charles of Valois, brother of Philip le Bel, with his wife Catharine, came accompanied by a suite of five hundred knights. It has been conjectured, and not without reason, that the poet Dante came to Rome on this occasion, and that in his allusion to the crowds passing over the bridge of S. Angelo in two streams, one directed to St. Peter's, the other returning to the city, he is describing what he saw:

As when the Romans (because all too vast
  Their multitude, the year of Jubilee)
The bridge in twofold line and order pass'd;
  And, thus divided, on one side they see
The castle, and towards St. Peter's go,
  And turn'd towards the mount the others be.[1]

It is also singular that the initial scene of his great poem is timed for Maundy Thursday, 1300. The subject of the "Divina Commedia," as Dante tells us in his dedication to Can Grande della Scala, is man in his relation to the Divine Justice, which dispenses reward or punishment according to the use made of his free will. It was composed with a deeply spiritual and ascetic purpose; in the poet's words, "to raise up those who are in this life from their condition of misery, and conduct them to a state of bliss."

---

[1] Dante, *Inferno*, xviii. Mrs. Ramsay's Translation.

The scope and purpose of the Holy Year is no other, and it would almost seem as if Dante had conceived the idea of his poem, when he was full of the impressions of the first Jubilee Year. Dante was certainly at Rome in the pontificate of Boniface, for he was one of five ambassadors sent to the Pope by the Guelphs of Florence.

The liberality of the Pontiff, aided by contributions from some Romans and the more wealthy of the pilgrims, provided lodging and food for all this multitude. Abundant alms for the entertainment of the poor, and for the restoration and embellishment of the churches, poured in. St. Peter's alone received fifty thousand gold florins, and St. Paul's thirty thousand. By the Pope's command a large portion of this money was invested in the purchase of castles and land as endowment for the basilicas, and till the present day the memory of those donations has been preserved in the name "Castel Giubileo," given to a domain ten miles from Rome, still part of the patrimony of St. Peter's.

The second Jubilee was promulgated in a time of desolation for Rome. For forty years the Popes had been holding splendid court at Avignon, and the Eternal City, abandoned to itself, was reduced to a state of extreme squalor. An earthquake had laid part in ruins, grass grew in St. Peter's, its bell tower was cast down, the Lateran was roofless, disaster menaced St. Paul's, the Liberian Basilica had suffered severely. A pestilence succeeded the earthquake and the Romans, in consternation, betook themselves to the churches and implored the divine mercy. They regarded their afflictions as a scourge for sin, and turned to the absent Pontiff for encouragement and help. The Pope then was Clement VI. An embassy headed by Stephen Colonna was dispatched to Avignon in 1342, and two years later another was sent conducted by Petrarch and Cola di Rienzi, then at the height of his fame and the popular favor. The eloquence of one envoy and the fascinating enthusiasm of the other appealed to the Pope. They besought him to restore the pontifical residence to Rome, and to raise it from its depression by anticipating the time for another Jubilee. Clement would not promise to bring back the Court, but he was so captivated by the young Tribune that he associated him with the Bishop of Orvieto in a commission to govern the Roman State till permanent provision was made. He agreed to anticipate the Holy Year, and issued a Bull stating that, in consideration of the brief span of human life, he abbreviated the interval fixed for the celebration of the Jubilee, reducing it from a hundred to fifty years. He added the Lateran to the churches to be visited by the pilgrims, reducing at the same time the number of visits to be made by strangers to eight. He deputed a Cardinal as Legate *a latere* to preside at the opening, appointed for the vigil of

Christmas, 1349. The Jubilee of 1350, notwithstanding the absence of the Papal Court, saw a greater concourse of pilgrims than the first. Matteo Villani, a contemporary, relates that at Pentecost nearly 800,000 persons were present in Rome. Louis of Bavaria came among the rest, and Rienzi offered him the protectorate of the Roman Republic, an honor which he declined out of reverence for the rights of the Church. St. Brigid of Sweden was also then in the city, where she had arrived with her daughter some years before to fix her home on soil sanctified by the blood of so many martyrs.

In 1371 Gregory XI. was elected Pope. Yielding to the representations and entreaties of St. Brigid and St. Catherine of Siena, and awed, perhaps, by a threat of the Romans to give themselves a Pope if he did not speedily come to reside with them himself, he resolved to set out. On January 17, 1377, he made his solemn entry into the city, received with unfeigned acclamation by the populace. He published no Jubilee, but to the number of churches to be visited for the indulgences he added St. Mary Major's.

In 1389 Pope Urban VI. further reduced the interval separating the Holy Years to thirty-three years, in memory of the reputed years of our Lord's life on earth, and fixed the year 1390 for the celebration of the next. He died before its opening, but his decree was carried out by his successor, Boniface IX. At this time an antipope divided the allegiance of Christendom, and his adherents in France and Spain abstained from taking part in the pilgrimage to Rome. Accordingly this was not so numerous as on previous occasions. Many, however, came from Germany, Hungary, Bohemia, Poland, England and other countries in the obedience of Boniface.

The year 1400 had been designated in the original Bull of Boniface VIII. as a Holy Year, and notwithstanding the subsequent changes decreed by other Popes, immense multitudes flocked to Rome, in expectation of the promised graces. But the Pope refused to open anew the treasures of the Church after such a short interval.

The fourth Jubilee was celebrated by Martin V. in 1423, after the space of thirty-three years prescribed by Urban VI. This time the pilgrims were less numerous than at the last. It was just at the close of the great schism which was healed by the election of Martin, and the renunciation or deposition of three contending claimants. It was this Pontiff who sternly rebuked the English Primate for presuming to arrogate the powers of the Vicar of Christ and proclaim a sort of Jubilee to all who visited his Cathedral Church at Canterbury.

If the last two Jubilees passed in comparative obscurity, this cannot be said of the next recurrence of the Holy Year. It was celebrated by Nicholas V. in 1450. The number of pilgrims far surpassed any of the former occasions. Many came to Rome, drawn by the fame of the Pope's personal holiness of life. He frequently took part in the processions of penance in the streets, often with bare feet. During this Jubilee, devotion to the Holy Face and its image, preserved in St. Peter's, received a great impulse. So eager was Frederic III., crowned King of the Romans and heir to the Imperial throne, to obtain a near view of the holy relic, that to enable him to enter the small chapel where it is kept he was made honorary canon of the chapter. It was on occasion of a solemn exposition of the Relic that a crowd returning from the Basilica, meeting another on its way to the church, on the bridge of S. Angelo, was thrown into panic which caused the death of two hundred persons.

Clearly the Popes, from what has been said, did not consider themselves tied by their predecessors to the intervals prescribed for holding the Jubilees, and the space of a hundred years was successively replaced by periods of fifty and thirty-three years. The last change, and it reduced the interval to twenty-five, still observed, was made by Paul II. in 1470. He issued a Bull in that year making this modification and proclaiming a Jubilee for 1475. He did not live to celebrate it, and the sixth Holy Year was solemnized by Sixtus IV.

It is in the Jubilee of Alexander VI. that we hear the first mention of the *Porta Santa*, or Holy Door, to be opened and shut with certain solemnities at the beginning and end of each Jubilee. Indeed most of the ceremonial attending the commencement and close of the years of Jubilee was established by this Pontiff. He directed that the announcement of the Jubilee was to be made three times in the previous year, but Julius III. limited the proclamations to two, fixed afterwards by Gregory XIII. for the Feast of the Ascension and the last Sunday in Advent. This regulation continues in force. Alexander VI. was the first to extend the privileges of the Jubilee to the whole Catholic world in the year following its celebration in Rome, on the fulfillment of certain conditions. Publishing the Jubilee for 1500 Alexander refers in his Bull to a "Door which is wont to be opened for the devotion of the faithful each hundredth Jubilee year." This, if it existed, must have been walled up by Boniface IX., but it could not be discovered by Alexander's workmen, although he himself superintended the search; and he ordered a new door to be prepared, decorated with marble and sculpture, easily recognized for future occasions.

The eighth Jubilee was celebrated under Clement VII. in 1525, the year in which Luther contracted his union with Catherine de

Bore. On account of the religious ferment and wars of the time the number of pilgrims to Rome was not remarkable.

The ninth Jubilee was published by Paul II. in 1549; but, through the vacancy of the See by his death in November, the inauguration was deferred till February 24, 1550, when it was performed by his successor, Julius III.

It was during this Holy Year that the Confraternity of the Holy Trinity, "Trinità dei Pellegrini," first came into notice. It had been founded under another name two years before by St. Philip Neri's direction, for the advancement of its associates in piety and virtue and for mutual help. At the approach of the Jubilee this society began to interest itself on behalf of the poorer pilgrims who were to be expected, and rented a small house where beds were provided for ten or twelve persons. A lady then offered the use of another house for women. In these two hospices the brothers and sisters of the Confraternity welcomed foot-sore travelers on their arrival and ministered to their wants during their stay. The marvelous development of this institution and the services it rendered to the poor, in centuries to follow, will appear in the sequel.

One of the most memorable Jubilees was the tenth, under Gregory XIII., in 1575. At the opening of the Holy Door the crowd was enormous, said to number 300,000. The pressure was so great that two hundred persons were forced through the opened entrance before the Pope was able to pass. Pilgrimages arrived from all parts, four hundred confraternities entered the city processionally to the chant of psalms, fourteen thousand came from Spoleto alone, and large numbers from other towns. The confraternity of the Holy Trinity by this time had so strengthened its administration and resources that it was enabled to house and feed, in the course of the year, 365,000 persons, of whom 20,000 were women. To provide spiritual help for this vast multitude confessionals were multiplied in the churches, priests were appointed with all the extraordinary faculties of Penitentiaries, to the number of fifty in St. Peter's, thirty in the Lateran and the same in St. Mary Major's and St. Paul's.

The Pope himself set an example of devotion and penance. He made frequent visits with his attendants to the churches, fasting for three days before each visit. The first was on January 3, when he made his confession, received Holy Communion, went to pray in each of the three basilicas within the city, prostrating himself at the Holy Door and kneeling before the High Altar, the Blessed Sacrament and other altars. He dismounted from his litter at the Ostian Gate, and seventy-four years old as he was, proceeded on foot for a mile and a half to St. Paul's, with no cortege but an immense crowd of devout pilgrims prayerfully following in his steps, he repeating this for three days. In the time of carnival, which was suspended that year, he made the penitential visit of the Seven Churches. In all these exercises he was imitated by many of the Cardinals and by Bishops and prelates of every degree. Among the rest was St. Charles Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan, who edified Rome by the assiduity and compunction with which he every day visited the various sanctuaries. During the year the Pope showed himself frequently to the pilgrims and admitted them freely to kiss his feet, at Easter-tide to the number of three thousand and on one day thirteen thousand.

Clement VIII. celebrated the tenth Jubilee in 1600. Prevented by gout from opening the Holy Door on Christmas Eve, he performed the function on the feast of St. Silvester. Bishops and pilgrims numbering four thousand were entertained at his expense in the Borgo for ten days, the Pope himself serving the tables and his nephews, the Cardinals Aldobrandini and S. Giorgio, washing the feet of all who arrived. He dispensed in charity in the course of the year 300,000 crowns, and on more than one occasion, assisted by Cardinals Borromeo and Baronius, washed the feet of pilgrims at Trinità dei Pellegrini. In this hospice 270,000 persons were lodged during the year, beside 50,000 belonging to aggregated associations. Five hundred and seventy corporate pilgrimages entered Rome in procession during the year, mostly with bare feet, ashes on their heads and penitential garb; 28,000 Masses were said in St. Peter's, 22,000 in St. Paul's, 19,000 in St. Mary Major's, 16,000 in the Church of the Trinità dei Pellegrini, besides the other churches of Rome.

Cardinals Bellarmine, Baronius and others preached often to the people. The Pope visited the Basilicas sixty times in the course of the year, often mounted the Scala Santa on his knees, all the time suffering from gout.

This Jubilee year was marked by the foundation of several charitable institutions. A poor simple man, Fra Alberisio, who went about the streets calling to those he met: "Fate bene, adesso che avete tempo" (Do good, now that you have time), supported with the alms he collected ten thousand pilgrims and originated the brotherhood and hospital still called by his salutation, the "Fate bene Fratelli." Among establishments founded by the Pope himself this year was the Scots' College.

Urban VIII. celebrated the twelfth Jubilee in 1625. The concourse was again great and solemn processions of pilgrims thronged the streets; 210,377 communicants were counted in St. Peter's alone; the number of pilgrims lodged at Trinità dei Pellegrini and its dependency of the Convalescents was over half a million, the figure given in the Register is 588,633. To entertain so great a number the ordinary revenues of the Confraternity were insufficient, and the Pope contributed 10,000 crowns. Cardinals, Princes, Ambassadors and nobles came forward with generous help. The list of the benefactions, sums of 1,000, 800, 500, etc., is still preserved. Still the administrators of the Confraternity were driven to the point of contracting a loan, when Francesco Contarelli, nephew of the Cardinal of the same name, died bequeathing forty-five thousand crowns to the institution. Another Confraternity, the Gonfalone, founded in 1264 by St. Bonaventure, for mutual assistance, joined this year the urgent work of charity and maintained 31,300 pilgrims.

A Protestant historian, Schmeiden, writing from Rome at this time, describes the constant movement, not of passing strangers only, but of the inhabitants of every town and village in Italy. Some places were left almost deserted, the population going in mass to Rome. When they came near the city they ranged themselves in order with their standards, the images of their patron saints and other religious emblems, and so made their entry. They went from church to church in strange garb, some clothed in a white sack with black mantle, some in coarse canvas with cord and hood, some carrying heavy crosses and wearing sackcloth open at the back, scourged themselves as they went.

These penitential exercises were not confined to the poorer pilgrims. Cardinal Lante, venerable in his ninety years, went fifteen times barefooted to visit the Basilicas, and over and over again made the ascent of the Scala Santa on his knees in tears. Five Cardinals divided the city into districts and preached in the squares.

Some amusing incidents are recorded during this Jubilee. The canons of St. Mary Major's wanted to remove the medals which, according to custom, had been built into the Holy Door at its last closing, before the arrival of the Cardinal Legate deputed to reopen it. A reference to authority gave it against the canons. At St. Paul's some one had knocked on the door before the arrival of the Legate; the masons behind the door took this for the ceremonial signal, and at once threw down the wall. A crowd of two hundred persons scrambled through the opening, carrying with them scraps of the plaster as a memento of the day. The old record says that the master of ceremonies "prudently" had the door built up to the height of a man, and when the Legate arrived the rite was proceeded with as usual. As the Pope on Holy Innocents' day was passing through the portico of St. Peter's to make the first of his visits, a pilgrim in his eagerness to kiss the Pope's feet got confused by the crowd and embraced the feet of the Majordomo instead, on which the Pope turned to the unfortunate man and said: "We dispense you from the homage. We take it as done."

Nearly a million and a half of pilgrims visited Rome in 1675, when Clement X. celebrated the fourteenth Jubilee. The register of Trinità dei Pellegrini proves that 300,000 persons were entertained by that institution alone.

The Jubilees of 1700, opened by Innocent XII. and closed by Clement XI., that of 1725 under Benedict XIII. and of 1750 celebrated by Benedict XIV., bring us to the Jubilee of 1775 published by Clement XIV., but celebrated by Pius VI. The concourse at this last was great; at Trinità dei Pellegrini 130,000 were entertained for three days and 395,000 received in Holy Week.

In 1800 no Jubilee could be observed. The French Revolution, sweeping like a tempest over all Europe, did not spare Rome. Pius VI., torn from his See, carried prisoner into France, with the States of the Church a prey to anarchy, was in no condition to open the Holy Year. He died at Valence in August, 1799, and it was not till March of the following year that the Cardinals, assembled in Venice, elected his successor in the person of Pius VII.

We come now to the nineteenth Jubilee, held in 1825 under Leo XII. As this was the last occasion on which the Holy Year was solemnly celebrated, and the ceremonial observed was, so far as the changed conditions of Rome permit, followed by Leo XIII. in the Jubilee recently begun, it may be interesting to dwell at some length on the details of the rite.

On May 24, 1824, the Pope held a Consistory to consult the Cardinals on the means for best promoting the success of the undertaking. On the same day he issued a Bull of general invitation to Rome in the following year. On Ascension day, attended by a numerous court, in the Sala Regia, he consigned the Jubilee Bull to a prelate official of the Apostolic Datary for publication. The prelate immediately proceeded to the porch of St. Peter's, and from an elevated stage read the proclamation to the sound of trumpet and drum, followed by a discharge of musketry. At the same time three couriers, with attendant drums and trumpets, were dispatched to publish the Bull at the doors of the other three churches.

The Pope next ordered missions to be preached during the first half of August in six of the principal squares of the city, piazze Navona, Barberini, Colonna, Monti, S. Giacomo and S. Maria Maggiore. Orators of the highest repute were selected, and the Pope himself assisted at the close of the mission in piazza Navona and blessed the people from a balcony. On the last Sunday of Advent the Bull was again read, and on Christmas Eve the Porta Santa was opened.

For three days before the vigil all the bells of the churches were rung for two hours. Long before the hour for Vespers the vast square of St. Peter's began to fill. From all the approaches from the Borgo, from Trastevere and from the neighboring gates of the city crowds of Romans and strangers and peasants in the picturesque costumes of their various villages hastened to secure the most advantageous places. Soldiers, horse and foot, were drawn up behind the people; the colonnade was hung with the brilliant tapestries from Raphael's designs, the piazza had a festive air, but the great gates of the basilica were closed, the church was empty.

Before leaving his apartments the Pope announced the names of the three Legates deputed to open the Holy Doors in the other basilicas at the same time that he opened the one in St. Peter's. They were, as is the custom, the Cardinal Dean for St. Paul's and the Cardinals Archpriests of the other two churches for each respectively. Robed pontifically in crimson vestments and wearing a mitre, he proceeded to the Sixtine Chapel to pray before the Holy Sacrament solemnly exposed. The Apostolic sub-deacon led the way, bearing aloft the pontifical three-barred cross. Seven acolytes, prelates of the Tribunal of the Signatura, carrying candles, surrounded the Papal cross. While the Pope knelt in adoration lighted candles were distributed to the assistants. After incensing the Blessed Sacrament the Pope intoned the hymn "Veni Creator," which was taken up by the choir. Then, seated on the *Sedia Gestatoria*, the portable chair of state, he was borne on the shoulders of twelve attendants in bright livery, under a splendid canopy of gold cloth, with the *flabelli*, or fans of ostrich feathers carried by chamberlains on either side, holding in his left hand a candle presented to him by the first Cardinal Deacon, and blessing with his right as he went. Preceded by the dignitaries of the Papal Chapel, the Bishops assistant at the throne and the three orders of Cardinals, vested according to their rank in rich dalmatics, chasubles or copes and followed by all the colleges of prelates, he was conducted down the Scala Regia to the colonnade and through the square between a double line of the clergy of Rome marshaled to let him pass to the portico of St. Peter's.

In the portico, in front of the Holy Door, which is the last on the right hand, a throne was prepared. On this the Pope seated himself for a few moments, then he rose, and taking a silver hammer from the hands of the Cardinal Grand Penitentiary, advanced to the Door and struck upon it with the hammer, saying: "Open ye to me the Gates of Justice," to which the choir answered: "I will go into them, and give praise to the Lord." Striking the door a second time, he said: "I will come into Thy House," and the choir answered: "I will worship towards Thy Holy Temple." A third time he struck the door, with the words: "Open the Gates, for the Lord is with us," and the response of the choir: "Who hath shown His power in Israel." The Pope then returned to the throne, and the Grand Penitentiary struck the door twice with the hammer. Upon this the door, which had previously been detached from the wall on all sides, was made to fall gently back, and, inclined on a massive frame of wood, was drawn aside. The Penitentiaries washed carefully the doorstep and lintels with sponges and dried them with fine linen cloths. When this was done the Pope rose and recited the prayer, *Actiones nostras,* and the choir sang the 99th Psalm, "Jubilate Deo omnis terra." This was followed by some versicles and the prayer recited by the Pope: "O God, who by Thy servant Moses didst institute a year of Jubilee for Thy people of Israel, grant to us Thy servants a happy commencement to this Jubilee instituted by Thy authority, in which Thou willest this door to be opened for Thy people to offer prayers to Thy Majesty, so that, having obtained in it pardon and full remission of all our offenses, when the day of our summons arrives, we may be found worthy to share Thy glory by the gift of Thy mercy."

Having finished the prayer, the Pope resumed his mitre, and descending from the throne, advanced towards the Holy Door. Standing on the step, he took in his right hand the triple cross from the sub-deacon and holding his lighted candle in his left, he intoned the "Te Deum," and then crossed the threshold, the first to enter the Basilica. The assistant Cardinals, two and two, followed, with all the rest, and the crowd immediately after. The Pope again was raised on the Sedia Gestatoria and carried to the Altar of the Confession, or High Altar under the dome, where he assisted at Vespers.

As the Pope crossed the threshold of the Holy Door the great bell of St. Peter's rang out its loud-voiced peal; at the signal the bells of more than three hundred churches joined their music, and the cannon of the castle of S. Angelo thundered the tidings to the foot of the Alban Hills and the shores of the Mediterranean Sea.

Such was the ceremonial at the opening of the last Jubilee. When shorn of all the pomp of the gorgeous public procession and approach to the basilica through the colonnade and great square of St. Peter's—when the Holy Father is constrained to make his entrance into his own church by a private door from his palace—and the majesty of the solemn rite is confined to a narrow space guarded to protect it from insult, in the presence of a few privileged witnesses, the opening of the Holy Door for the Jubilee of 1900 must have filled the hearts of all who assisted with conflicting emotions. But regret at the absence of much that gave dignity and solemnity to the occasion, impossible to-day under a hostile domination, was overpowered in the gladness of the thought that in any form it had been granted to Leo XIII., after seventy-five years since he himself assisted at the last opening of the Porta Santa, to open to us with such grandeur of solemnity as still exists the treasures of God's grace and pardon.

James A. Campbell.

Rome.

THE ELECTION OF ALEXANDER VI.

On the 6th day of August, A. D. 1492—three days had passed since the little fleet of Christopher Columbus had departed from Palos on its memorable voyage of discovery—three-and-twenty Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church met in conclave at the Vatican for the purpose of selecting a successor to Pope Innocent VIII. As the reader may be curious to form some personal acquaintance with the eminent dignitaries who were responsible to the Church and to humanity for the election of Alexander VI., I shall assume the office of *cicerone* and introduce them one by one as they enter the sacred enclosure.

In fact, the Cardinals of the fifteenth century are far better known to fame than their successors at any later age; and this for two reasons. First, they were then much fewer in numbers. Ever since the days of Avignon they had made persistent efforts to restrict the membership of the Sacred College to little above a score, thus increasing their individual importance to the detriment of the Papal monarchy. Indeed it was no fault of theirs if the form of Church government was not converted into a downright Venetian aristocracy, with the Supreme Pontiff reduced to the position of a mere Doge or figurehead. Secondly, and as a consequence of their overshadowing influence, it was taken for granted that to them and to their father's houses belonged "all the best things of Israel." It fairly takes one's breath away to read the long catalogue of incongruous and incompatible benefices which many of them held, or, to speak more accurately, the revenues of which they appropriated to their own use. As a natural result, they were, away and beyond, the most opulent, and therefore the most powerful, princes of their time; and their friendship was obsequiously courted by Popes and kings. As another result, and one which "did not nor could not come to good," the Cardinalate became the coveted prey of princely and royal cadets and of intriguing and unscrupulous politicians.

It would be childish to expect that any Pope of reforming tendencies could do much in the way of abolishing these abuses. In the first place, no Papal candidate known to be a reformer could by any possibility run the gauntlet of a Conclave. Moreover, the right of presentation to benefices was only to a limited extent vested in the Pope. The major portion of the emoluments of the Cardinals came through the *jus patronatus* of monarchs and princes, who thus secured their good-will and services, often to the grave displeasure and inconvenience of the Supreme Pontiff.

The objects to which the Cardinals devoted their enormous incomes were as different as their respective characters. But taking them for all in all, and thanking God that the Renaissance Cardinals have forever disappeared from the earth, we are compelled by justice to admit that to their generous patronage of the arts more than to any other factor, we owe the first awakenings of modern culture. Their faults and vices may be imputed to the circumstances of their times; but the high and noble impulses which distinguish them from the secular barons of that or any other age, they owed to the promptings of the Catholic faith, which was operative in the most worldly of them.

To return to the Conclave of 1492: The first in order of seniority, this prince of Holy Church who advances with tall, majestic figure, noble countenance and piercing black eyes, is Cardinal *Rodrigo Borgia,* Dean of the Sacred College. The blood of the royal race of Aragon flows in his veins. He is now sixty years of age; during thirty-seven of which he has worn the Roman purple. It was by mere accident that he ever became identified either with Rome or with the priesthood. Born in the province of Valencia, he had chosen the army for his calling, when the elevation of his uncle, Calixtus III., to the Papacy opened up new prospects to his ambition. He immediately came, or was summoned, to Rome; and since his younger brother was selected for the office of Captain General of the Pontifical forces, there was nothing left for Rodrigo but to become a Cardinal. "Could Calixtus have foreseen the evil which his nephews would do to Italy and to the Church," exclaims Pastor indignantly, "he would certainly, instead of elevating them, have banished them to the deepest dungeons of Spain."[1] No doubt he would; but since he laid no claim to the gift of prophecy, there is very little use or consolation in our losing our tempers at this late day because of his mistake. Under four successive Pontiffs Rodrigo has held separate court as "a second Pope," for during this extended period he has been Vice Chancellor of the Roman Church.[2] Strange rumors are in circulation regarding the private life of the great Cardinal; but these malicious whispers are scarcely audible amidst the chorus of applause which greets him as the most magnanimous, most affable, most industrious and most efficient official who, within the memory of living men, has transacted the business of the Holy See.

---

[1] Pastor, II., 448.

Next in the order of seniority comes *Francesco Piccolomini*, popularly known as the Cardinal of Siena. As Borgia owed his early elevation to the partiality of his uncle, Calixtus III., so did Piccolomini owe his still more youthful elevation to the affection of his mother's brother, Pope Pius II. But here ends the resemblance between them; for whereas the young Borgia had been made an ecclesiastic, or at least a Cardinal, almost in spite of himself and without any preliminary spiritual training, Piccolomini, after a boyhood passed in destitute circumstances, had been taken into the household of his uncle and most carefully prepared for the priesthood under his able and experienced direction. "In his twenty-third year, immediately upon his receiving his doctor's hat as canonist, he was appointed Archbishop of Siena in January, 1460; in the following March he was created Cardinal; in April, after the death of the Cardinal of Pavia (Ammannati), he was sent as Legate to the Picentine March, with the experienced Bishop of Marsico as his counsellor. The only thing objectionable about him was his youth; for in the administration of his Legation and in his later conduct at the Curia he proved to be a man of spotless character and many-sided capacity, not to be compared with the scandalous nephew whom Calixtus had introduced into the Sacred College."[3]

"In the time of Paul II., he filled the difficult post of Legate in Germany with consummate tact, to the great satisfaction of the then Pope; the knowledge of German which he had acquired while living in the household of Pius II. being naturally of great assistance to him there. Afterwards, when, owing to the influence of the nephews of Sixtus IV., a worldly spirit predominated at the Court, he, like others of a pious and serious turn of mind, kept away from Rome as much as possible, and still more so in the time of Alexander VI. Like his uncle, Cardinal Piccolomini was tormented with gout, and was prematurely old and decrepid, although he had led a very regular life. Sigismondo de' Conti[4] especially praises his scrupulous love of order. 'He left no moment unoccupied; his time for study was before daybreak; he spent his mornings in prayer and his midday hours in giving audiences, to which the humblest had easy access. He was so temperate in food and drink that he only allowed himself an evening meal every other day.' "[5]

---

[2] Two contrary reasons have been assigned for the anomaly that a Cardinal holding the position of Chancellor to the Pope should be designated a *Vice*-Chancellor. The common explanation is that the chancellorship being merely of prelatial rank, it would be beneath the dignity of a Cardinal to hold it otherwise than as a *locum tenens*. On the other hand, the Benedictine compilers of the *Art de Verifier les Dates*, speaking of Boniface VIII., inform us that "la dignité de Chancelier de l'Eglise Romaine fut supprimée sous son Pontificat, *quia*, dit le Docteur Taberelli, *Cancellarius de pari certabat cum Papa*."

[3] Voigt, Enea Silvio, vol. iii., p. 531.

Borgia and Piccolomini are the sole survivors in 1492 of the remote times of Calixtus III. and Pius II. Of the Cardinals created by Paul II., three still remain. Two of them, *Battista Zeno* and *Giovanni Michiel,* owed their elevation to their close relationship to that Pontiff, being his sisters' children. Like the true Venetian noblemen they are, they may confidently be relied upon to lose no opportunity of advancing their own interests. This will undoubtedly be the case with Michiel.

Their colleague, *Oliviero Carafa,* is a man of widely different stamp. He was created Cardinal by Paul II. on September 18, 1467. He was a distinguished member, indeed one of the chief founders, of the great Neapolitan house which has furnished to that most charming of modern Catholic historians, Alfred von Reumont, the subject of one of his most delightful monographs, *Die Carafa von Maddaloni.* The prominent part which Cardinal Carafa took in the ecclesiastical affairs of his time seems to justify us in making a somewhat extended extract from Reumont's description of him. "He was born in 1430. . . . At the age of eight-and-twenty Oliviero was raised by Pius II. to the archiepiscopal dignity. Nine years afterwards Paul II. invested him with the Roman purple. He was a jurist, a theologian, an antiquarian, a statesman. He even exerted himself in the art of war, as an admiral, in commanding a fleet of galleys against the Turks, but without any fortunate results. Like most of his race, faithful and attached to the Aragonese, in whose favors he shared largely, and often in the midst of the difficulties attending the varying politics of the Popes Sixtus IV., Innocent VIII. and Alexander VI., he defended the interests of his sovereign's family. According to the morality or immorality of those times, he accumulated, besides his archbishopric of Naples, that he could only visit occasionally, a number of bishoprics and abbeys—Chieti, that he resigned to his cousin, afterwards Pope; Rimini, Terracina, and so on; and the famous Abbeys of La Cave and Monte Vergine, which are visited in these days, not merely on account of their picturesque situation in the mountains, but also for the sake of the rich treasures contained in their archives. . . . Few Cardinals have been so popular in Rome. He deserved this popularity by the use which he made of his great income, as well as by the courteousness of his character. He was a very liberal supporter of science and learning; many youths have been won over by him to the Church and to serious studies. He built for the Lateran prebendaries the monastery next to Santa Maria della Pace, that church which was built by Pope Sixtus IV. to commemorate the peace which he obtained, not by, but after, the long wars carried on during his government, where Raphael's Sybils and Bramante's Court are to be admired. He left his beautiful collection of books to this institution."[6]

---

[4] "Sigismondo de' Conti was a man of good family in Foligno, where he held the office of Chancellor under Paul II. He was famous as a Humanist, and came in 1476 to improve his fortunes in Rome, where he was made one of the secretaries of the Curia. He attended Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere in an embassy to Germany in 1480, and in 1482 was made one of the secretaries of the Pope. This office he held till 1502, when he retired · but Julius II. appointed him his private secretary, and he died in Rome in 1512. He is famous in the history of art as the donor whose portrait was painted by Raffaelle in the great picture of the 'Madonna di Foligno' which was painted by his order." Creighton, vol. iv., p. 328.

[5] Pastor, vol. vi., p. 199. The Catholic historian repels with righteous indignation the infamous lie invented by Gregorovius in his *Lucrezia Borgia*, and repeated, parrot-like, by Brosch and Bishop Creighton. that Piccolomini—later Pope Pius III.—was "the happy father of no fewer than twelve children, boys and girls." This is by no means the only instance in which Gregorovius' fertile imagination has travestied the facts of history. We trust that the learned Bishop of London will be careful to remove this unseemly blemish from his admirable book in a future edition.

Although Cardinal Carafa passed the most of his time in Rome in the service of the Holy See, yet he did not entirely neglect his diocese. He built the high altar in the Cathedral of Naples, and also the magnificent shrine of St. Januarius, before which, at the present day, the traveler still admires the marble statue of the Cardinal, which Reumont pronounces as "amongst the best sculptures of Naples," represented kneeling in prayer. As additional claims upon our esteem, we may mention that Cardinal Carafa was one of the earliest and most generous patrons of the newly-discovered art of printing; and that he was chiefly influential in forming the priestly character of his young cousin, John Peter Carafa, who, in the next generation, ascended the Chair of St. Peter, to begin, as Pope Paul IV., the long series of Reforming Popes.

The next twelve Cardinals who enter the Conclave of 1492 are the survivors of the successive creations of Pope Sixtus IV.[7] The first of these, in seniority as in personal worth, is our old friend *Giuliano della Rovere.*

"Tutti lo miran, tutti onor gli fanno."

In his own and the general estimation he enters all but elected; only to come out in a few days a bitterly disappointed man. He is attended by two cousins, *Basso della Rovere* and *Domenico della Rovere;* also by a fourth creature of the Sixtine family, the young *Raffaello Riario,* whose bloodless cheeks give evidence that he has not yet recovered from the effects of the shock imparted to his nervous system by the awful tragedy of April 26, 1478, in which he was the innocent and unconscious tool of his uncle, Girolamo.

---

[6] Reumont: The Carafas of Maddaloni, Bohn edition, p. 139.

[7] Pastor says (vol iv., p. 416) that the Cardinals of Sixtus present at this Conclave numbered *fourteen*. But this is evidently a mistake.

Another of the Cardinals of Sixtus is *George da Costa,* a Portuguese of obscure parentage, who by his talents and industry worked his way upwards to the dignity of Archbishop of Lisbon and the office of Prime Minister of his sovereign, Alfonso V. But since his admission into the College of Cardinals, in 1476, Costa has seen little or nothing of his native land, and he has the reputation of being one of the wealthiest prelates of his age. As he is a man of considerable ability, and has prudently kept himself aloof from the intricacies of Italian politics, there are many who are of opinion that his chances of election are good.

The eleventh Cardinal on our list is *Paolo Fregoso,* known as the Cardinal of Genoa. He may be described as an odd combination of priest, condottiere and party leader. Belonging to the aristocratic family of the Campofregosi, he was made Archbishop of Genoa as early as 1453,[8] and thereafter took an active part in all the tumults and revolutions which seemed to be the delight of his native city. At times he combined the offices of Bishop and Doge; soon to spend a more or less extended period in exile. Such had been the vicissitudes of his stormy career, when, in 1480, Pope Sixtus IV., recognizing in his fellow Ligurian a kindred spirit, and desirous of employing his talents and experience in the defense of Christendom against the Turks, created him Cardinal and appointed him Admiral of the Papal fleet destined to aid in driving the invaders from Otranto. It became apparent, however, that the leader of a municipal faction was not necessarily a great commander. Fregoso's admiralship brought him no laurels; and we hear little of him from the time he returned to Rome in disfavor with the Pope, until he reappears at the present Conclave.

With two exceptions, the remaining Cardinals of Sixtus IV. are representatives of the Roman nobility. *John Baptist Savelli,* a man of considerable ability, had been designated for the honors of the purple as far back as 1471, the last year of Paul II. But since that Pontiff had already exceeded the number to which the jealousy of the Cardinals wished to restrict the membership of the Sacred College, he was forced to keep Savelli and two other candidates *in petto.* Paul died suddenly soon afterwards; whereupon the Cardinals, notwithstanding they had promised, in the event of his death, to admit his nominees, now refused to acknowledge their claims. Their opposition was mainly owing to the unwillingness of the powerful Cardinal Latino Orsini to give admission to the scion of a hostile family; for the Savelli were hereditary allies of the Colonna, and consequently in feud with the Orsini. It was not until the year 1480, when Latino had died, that Savelli finally took his seat in the College of Cardinals.

---

[8] Gams, Series Episcoporum, p. 715.

He took his seat together with his friend *Giovanni Colonna*, son of Prince Antonio of Salerno, and brother of Prospero, Duke of Paliano. He was also grand-nephew of Pope Martin V., the restorer of the Papacy after the Great Schism. In the simultaneous elevation of these two Roman princes, we seem to discover the influence of Cardinal Giuliano, who no doubt was confident he could count upon their gratitude.

Either for the purpose of holding the balance fairly between the two chief factions of the Roman barons, or yielding to the wishes of Girolamo Riario, Sixtus, in 1483, raised to the Cardinalate *Battista Orsini* and *Giovanni Conti;* and thus "the seeds of party strife were introduced into the Sacred College."[9]

History fails to inform us what unusual gifts Sixtus discerned in *Giacomo Sclafenati*, or by what extraordinary influences he was induced to bestow the dignity of the purple on this Bishop of Parma at the early age of twenty-three.

The total absence of any ecclesiastical recommendation, and the pressure of irresistible political influence, are painfully evident in the last Cardinal created by Sixtus, *Ascanio Maria Sforza.* Of him we may, with full truth, affirm, that which Guicciardini, with more wit than accuracy, says of Giuliano: "There is nothing priestly about him, except his cassock." Even the cassock he wears as seldom as possible; for he feels more at home, and is oftenest seen, in the habit and with the environment of a secular prince. He has been forced to adopt the ecclesiastical calling, for the simple reason that he is a cadet of the House of Milan. His brother, Lodovico il Moro, the Regent of Milan, having set his heart upon ousting the rightful Duke, their nephew John Galeazzo, has at length succeeded, in the face of strenuous opposition, in obtaining a seat in the Sacred College for Ascanio, as a first step toward the realization of his nefarious design. It will not be Lodovico's fault if Ascanio does not ascend still higher.

We have thus accounted for seventeen of the twenty-three voters. Next follow the Cardinals created by Pope Innocent VIII. The first of these is *Lorenzo Cibò*, whose elevation, in 1489, aroused a great deal of adverse comment, since he was a natural son of the Pontiff's brother, Maurice. The stain of birth is, however, the only blemish which history has recorded against him; nor, on the other hand, has much been said in his favor; for, like all the Cibòs, he is of no great intellectual calibre, and his principal title to the respect of posterity is that he will reject with scorn the seductions of Borgia.

---

[9] Pastor, vol. v., p. 415

Another of Innocent's Cardinals is *Ardicino della Porta,* who is described as "a fit and worthy man."[10] His subsequent conduct will prove that the eulogy is not unmerited; for he will atone, in the penitential garb of St. Romoald, for the fatal error of placing his vote and conscience in the unscrupulous hands of Ascanio.[11]

The next Cardinal on the list is *Antonio Pallavicini,* a fellow-countryman of the Genoese Pontiff. Little is known concerning him; but that little is creditable. Regarding *Giovanni de' Medici,* the future Leo X., it is needless to discourse at length. He is now seventeen years of age, and life lies before him. He has been lucky in securing his anomalous position before the departure of Lorenzo and Innocent; for otherwise his promotion would in all probability have been indefinitely postponed. How much, by the way, would the Church have lost by that contingency?

There still remain two Cardinals whose right to participate in the Conclave is the subject of serious discussion, for they have not yet been formally installed. The first of these is *Federigo Sanseverino,* son of the famous Robert, General of the Venetian armies. As his two brothers are in the service of the Duke of Milan, his cause is warmly advocated by Ascanio, by whose influence he is admitted to the College. Consequently, when the aged Patriarch of Venice, the nonagenarian *Maffeo Gherardo,* arrived, with an energetic demand from the Signory that his rights should not be assailed, his claims were acknowledged, mainly through the exertions of Giuliano della Rovere, who thought thus to secure his vote; but, as the result will show, that able politician has made a serious miscalculation.

The reader is now in possession of sufficient data to form an intelligent judgment upon the character of the men who composed the Conclave of 1492. Though they were not ideal princes of the Church, yet they were far superior to the reputation which "history," relying on worthless gossip and exaggerated rhetoric, has hitherto commonly accorded them. They numbered in their ranks experienced statesmen, whose equals could not have been found in any court of Europe. They numbered, moreover, men of deep conscientiousness and unfeigned piety. But what caused this Conclave to come to so disastrous a termination was the fact that the Cardinals of most commanding genius and influence were precisely the few who possessed the least either of piety or of conscience.

---

[10] Pastor, vol. v., p. 356. [11] Raynald, ad annum 1492, n. 3. has preserved an extremely interesting letter written by Porta to Alexander VI., in which he defends his action in renouncing the purple and assuming the lowly habit of the Camaldolese. Alexander had given his sanction to the step; but the Cardinals maintained that the consent of the Sacred College was also needed.

The proceedings of the Conclave were opened with the exact observance of all those religious rites whereby Holy Church seeks to impress the electors with a keen sense of their awful responsibility. The address of Leonello Chieregato, Bishop of Concordia in the Venetian territory, large extracts from which are given by Raynaldus, was a masterly exposition of the needs and dangers of the times, and a fearless appeal to the conscience of the Cardinals. His peroration would do credit to Savonarola; indeed, viewed in the wierd light of subsequent events, it might seem that the preacher was inspired. The reader will thank us for inserting it:

"Sorely is the Church afflicted. But it is in your power, most excellent fathers, to comfort and console her. Banishing from your hearts every suggestion of egotism, ambition and party spirit, harbor no other thought than that of coöperating with the Divine Will in the selection of a Pontiff eminent for sanctity, learning and experience. The eyes of the whole Church are fixed upon you. Give her a Pontiff who, by the very odor of his good name, shall draw all the faithful after him unto salvation. For it is written in the books of wise men that the entire commonwealth, as it is infected and ruined by the lusts and vices of its princes, so, too, is it by their self-restraint and virtues corrected and preserved. Whatever deterioration takes place in the morals of princes is followed by a similar change in the habits of the people; and the adage is proved true: That the bad example of rulers is more harmful than their personal offenses. Choose, then, for ruler *the best*. Him you will easily recognize if you hearken to Plato, who enjoins that he only ought to be chosen who in every period of life has been without reproach, and whose persevering endeavor it has been to promote the public welfare; for otherwise, he teaches, the Deity will doom the community to destruction. To the same effect does the Blessed Pope Leo command that you should elect one whose whole life from earliest childhood until his ripest years has been devoted to the faithful service of the Church; one whose past career leaves us without apprehension as to his future; and whose elevation to a higher station must be regarded as the reward justly due to his many labors, his unsullied morals and his strenuous industry. Shudder at the thought, most reverend fathers, that the Lord should ever say of you: 'They have made for themselves a king, but not through me; a prince, but with no counsel of mine.' Now the counsel of the Lord is, if we believe Jerome, that the man most distinguished for learning and sanctity and most conspicuous by the possession of every good quality should ascend to the supreme Pontificate by pure and upright means, without resorting to intrigues or bribery. Recall the fate of Abimelech. He did indeed reach the goal of his ambition, and ruled over the people of Israel. But brief and turbulent was his reign, and he came to an ignoble end.

"To sum up my remarks in one short sentence: Imprint upon your hearts and carry into effect the sacred canons which regulate the election of the Roman Pontiff and other Prelates. Do this; and under the coming Pontiff, the Church will without doubt once more resume her flourishing estate: Through the mercy of Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who is blessed forever and ever."

If the eminent dignitaries to whom this stirring appeal was addressed had obeyed the injunctions of the eloquent orator, it is quite probable that another Chieregato, the preacher's cousin, would have been spared the indignities which were in reserve for him at the Diet of Nurnberg. But, of all men then living, the worldly-minded Cardinals who composed this Conclave were the least able to foresee and the least disposed to reck the ultimate consequences of the step they were about to take. They will, however, have occasion to "recall the fate of Abimelech"—one of them when he bends, heart-broken, over the mangled corpse of his favorite son; others when, during the turbulent years that are to come, they languish in prison or wander about in exile.

From the moment that a Conclave is closed until the door is thrown open to announce the election of the new Pontiff, all the proceedings are supposed to be, and eternally to remain, a profound secret from those who are without. Viewing the Conclave of 1492 from the standpoint of those who were thus excluded, we must say that seldom has it happened in the history of the Papacy that an election has been conducted with a more scrupulous attention to order, freedom and dignity. During the four days that the Cardinals remained in seclusion, the most inquisitive and keen-scented envoys of the European powers had absolutely no news to impart to their respective Courts. They were all equally surprised, though not similarly affected, when the wicket was thrown open on the morning of August 11th, and announcement was made that the Vice-Chancellor, Rodrigo Borgia, had been duly elected, and had chosen the name of ALEXANDER VI.

But divine Clio is too shrewd and fearless a Maid, either to accept appearances for facts, or to permit official pronouncements to interfere with her inalienable right of ascertaining the truth. To do justice to her discernment, she no sooner heard the sad news than she began to form that judgment upon it to which the veteran pen of Ranke has given definitive form:

"Amidst the universal corruption, it was a universal calamity, and discreditable to the whole human race, that, in the retired cells of the Conclave assembled to elect a Pope, amid high and holy ceremonies, and among men who had no further wants, and no one to provide for, it was not the weal of Christendom, so sorely in need, that determined the election, nor that of a nation—no, nor even genuine affections and emotions. The highest dignity in the Church was regarded as the inheritance of all Cardinals; given, because, alas! it was indivisible, to the one who promised the others most."[12]

That Borgia secured his election through "the rankest simony,"[13] is a fact too well authenticated to admit of a doubt. The Cardinals who had rejected his bribes proclaimed it immediately; and those who had accepted them confessed it later on. It is all but officially stated in the scathing terms with which the Bull of Pope Julius II., dated 14 January, 1505, anathematizes and invalidates a Papal election obtained by simoniacal means. Besides, what interest is served by denying it? It lessens, not increases, the scandal, when we reflect that the "thief and robber" entered not by the door, as the legitimate outcome of those "high and holy ceremonies" alluded to by Ranke, but climbed in *aliunde*.

Sifting the mass of evidence which has been collected by the diligence of Pastor and other investigators, we seem to be able to assure the reader that the following narrative of the proceedings is substantially correct:

The principal candidates at the beginning of the Conclave were Giuliano della Rovere and Ascanio Sforza. The claims of the former were supported by France and Genoa, which were commonly reported (though this may be only idle rumor) to have put 300,000 ducats at his disposal; strange to say, his old-time foe, now become his firm adherent, Ferrante of Naples, also worked hard to secure his election. "Naples and France," remarks Pastor, "though preparing for a final and decisive hostile encounter, supported meanwhile the same candidate for the Papal Chair."[14]

Giuliano's strength was at the same time his weakness. The favor of France was a poor recommendation in the eyes of the Italians. On the other hand, not every one was as able or as willing to forget old grievances as the veteran politician who occupied the throne of Naples. The consequence was that all those who disliked or mistrusted the Rovere gathered about Ascanio, whose candidature was urged with vigor and address by his brother, il Moro. An abortive attempt to compound their differences was made by the two antagonists in a prolonged interview held in the sacristy of St. Peter's on August 4th. As no eavesdropper was permitted to hear their conversation, we can only surmise, from the event, that neither was disposed to withdraw or compromise.

---

[12] Ranke's "Latin and Teutonic Nations," p. 41. [13] Pastor, V., p. 385. [14] Pastor, V., p. 379.

Having tested each other's strength, they were far too shrewd to permit their names to be brought forward in the earlier Scrutinies of the Conclave, during which the names of Carafa and Costa were prominently canvassed. Three days passed in fruitless balloting, with no prospect of opening the deadlock. We are sufficiently acquainted with Giuliano to be certain that he would have fought it out till doom's day before yielding an inch; it is proverbial with his ancestral "oak" to break, but not to bend. His rival, though equally firm and unscrupulous, took a more "common-sense" view of the situation; he improved upon the lesson taught him eight years before by Giuliano, and aspired, in his turn, to be "the power behind the throne." Ascanio will ere long discover that Borgia is not a Cibò. Our readers will thank us for permitting Dr. Pastor to give the story in his own words:

"A sudden change came over the whole situation. As soon as Ascanio Sforza perceived that there was no likelihood that he would himself be chosen, he began to lend a willing ear to Borgia's brilliant offers. Rodrigo not only promised him the office of Vice-Chancellor"—worth 8,000 ducats a year—"with his own Palace"—which, to the present day, perpetuates the memory of this shameful bargain by bearing the name of *Palazzo Sforza-Cesarini*—"but in addition to this the Castle of Nepi, the Bishopric of Erlau, with a revenue of 10,000 ducats, and other benefices. Cardinal Orsini was to receive the two fortified towns of Monticelli and Soriano, the legation of the Marches and the Bishopric of Carthagena; Cardinal Colonna, the Abbacy of Subiaco, with all the surrounding villages; Savelli, Civita Castellana and the Bishopric of Majorca; Pallavicini, the Bishopric of Pampeluna; Giovanni Michiel the suburban Bishopric of Porto; the Cardinals Sclafenati, Sanseverino, Riario and Domenico della Rovere, rich abbacies and valuable benefices. By these simoniacal means, counting his own vote and those of the Cardinals Ardicino della Porta and Conti, who belonged to the Sforza party, Borgia had thus secured fourteen votes,[15] and only one more was wanting to complete the majority of two-thirds.[16] This one, however, was not easy to obtain. The Cardinals Carafa, Costa, Piccolomini and Zeno were not to be won by any promises, however brilliant; and the young Giovanni de' Medici held with them. Cardinal Basso followed Giuliano della Rovere, who would not hear of Borgia's election. Lorenzo Cibo also held aloof from these unhallowed transactions. Thus Gherardo, now in his ninety-sixth year and hardly in possession of his faculties, alone remained, and he was persuaded by those who were about him to give his vote to Borgia."

---

[15] Not twenty-four, as the English translation makes him say. Father Antrobus' printer is vexatiously inexact in his figures. [16] Pastor is at fault in his count. It takes *sixteen* to make a two-thirds vote, when there are twenty-three electors. The Innsbruck historian has overlooked Fregoso, whose vote, no doubt, was cheaply secured.

This vote of the venerable Patriarch of Venice is the very climax of the whole tragedy. It was the crowning triumph of the power of darkness, that the voice which elected the unworthy Borgia to the saintliest dignity of Christendom was the voice of a saint! Not all Rodrigo's riches, nor all Ascanio's power, could have held that ignoble phalanx together for a day. The only hope of success which the two main conspirators could entertain lay in the celerity with which they could rush the election through, before their dupes had time to listen to the admonitions of conscience, and their opponents to expose the infamy of their intrigues.

It is commonly stated by historians, on the authority of Infessura, that Gherardo's vote was obtained by bribery; and Gregorovius indulges his poetic fancy by representing the aged Patriarch as "stretching forth his palsied hand to clutch five thousand ducats." But his saintly life, as a Camaldolese monk, and later as Prelate, forbid our giving credence to any such enormity. It was surely no difficult task to circumvent a decrepid old man, who was thinking more of his speedy dissolution than of earthly matters,[17] in which he could feel but a remote concern. His unacquaintance with Rome and the Curia, and the irksomeness of confinement to one who was at death's door, are quite sufficient to explain his vote.

And now, having placed this painful episode before the reader, as we have found it in the best authorities, "nothing extenuating nor setting down aught in malice," we give him time to regain his breath before we continue our narrative.

J. F. Loughlin.

Philadelphia.

THE MODERN MUSICAL MASS.*

To one who is accustomed to study the history of art in the light of the law of evolution the contrast between the reigning modern style of Catholic church music and that of the Middle Age seems at first sight very difficult of explanation. The growth of the *a capella* chorus, which reached its perfection in the sixteenth century, may be traced through a steady process of development, every step of which was a logical consequence of some prior invention. But as we pass onward into the age succeeding and look for a form of Catholic music which may be taken as the natural offspring and successor of the venerable mediæval style, we find what appears to be a break in the line of continuity. The ancient form maintains its existence throughout the seventeenth century and a portion of the eighteenth, but it is slowly crowded to one side and at last driven from the field altogether by a style which, if we search in the field of church art alone, appears to have no antecedent. The new style is opposed to the old in every particular. Instead of forms that are polyphonic in structure, vague and indefinite in plan, based on an antique key system, the new compositions are homophonic in structure, definite and sectional in plan, revealing an entirely novel principle of tonality, containing vocal solos as well as choruses and supported by a free instrumental accompaniment. These two contrasted phases of religious music seem to have nothing in common so far as technical organization is concerned, and it is perfectly evident that the younger style could not have been evolved out of the elder. Hardly less divergent are they in respect to ideal of expression, the ancient style never departing from a moderate, unimpassioned uniformity, the modern abounding in variety and contrast, and continually striving after a sort of dramatic portrayal of subjective moods. To a representative of the old school this florid accompanied style would seem like an intruder from quite an alien sphere of experience, and the wonder grows when we discover that it sprang from the same national soil as that in which its predecessor ripened, and was likewise cherished by an institution that has made immutability in all essentials a cardinal principle. Whence came the impulse that effected so sweeping a change in a great historic form of art, where we might expect that liturgic necessities and ecclesiastical tradition would decree a tenacious conservatism? What new conception had seized upon the human mind so powerful that it could even revolutionize a large share of the musical system of the Catholic Church? Had there been a long preparation for a change that seems so sudden? Were there causes working under the surface, antecedent stages, such that the violation of the law of continuity is apparent only and not real? These questions are easily answered if we abandon the useless attempt to find the parentage of the modern church style in the ritual music of the previous period, and by surveying all the musical conditions of the age we shall quickly discover that it was an intrusion into the Church of musical methods that were fostered under purely secular auspices. The Gregorian chant and the mediæval *a capella* chorus were born and nurtured within the fold of the Church, growing directly out of the necessity of adapting musical cadences to the rhythmical phrases of the liturgy. The modern sectional and florid style, on the contrary, was an addition from without and was not introduced in response to any liturgical demands whatever. In origin and affiliations it was a secular style, adopted by the Church under a necessity which she eventually strove to turn into a virtue.

---

[17] Gherardo died, according to Gams, on the 14th of the following month. Would that he had passed to his eternal repose a few weeks earlier! His praises, celebrated by Pietro Delphino, General of the Camaldolese Order, may be read in Raynald, ad annum, 1492, n. 32.

*The present article is the continuation of two earlier essays in The American Catholic Quarterly Review, viz., "Music in the Early Christian Church," January, 1898, and "The Mediæval Chorus Music of the Catholic Church," April, 1899.

This violent reversal of the traditions of Catholic music was simply a detail of that universal revolution in musical practice and ideal which marked the passage from the sixteenth century to the seventeenth. The learned music of Europe had been for centuries almost exclusively in the care of ecclesiastical and princely chapels, and its practitioners held offices that were primarily clerical. The professional musicians, absorbed in churchly functions, had gone on adding Masses to Masses, Motets to Motets and Hymns to Hymns, until the Church had accumulated a store of sacred song so vast that it remains the admiration and despair of modern scholars. These works, although exhibiting every stage of construction from the simplest to the most intricate, were all framed in accordance with principles derived from the mediæval conception of melodic combination. The secular songs which these same composers produced in great numbers—Madrigals, Chansons, Villanellas and the like—notwithstanding their greater flexibility and lightness of touch, were also written for chorus, usually unaccompanied, and were theoretically constructed according to the same contrapuntal schemes as the church pieces. Nothing like operas or symphonies existed; there were no orchestras worthy of the name; pianoforte, violin and organ playing in the modern sense had not been dreamed of; solo singing was in its helpless infancy. When we consider, in the light of our present experience, how large a range of emotion that naturally utters itself in tone was left unrepresented through this lack of a proper secular art of music, we can understand the urgency of the demand which, at the close of the sixteenth century, broke down the barriers that hemmed in the currents of musical production and swept music out into the vaster area of universal human interests. The spirit of the Renaissance had led forth all other art forms to share in the multifarious activities and joys of modern life at a time when music was still the satisfied inmate of the cloister. But it was impossible that music also should not sooner or later feel the transfiguring touch of the new human impulse. The placid, austere expression of the clerical style, the indefinite forms, the Gregorian modes precluding free dissonance and regulated chromatic change, were incapable of rendering more than one order of ideas. A completely novel system must be forthcoming or music must confess its impotence to enter into the fuller emotional life which had lately been revealed to mankind.

The genius of Italy was equal to the demand. Usually when any form of art becomes complete a period of degeneracy follows; artists become mere imitators, inspiration and creative power die out, the art becomes a handicraft, new growth appears only in another period or another nation and under altogether different auspices. Such would perhaps have been the case with church music in Italy if a method diametrically opposed to that which had so long prevailed in the Church had not inaugurated a new school and finally extended its conquest into the venerable precincts of the Church itself. The opera and instrumental music—the two currents into which secular music divided—sprang up, as from hidden fountains, right beside the old forms which were even then just attaining their full glory, as if to show that the Italian musical genius so abounded in energy that it could never undergo decay, but when it had gone to its utmost limits in one direction it could instantly strike out in another still more brilliant and productive.

The invention of the opera about the year 1600 is usually looked upon as the event of paramount importance in the transition period of modern music history, yet it was only the most striking symptom of a radical sweeping tendency. Throughout the greater part of the sixteenth century a search had been in progress after a style of music suited to a solo voice, which could lend itself to the portrayal of the change and development of emotion involved in dramatic representation. The folk song, which is only suited to the expression of a single simple frame of mind, was of course inadequate. The old church music was admirably adapted to the expression of the consciousness of man in his relations to the divine—what was wanted was a means of expressing the emotions of man in his relations to his fellow-men. Lyric and dramatic poetry flourished, but no proper lyric or dramatic music. The Renaissance had done its mighty work in all other fields of art, but so far as music was concerned in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries a Renaissance did not exist. Many reasons might be given why the spirit of the Renaissance had no appreciable effect in the musical world until late in the sixteenth century. Musical forms are purely subjective in their conception; they find no models or even suggestions in the natural world, and the difficulty of finding the most satisfactory arrangements of tones out of an almost endless number of possible combinations, together with the necessity of constantly new adjustments of the mind in order to appreciate the value of the very forms which itself creates, makes musical development a matter of peculiar slowness and difficulty. The enthusiasm for the antique, which gave a definite direction to the revival of learning and the new ambitions in painting and sculpture, could have little practical value in musical invention, since the ancient music, which would otherwise have been chosen as a guide, had been completely lost. The craving for a style of solo singing suited to dramatic purposes tried to find satisfaction by means that were childishly insufficient. Imitations of folk-songs, the device of singing one part in a Madrigal, while the other parts were played by instruments, were some of the futile efforts to solve the problem. The sense of disappointment broke forth in bitter wrath against the church counterpoint, and a violent conflict raged between the bewildered experimenters and the adherents of the scholastic methods.

The discovery that was to satisfy the longings of a century and create a new art was made in Florence. About the year 1580 a circle of scholars, musicians and amateurs began to hold meetings at the house of a certain Count Bardi, where they discussed, among other learned questions, the nature of the music of the Greeks and the possibility of its restoration. Theorizing was supplemented by experiment, and at last Vincenzo Galilei, followed by Giulio Caccini, hit upon a mode of musical declamation, half speech and half song, which was enthusiastically hailed as the long-lost style employed in the Athenian drama. A somewhat freer and more melodious manner was also admitted in alternation with the dry formless recitation, and these two related methods were employed in the performance of short lyric, half-dramatic monologues. Such were the Monodies of Galilei and the Nuove Musiche of Caccini. More ambitious schemes followed. Mythological masquerades and pastoral comedies, which had held a prominent place in the gorgeous spectacles and pageants of the Italian court festivals ever since the thirteenth century, were provided with settings of the new declamatory music, or *stile recitativo*, and behold the opera was born.

The Florentine inventors of dramatic music builded better than they knew. They had no thought of setting music free upon a new and higher flight; they never dreamed of the consequences of releasing melody from the fetters of counterpoint. Their sole intention was to make poetry more expressive and emphatic by the employment of tones that would heighten the natural inflections of speech, and in which there should be no repetition or extension of words (as in the contrapuntal style) involving a subordination of text to musical form. The ideal of recitative was the expression of feeling by a method that permits the text to follow the natural accent of declamatory speech, unrestrained by a particular musical form or tonality, and dependent only upon the support of the simplest kind of instrumental accompaniment. In this style of music, said Caccini, speech is of the first importance, rhythm second and tone last of all. These pioneers of dramatic music, as they declared over and over again, simply desired a form of music that should allow the words to be distinctly understood. They condemned counterpoint, not on musical grounds, but because it allowed the text to be obscured and the natural rhythm broken. There was no promise of a new musical era in such an anti-musical pronunciamento as this. But a relation between music and poetry in which melody renounces all its inherent rights could not long be maintained. The genius of Italy in the seventeenth century was musical, not poetic. Just so soon as the infinite possibilities of charm that lie in free melody were once perceived, no theories of Platonizing pedants could check its progress. The demands of the new age, reinforced by the special Italian gift of melody, created an art form in which absolute music triumphed over the feebler claims of poetry and rhetoric. The cold, calculated Florentine music-drama gave way to the vivacious impassioned opera of Venice and Naples. Although the primitive dry recitative survived, the far more expressive accompanied recitative was evolved from it, and the grand aria burst into radiant life out of the brief lyrical sections which the Florentines had allowed to creep into their tedious declamatory scenes. Vocal colorature, which had already appeared in the dramatic pieces of Caccini, became the most beloved means of effect. The little group of simple instruments employed in the first Florentine music-dramas was gradually merged in the modern full orchestra. The original notion of making the poetic and scenic intention paramount was forgotten, and the opera became cultivated solely as a means for the display of all the fascinations of vocalism.

Thus a new motive took complete possession of the art of music. By virtue of the new powers revealed to them, composers would now strive to enter all the secret precincts of the soul and give a voice to every emotion, simple or complex, called forth by solitary meditation or by situations of dramatic stress and conflict. Music, like painting and poetry, would now occupy the whole world of human experience. The stupendous achievements of the tonal art of the past two centuries are the outcome of this revolutionary impulse. But not at once could music administer the whole of her new possession. She must pass through a course of training in technic, to a certain extent as she had done in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but under far more favorable conditions and quite different circumstances. The shallowness of the greater part of the music of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is partly due to the difficulty that composers found in mastering the new forms. A facility in handling the material must be acquired before there could be any clear consciousness of the possibilities of expression which the new forms contained. The first problem in vocal music was the development of a method of technic, and musical taste, fascinated by the new sensation, ran into an extravagant worship of the human voice. There appeared in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the most brilliant group of singers, of both sexes, that the world has ever seen. The full extent of the morbid, we might almost say the insane passion for sensuous nerve-exciting tone is sufficiently indicated by the encouragement in theatre and church of those outrages upon nature, the male soprano and alto. A school of composers of brilliant melodic genius appeared in Italy, France and Germany, who supplied these singers with showy and pathetic music precisely suited to their peculiar powers. Italian melody and Italian vocalism became the reigning sensation in European society, and the opera easily took the primacy among fashionable amusements. The Italian grand opera, with its solemn travesty of antique characters and scenes, its mock heroics, its stilted conventionalities, its dramatic feebleness and vocal glitter, was a lively reflection of the taste of this age of "gallant" poetry, rococo decoration and social artificiality. The musical element consisted of a succession of arias and duets stitched together by a loose thread of *secco* recitative. The costumes were those of contemporary fashion, although the characters were named for worthies of ancient Greece and Rome. The plots were in no sense historic, but consisted of love tales and conspiracies concocted by the playwright. Truth to human nature and to locality was left to the despised comic opera. Yet we must not suppose that the devotees of this music were conscious of its real superficiality. They adored it not wholly because it was sensational, but because they believed it true in expression; and indeed it was true to those light and transient sentiments which the voluptuaries of the theatre mistook for the throbs of nature. Tender and pathetic these airs often were, but it was the affected tenderness and pathos of fashionable eighteenth century literature which they represented. To the profounder insight of the present they seem to express nothing deeper than the make-believe emotions of children at their play.

Under such sanctions the Italian grand aria became the dominant form of melody. Not the appeal to the intellect and the genuine experiences of the heart was required of the musical performer, but rather brilliancy of technic and seductiveness of tone. Ephemeral nerve excitement, incessant novelty within certain conventional bounds, were the demands laid by the public upon composer and singer. The office of the poet became hardly less mechanical than that of the costumer or the decorator. Composers, with a few exceptions, yielded to the prevailing fashion, and musical dramatic art lent itself chiefly to the portrayal of stereotyped sentiments and the gratification of the sense. I would not be understood as denying the germ of truth that lay in this art element contributed by Italy to the modern world. Its later results were sublime and beneficent, for Italian melody has given direction to well nigh all the magnificent achievements of secular music in the past two centuries. I am speaking here of the first outcome of the infatuation it produced, in the breaking down of the taste for the severe and elevated and the production of a transient, often demoralizing, intoxication.

It was not long before the charming Italian melody undertook the conquest of the Church. The popular demand for melody and solo singing overcame the austere traditions of ecclesiastical song. The dramatic and concert style invaded the choir gallery. The personnel of the choirs was altered and women, sometimes male sopranos and altos, took the place of boys. The prima donna, with her trills and runs, often made the choir gallery the parade ground for her arts of fascination. The chorus declined in favor of the solo, and the church aria vied with the opera aria in bravura and languishing pathos. Where the chorus was retained in Mass, Motet or Hymn, it abandoned the close-knit contrapuntal texture in favor of a simple homophonic structure, with strongly marked rhythmical movement. The orchestral accompaniment also lent to the composition a vivid dramatic coloring, and brilliant solos for violins and flutes seemed often to convert the sanctuary into a concert hall. All this was inevitable, for the Catholic musicians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were artists as well as churchmen; they shared the æsthetic convictions of their time and could not be expected to forego the opportunities for effect which the new methods put into their hands. They were no longer dependent upon the Church for commissions; the opera house and the salon gave them sure means of subsistence and fame. The functions of church and theatre composer were often united in a single man. The convents and cathedral chapels were made training schools for the choir and the opera stage on equal terms. It was in a monk's cell that Bernacchi and other world-famous opera singers of the eighteenth century were educated. Ecclesiastics united with aristocratic laymen in the patronage of the opera; Cardinals and Archbishops owned theatre boxes, and it was not considered in the least out of character for monks and priests to write operas and superintend their performance. Under such conditions it was not strange that church and theatre reacted upon each other, and the sentimental style beloved in opera house and salon should at last be accepted as the proper vehicle of devotional feeling.

In this adornment of the liturgy in theatrical costume we find a singular parallel between the history of church music in the transition period and that of religious painting in the period of the Renaissance. Pictorial art had first to give concrete expression to the conceptions evolved under the influence of Christianity, and since the whole intent of the pious discipline was to turn the thought away from temporal joys, art avoided the representation of ideal physical loveliness on the one hand and a scientific historical correctness on the other. Hence arose the naïve, emblematic pictures of the fourteenth century, whose main endeavor was to attract and indoctrinate with delineations that were symbolic and intended mainly for edification. Art, therefore, although emancipated from Byzantine formalism, was still essentially hieratic, and the painter willingly assumed a semi-sacerdotal office as the efficient coadjutor of the preacher and the confessor. With the fifteenth century came the inrush of the antique culture, uniting with native Italian tendencies to sweep art away into a passionate quest of beauty wherever it might be found. The conventional religious subjects and the traditional modes of treatment could no longer satisfy those whose eyes had been opened to the magnificent materials for artistic treatment that lay in the human form, draped and undraped, in landscape, atmosphere, color and light and shadow, and who had been taught by the individualistic trend of the age that the painter is true to his genius only as he frees himself from formulas and follows the leadings of his own instincts. But art could not wholly renounce its original pious mission. The age was at least nominally Christian, sincerely so in many of its elements, and the patronage of the arts was still to a very large extent in the hands of the clergy. And here the Church prudently consented to a modification of the established ideals of treatment of sacred themes. The native Italian love of elegance of outline, harmony of form and splendor of color, directed by the study of the antique, overcame the earlier austerity and effected a combination of Christian tradition and pagan sensuousness which, in such work as that of Correggio and the great Venetians, and even at times in the pure Raphael and the stern Michael Angelo, quite belied the purpose of ecclesiastical art, aiming not to fortify dogma and elevate the spirit, but to gratify the lust of the eye and the delight in the display of technical skill. Painting no longer conformed to a traditional religious type; it followed its genius, and that genius was really inspired by the splendors of earth, however much it might persuade itself that it ministered to holiness. A noted example of this self-deception, although an extreme one, is the picture entitled "The Marriage at Cana," by Paolo Veronese. Christ is the central figure, but His presence has no vital significance. He is simply an imposing Venetian grandee, and the enormous canvas, with its crowd of figures elegantly attired in fashionable sixteenth century costume, its profusion of sumptuous dishes and gorgeous tapestries, is nothing more or less than a representation of a Venetian state banquet. One painter drew naked young men as a background for a picture of the Madonna and infant Christ. Another painted a St. Sebastian for a nunnery, whose physical charms proved a snare, so that it was removed. Others, such as Titian, lavished all the resources of their art with apparently equal enthusiasm upon Madonnas and nude Venuses. The other direction which was followed by painting, aiming at historical verity and rigid accuracy in anatomy and expression, may be illustrated by comparing Rubens' "Crucifixion" in the Antwerp Museum with a crucifixion, for example, by Fra Angelico. Each motive was sincere, but the harsh realism of the Fleming shows how far art, even in reverent treatment of religious themes, had departed from the unhistoric symbolism formerly imposed by the Church. In all this there was no disloyal intention; art had simply issued its declaration of independence, its sole aim was henceforth beauty and reality, the body as well as the soul seemed worthy of study and adoration, and the Church adopted the new skill into its service, not seeing that the world was destined to be the gainer and not religion.

The same impulse produced analogous results in the music of the Catholic Church. The liturgic texts that were appropriated to choral setting remained as they had been, the place and theoretic function of the musical offices in the ceremonial were not altered, but the music, in imitating the characteristics of the opera and exerting a somewhat similar effect upon the mind, became animated by an ideal of devotion quite apart from that of the liturgy and belied that unimpassioned, absorbed and universalized mood of worship of which the older forms of liturgic art are the most complete and consistent embodiment. Herein is to be found the effect of the spirit of the Renaissance upon church music. It is not simply that it created new musical forms, new styles of performance and a more definite expression; the significance of the change lies rather in the fact that it transformed the whole spirit of devotional music by endowing religious themes with sensuous charm and with a treatment inspired by the arbitrary will of the composer and not by the teachings of the Church.

At this point we reach the real underlying motive, however unconscious of it individual composers may have been, which compelled the revolution in liturgic music. A new ideal of devotional expression made inevitable the abandonment of the formal, academic style of the Palestrina school. The spirit of the age, which required a more subjective expression in music, involved a demand for a more definite characterization in the setting of the sacred texts. The composer could no longer be satisfied with a humble imitation of the forms which the Church had sealed as the proper expression of her attitude toward the divine mysteries, but claimed the privilege of coloring the text according to the dictates of his own feeling as a man and his peculiar method as an artist. The mediæval music was that of the cloister and the chapel. It was elevated, vague, abstract; it was as though it took up into itself all the particular and temporary emotions that might be called forth by the sacred history and articles of belief, and sifted and refined them into a generalized type, special individual experience being dissolved in the more diffused sense of awe and rapture which fills the hearts of an assembly in the attitude of worship. It was the mood of prayer which this music uttered, and that not the prayer of an individual agitated by his own personal hopes and fears, but the prayer of the Church, which embraces all the needs which the believers share in common and offers them at the Mercy Seat with the calmness that comes of reverent confidence. Thus in the old Masses the "Kyrie eleison" and the "Miserere nobis" are never agonizing; the "Crucifixus" does not attempt to portray the grief of an imaginary spectator of the scene on Calvary; the "Gloria in Excelsis" and the "Sanctus" never force the jubilant tone into a frenzied excitement; the setting of the "Dies Irae" in the Requiem Mass makes no attempt to paint a realistic picture of the terrors of the day of judgment. Now compare a typical Mass of the modern dramatic school and see how different is the conception. The music of "Gloria" and "Credo" revels in all the opportunities for change and contrast which the varied text supplies; the "Dona nobis pacem" dies away in strains of tender longing. Consider the mournful undertone that throbs through the "Crucifixus" of Schubert's Mass in A flat, the terrifying crash that breaks into the "Miserere nobis" in the "Gloria" of Beethoven's Mass in D, the tide of ecstasy that surges through the "Sanctus" of Gounod's St. Cecilia Mass and the almost cloying sweetness of the "Agnus Dei;" the uproar of brass instruments in the "Tuba mirum" of Berlioz's Requiem. Observe the strong similarity of style at many points between Verdi's Requiem and his opera "Aida." In such works as these, which are fairly typical of the modern school, the composer writes under an independent impulse, with no thought of subordinating himself to ecclesiastical canons or liturgic usage. He attempts not only to depict his own state of mind as affected by the ideas of the text, but he also often aims to make his music picturesque according to dramatic methods. He does not seem to be aware that there is a distinction between religious concert music and church music. The classic example of this confusion is in the "Dona nobis pacem" of Beethoven's "Missa Solemnis," where the composer introduces a strain of military music in order to suggest the contrasted horrors of war. This device, as Beethoven employs it, is exceedingly striking and beautiful, but it is exactly antagonistic to the meaning of the text and the whole spirit of the liturgy. The conception of a large amount of modern Mass music seems to be not that the ritual to which it belongs is prayer, but rather a splendid spectacle intended to excite the imagination and fascinate the sense. It is this altered conception, lying at the very basis of the larger part of modern church music, that leads such writers as Jakob to refuse even to notice the modern school in his sketch of the history of church music, just as Rio condemns Titian as the painter who mainly contributed to the decay of religious painting.

In the Middle Age artists were grouped in schools or in guilds, each renouncing his right of initiative and shaping his productions in accordance with the legalized formulas of his craft. The modern artist is a separatist, his glory lies in the degree to which he rises above hereditary technic, and throws into his work a magical personal quality which becomes his own creative gift to the world. The church music of the sixteenth century was that of a school; the composers, although not actually members of a guild, worked on exactly the same technical foundations, and produced Masses and Motets of a uniformity that often becomes academic and monotonous. The modern composer carries into church pieces his distinct personal style. The grandeur and violent contrasts of Beethoven's symphonies, the elegiac tone of Schubert's songs, the enchantments of melody and the luxuries of color in the operas of Verdi and Gounod, are also characteristic marks of the Masses of these composers. The older music could follow the text submissively, for there was no prescribed musical form to be worked out, and cadences could occur whenever a sentence came to an end. The modern forms, on the other hand, consisting of consecutive and proportional sections, imply the necessity of contrast, development and climax—an arrangement that is not necessitated by any corresponding system in the text. This alone would often result in a lack of congruence between text and music and the composer would easily fall into the way of paying more heed to the sheer musical working out than to the meaning of the words. Moreover, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries there was no radical conflict between the church musical style and the secular; so far as secular music was cultivated by the professional composers it was no more than a slight variation from the ecclesiastical model. Profane music may be said to have been a branch of religious music. In the modern period this relationship is reversed; secular music in opera and instrumental forms has remoulded church music, and the latter is in a sense a branch of the former.

Besides the development of the sectional form another technical change acted to break down the old obstacles to characteristic expression. An essential feature of the mediæval music, consequent upon the very nature of the Gregorian modes, was the very slight employment of chromatic alteration of notes and the absence of free dissonances. Whereas in the modern keys the notes themselves differ (the key of E, for instance, containing notes that are not found in the keys of C or F), the Gregorian modes do not differ in the notes employed, but only in the relation of the intervals to the key-note or final, according to the arrangement of steps and half-steps. Modulation in the modern sense, therefore, cannot exist in a purely diatonic scheme. The breaking up of the modal system was foreshadowed when composers became impatient with the placidity and colorlessness of the modal harmonies and began to introduce unexpected dissonances for the sake of variety. These sharps and flats were employed at first without any regularity whatever, except occasionally to avoid an objectionable progression or to give the effect of a leading tone in a final cadence. The other chromatic changes that occasionally appear in the old music are scattered about in a haphazard fashion; they give an impression of helplessness to the modern ear when the composer seems about to make a modulation and at once falls back again into the former tonality. It was a necessity, therefore, as well as a virtue, that the church music of the old régime should maintain the calm equable flow that seems to us so pertinent to its liturgic intention. For these reasons it may perhaps be replied to what has been said concerning the devotional ideal embodied in the calm, severe strains of the old masters that they had no choice in the matter. Does it follow, it may be asked, that these men would not have written in the modern style if they had had the means? Some of them probably would have done so, others almost certainly would not. Many writers who carried the old form into the seventeenth century did have the choice and resisted it; they staunchly defended the traditional principles and condemned the new methods as destructive of pure church music. The laws that work in the development of ecclesiastical art also seem to require that music should pass through the same stages as those that sculpture and painting traversed—first the stage of symbolism, restraint within certain conventions in accordance with ecclesiastical prescription; afterwards the deliverance from the trammels of school formulas, emancipation from all laws but those of the free determination of individual genius. At this point authority ceases, dictation gives way to persuasion and art still ministers to the higher ends of the Church, not through fear, but through reverence for the teachings and appeals which the Church sends forth as her contribution to the nobler influences of the age.

The writer who would trace the history of the modern musical Mass has a task very different from that which meets the historian of the mediæval period. In the latter case, as has already been shown, generalization is comparatively easy, for we deal with music in which differences of nationality and individual style hardly appear. The modern Catholic music, on the other hand, follows the currents that shape the course of secular music. Where secular music becomes formalized, as in the early Italian opera, religious music tends to fall into a similar routine. When, on the other hand, men of commanding genius, such as Beethoven, Berlioz, Liszt, Verdi, contribute works of a purely individual stamp to the general development of musical art, their church compositions form no exception, but are likewise sharply differentiated from others of the same class. The influence of nationality makes itself felt—there is a style characteristic of Italy, another of S. Germany and Austria, another of Paris, although these distinctions tend to disappear under the solvent of modern cosmopolitanism. The Church does not positively dictate any particular norm or method, and hence local tendencies have run their course almost unchecked.

Catholic music has shared all the fluctuations of European taste. The levity of the eighteenth and early part of the nineteenth centuries was as apparent in the Mass as in the opera. The grand uplift in the musical culture during the last 100 years has carried church composition along with it, so that almost all the works, produced since Palestrina, of which the Church has most reason to be proud, belong to the present century. One of the ultimate results of the modern license in style and the tendency toward individual expression is the custom of writing Masses as free compositions rather than for liturgic uses, and of performing them in public halls or theatres in the same manner as oratorios. Mozart wrote his Requiem to the order of a private patron. Beethoven's "Missa Solemnis," not being ready when wanted for a consecration ceremony, outgrew the dimensions of a service Mass altogether, and was finished without any liturgic purpose in view. Cherubini's Mass in D minor and Liszt's Gran Mass were each composed for a single occasion, and both of them, like the Requiems of Berlioz and Dvorak, although often heard in concerts, have but very rarely been performed in church worship. Masses have even been written by Protestants, such as Bach, Schumann, Hauptmann, Richter and Becker. Masses that are written under the same impulse as ordinary concert and dramatic works easily violate the ecclesiastical spirit, and pass into the category of religious works that are non-churchly, and it may often seem necessary to class them with cantatas on account of their semi-dramatic tone. In such productions as Bach's B minor Mass, Beethoven's "Missa Solemnis" and Berlioz's Requiem we have works that constitute a separate phase of art, not Masses in the proper sense, for they do not blend with the Church ceremonial nor contribute to the special devotional mood which the Church aims to promote, while yet in their general conception they are held by a loose band to the altar. So apart do these mighty creations stand that they may almost be said to glorify religion in the abstract rather than the confession of the Catholic Church.

The changed conditions in respect to patronage have had the same effect upon the Mass as upon other departments of musical composition. In former periods down to the close of the eighteenth century, the professional composer was almost invariably a salaried officer, attached as a personal retainer to a court, lay or clerical, and bound to conform his style of composition to a greater or less extent to the tastes of his employer. A Pope Sixtus V. could reprove Palestrina for failing to please with a certain Mass and admonish him to do better work in the future. Haydn could hardly venture to introduce any innovation into the style of religious music sanctioned by his august masters, the Esterhazys. Mozart wrote all his Masses, with the exception of the Requiem, for the chapel of the Prince Archbishop of Salzburg. In this establishment the length of the Mass was prescribed, the mode of writing and performance, which had become traditional, hindered freedom of development, and therefore Mozart's works of this class everywhere gave evidence of constraint. On the other hand, the leading composers of the present century that have occupied themselves with the Mass have been free from such arbitrary compulsions. They have written Masses, not as a part of routine duty, but as they were inspired by the holy words and by the desire to offer the free gift of their genius at the altar of the Church. They have been, as a rule, devoted churchmen, but they have felt that they had the sympathy of the Church in asserting the rights of the artist as against prelatical conservatism and local usage. The outcome is seen in a group of works which, whatever the strict censors may deem their defects in edifying quality, at least indicate that in the field of musical art there is no necessary conflict between Catholicism and the free spirit of the age.

Under these very conditions the Mass in the modern musical era has taken a variety of directions and assumed distinct national and individual complexions. The Neapolitan school, which gave the law to Italian opera in the eighteenth century, endowed the Mass with the same soft sensuousness of melody and sentimental pathos of expression, together with a dry calculated kind of harmony in the chorus portions, the work never touching deep chords of feeling, and yet preserving a tone of sobriety and dignity. As cultivated in Italy and France the Mass afterward degenerated into rivalry on equal terms with the shallow, captivating, cloying melody of the later Neapolitans and their successors, Rossini and Bellini. In this school of so-called religious music all sense of appropriateness was often lost, and a florid, profane treatment was not only permitted but encouraged. Perversions which can hardly be called less than blasphemous sometimes had free rein in the ritual music. Franz Liszt, in a letter to a Paris journal, written in 1835, bitterly attacks the music which flaunted itself in the Catholic churches of the city. He complains of the sacrilegious virtuoso displays of the prima donna, the wretched choruses, the vulgar antics of the organist playing galops and variations from comic operas in the most solemn moments of the holy ceremony. Similar testimony has come from time to time from Italy, and it would appear that the most lamentable lapses from the pure church tradition have occurred in some of the very places where one would expect that the strictest principles would be loyally maintained. The most celebrated surviving example of the consequences to which the virtuoso tendencies in church music must inevitably lead when unchecked by a truly pious criticism is Rossini's "Stabat Mater." This frivolous work is frequently performed with great éclat in Catholic places of worship, as though the clergy were indifferent to the almost incredible levity which could clothe the heart-breaking pathos of Jacopone's immortal hymn—a hymn properly honored by the Church with a place among the five great Sequences—with strains properly suited to the sprightly abandon of opera bouffe.

Another branch of the Mass was sent by the Neapolitan school into Austria, and here the results, although unsatisfactory to the better taste of the present time, were far nobler and more fruitful than in Italy and France. The group of Austrian church composers, represented by the two Haydns, Mozart, Eybler, Neukomm, Sechter and others of the period, created a form of church music which partook of much of the dry, formal, pedantic spirit of the day, in which regularity of form, scientific correctness and a conscious propriety of manner were often more considered than emotional fervor. Certain conventions, such as a florid contrapuntal treatment of the Kyrie with its slow introduction followed by an Allegro, the fugues at the "Cum Sanctu Spiritu" and the "Et vitam," the regular alternation of solo and chorus numbers, give the typical Austrian Mass a somewhat rigid perfunctory air, and in practice produce the effect which always results when expression becomes stereotyped and form is exalted over substance. Mozart's Masses, with the exception of the beautiful Requiem (which was his last work and belongs in a different category), were the production of his boyhood, written before his genius became self-assertive and under conditions distinctly unfavorable to the free exercise of the imagination. The Masses of Joseph Haydn stand somewhat apart from the strict Austrian school, for although as a rule they conform externally to the local conventions, they are far more individual and possess a freedom and buoyancy that are decidedly personal. It has become the fashion among the sterner critics of church music to condemn Haydn's Masses without qualification, as conspicuous examples of the degradation of taste in religious art which is one of the depressing legacies of the eighteenth century. Much of this censure is deserved, for Haydn too often loses sight of the law which demands that music should reinforce and not contradict the meaning and purpose of the text. Haydn's Mass style is often indistinguishable from his oratorio style. His coloratura arias are always flippant, often introduced at such solemn moments as to be grossly offensive. Even where the voice part is subdued to an appropriate solemnity, the desired impression is frequently destroyed by some tawdry flourish in the orchestra. The brilliancy of the choruses is often pompous and hollow. Haydn's genius was primarily instrumental; he was the virtual creator of the modern symphony and string quartette; his musical forms and modes of expression were drawn from two diverse sources which it was his great mission to conciliate and idealize, viz., the Italian aristocratic opera and the dance and song of the common people. An extraordinary sense of form and an instinctive sympathy with whatever is spontaneous, genial and racy made him what he was. The joviality of his nature was irrepressible. To write music of a sombre cast was out of his power. There is not a melancholy strain in all his works; pensiveness was as deep a note as he could strike. He tried to defend the gay tone of his church music by saying that he had such a sense of the goodness of God that he could not be otherwise than joyful in thinking of Him. This explanation was perfectly sincere, but Haydn was not enough of a philosopher to see the weak spot in this sort of æsthetics. Yet in spite of the obvious faults of Haydn's Mass style, looking at it from an historic point of view, it was a promise of advance and not a sign of degeneracy. For it marked the introduction of genuine, even if misdirected feeling, into worship music in the place of dull conformity to routine. Haydn was far indeed from solving the problem of church music, but he helped to give new life to a form that showed danger of becoming petrified.

Two Masses of world importance rise from above the mediocrity of the Austrian school, like the towers of some Gothic cathedral above the monotonous tiled roofs of a mediæval city—the Requiem of Mozart and the "Missa Solemnis" of Beethoven. The unfinished masterpiece of Mozart outsoars all comparison with the religious works of his youth, and as his farewell to the world he could impart to it a tone of pathos and exaltation which had hardly been known in the cold objective treatment of the usual eighteenth century Mass. The hand of death was upon Mozart as he penned the immortal pages of the Requiem, and in this crisis he could feel that he was free from the dictation of fashion and precedent. This work is perhaps not all that we might look for in these solemn circumstances. Mozart's exquisite genius was suited rather to the task, in which lies his true glory, of raising the old Italian opera to its highest possibilities of grace and truth to nature. He had not that depth of feeling and sweep of imagination which make the works of Bach, Handel and Beethoven the sublimest expression of awe in view of the mysteries of life and death. Yet it is absolutely free from the fripperies which disfigure the Masses of Haydn, as well as from the dry scholasticism of much of Mozart's own early religious work. Such movements as the "Confutatis," the "Recordare" and the "Lacrimosa"—movements inexpressibly earnest, consoling and pathetic—gave evidence that a new and loftier spirit had entered the music of the Church.

The "Missa Solemnis" of Beethoven, composed 1818-1822, can hardly be considered from the liturgic point of view. In the vastness of its dimensions it is quite disproportioned to the ceremony to which it theoretically belongs, and its almost unparalleled difficulty of execution and the stupendous grandeur of its choral climaxes remove it beyond the reach of all but the most exceptional choirs. It is, therefore, performed only as a concert work by choral societies with a full orchestral equipment. For these reasons it is not to be classed with the service Masses of the Catholic Church, but may be placed beside the B minor Mass of Sebastian Bach, both holding a position outside all ordinary comparisons. Each of these colossal creations stands on its own solitary eminence, the projection in tones of the religious conceptions of two gigantic all-comprehending intellects. For neither of these two works is the Catholic Church strictly responsible. They do not proceed from within the Church. Bach was a strict Protestant; Beethoven, although nominally a disciple of the Catholic Church, had almost no share in her communion, and his religious belief, so far as the testimony goes, was a sort of pantheistic mysticism. Both these supreme artists in the later periods of their careers gave absolutely free rein to their imaginations, and not only well nigh exceeded all available means of performance, but also seemed to strive to force musical forms and the powers of instruments and voices beyond their limits in the efforts to realize that which is unrealizable through any human medium. In this endeavor they went over the verge of the sublime and produced achievements which excite wonder and awe. These two Masses defy all imitation, represent no school and come into comparison not with works of their own nominal class, but rather with Michael Angelo's "Last Judgment," Titian's "Assumption of Madonna" and Dante's "Paradiso." The spirit of individualism in modern religious music can no further go.

The last Masses of international importance produced on Austrian soil are those of Franz Schubert. Of his six Latin Masses four are youthful works, pure and graceful, but not especially significant. In his E flat and A flat Masses, however, he takes a place in the upper rank of Mass composers of this century. The E flat Mass is weakened by the diffuseness which was Schubert's besetting sin; the A flat is more terse and sustained in excellence and thoroughly available for practical use. Both of them contain movements of purest ideal beauty and sincere worshipful spirit, and often rise to a grandeur that is unmarred by sensationalism and wholly in keeping with the tone of awe which pervades even the most exultant moments of the liturgy.

The lofty idealism exemplified in such works as Mozart's Requiem, Beethoven's Mass in D, Schubert's last two Masses and in a less degree in Weber's Mass in E flat has never since been lost from the German Mass in spite of local and temporary reactions. Such composers as Kiel, Havert, Grell and Rheinberger have done noble service in holding German Catholic music fast to the tradition of seriousness and truth which has been taking form all through this century in German secular music. It must be said, however, that the German Catholic Church at large, especially in the country districts, has been too often dull to the righteous claims of the profounder expression of devotional feeling, and has maintained the vogue of the Italian Mass and the shallower products of the Austrian school. Against this indifference the St. Cæcilia Society, founded at Regensburg in 1868, has directed its noble missionary labors, with as yet but partial success.

If we turn our observation to Italy and France we find that the music of the Church is at every period sympathetically responsive to the fluctuations in secular music. Elevated and dignified, if somewhat cold and constrained in the writings of the nobler spirits of the Neapolitan school such as Durante and Jomelli, sweet and graceful even to effeminacy in Pergolesi, sensuous and flippant in Rossini, imposing and massive, rising at times to epic grandeur, in Cherubini, intentionally dramatic and sensational in Lesueur, by turns ecstatic and voluptuous in Gounod, ardent and impassioned in Verdi—the ecclesiastical music of the Latin nations offers works of adorable beauty, sometimes true to the pure devotional ideal, sometimes perverse, and by their isolation serving to illustrate the dependence of the church composer's inspiration upon the general conditions of musical taste and progress. Not only were those musicians of France and Italy who were prominent as church composers also among the leaders in opera (and indeed dramatic and church music were the only forms cultivated with success in these two centuries down to Hector Berlioz), but their ideals and methods in opera were closely paralleled by those displayed in their religious productions. It is impossible to separate the powerful Masses and Requiems of Cherubini, with their pomp and majesty of movement, their reserved and pathetic melody, their grandiose dimensions and their sumptuous orchestration, from those contemporary tendencies in dramatic art which issued in the "historic school" of grand opera as examplified in the pretentious works of Spontini, Meyerbeer and Auber. They may be said to be the reflection in church art of the hollow splendor of French imperialism. Such an expression, however, may be accused of failing in justice to the undeniable merits of Cherubini's Masses. As a man and as a musician Cherubini commands unbounded respect for his unswerving sincerity in an age of sham, his uncompromising assertion of his dignity as an artist in an age of sycophancy, and the solid worth of his achievement in an age of shallow aims and mediocre results. As a church composer he towers so high above his predecessors of the eighteenth century in respect to learning and imagination that his Masses are not unworthy to stand beside Beethoven's "Missa Solemnis" as auguries of the loftier aims that were soon to prevail in the realm of religious music. His Requiem in C minor, particularly, by reason of its exquisite tenderness, breadth of thought, nobility of expression and avoidance of all excess either of agitation or of gloom, must be ranked among the most admirable modern examples of pure Catholic art.

The aim of Lesueur (1763-1837) to introduce into church music a picturesque and imitative style—which, in spite of much that was striking and attractive in result, must be pronounced a false direction in church music—was characteristically French and was reproduced in such works as Berlioz's Requiem and to a certain extent in the Masses and Psalms of Liszt. The genius of Liszt, notwithstanding his Hungarian birth, was closely akin to the French in his tendency to connect every musical impulse with a picture or with some mental conception that could be grasped in distinct concrete outline. In his youth Liszt, in his despair over the degeneracy of liturgic music in France and its complete separation from the real life of the people, proclaimed the necessity of a *rapprochement* between church music and popular music. In an article written for a Paris journal in 1834, which remains a fragment, he imagined a new style of religious music which should "unite in colossal relations theatre and church, which should be at the same time dramatic and solemn, imposing and simple, festive and earnest, fiery and unconstrained, stormy and reposeful, clear and fervent." These expressions are too vague to serve as a programme for a new art movement. They imply, however, a protest against the one-sided operatic tendency of the day, at the same time indicating the conviction that the problem is not to be solved in a pedantic reaction toward the ancient austere ideal, and yet that the old and new ideals, liturgic appropriateness and characteristic expression, reverence of mood and recognition of the claims of contemporary taste, should in some way be made to harmonize. The man who all his life conceived the theatre as a means of popular education and who strove to realize that conception as court music director at Weimar, would also lament any alienation between the church ceremony and the intellectual and emotional habitudes and inclinations of the people. A devoted churchman reverencing the ancient ecclesiastical tradition, and at the same time a musical artist of the advanced modern type, Liszt's instincts yearned more or less blindly towards an alliance between the sacerdotal conception of religious art and the general artistic spirit of the age. Some such vision evidently floated before his mind in the Masses, Psalms and Oratorios of his later years, as shown in their subjective and reflective character, together with a strong inclination toward the older ecclesiastical forms. These two ideals are probably incompatible; at any rate Liszt did not possess the genius to blend them in a convincing manner.

Among the later ecclesiastical composers of France Gounod shines out conspicuously by virtue of those fascinating melodic gifts which have made the fame of the St. Cæcilia Mass almost conterminous with that of the opera "Faust." Indeed, there is hardly a better example of the modern propensity of the dramatic and religious styles to reflect each other's lineaments than is found in the close parallelism which appears in Gounod's secular and church productions. So pliable, or perhaps we might say so neutral is his art, that a similar quality of melting cadence is made to portray the mutual avowals of love-lorn souls and the raptures of heavenly aspiration. Those who condemn Gounod's religious music on this account as sensuous have some reason on their side, yet no one has ever ventured to accuse Gounod of insincerity, and it may well be that his wide human sympathy saw enough correspondence between the worship of an earthly ideal and that of a heavenly—each implying the abandonment of self-consciousness in the yearning for a happiness that is at the moment the highest conceivable—as to make the musical expression of both essentially similar. This is to say that the composer forgets liturgical claims in behalf of the purely human. This principle no doubt involves the destruction of church music as a distinctive form of art, but it is certain that the world at large, as evinced by the immense popularity of Gounod's religious works, sees no incongruity and does not feel that such usage is profane. Criticism on the part of all but the most austere is disarmed by the pure seraphic beauty which this complacent art of Gounod often reveals. The intoxicating sweetness of his melody and harmony never sinks to a Rossinian flippancy. Of Gounod's reverence for the Church and for its art ideals there can be no question. A man's views of the proper tone of church music will be controlled largely by his temperament, and Gounod's temperament was as warm as an Oriental's. He offered to the Church his best, and as the Magi brought gold, frankincense and myrrh to a babe born among cattle in a stable, so Gounod, with a consecration equally sincere, clothed his prayers in strains so ecstatic that compared with them the most impassioned accents of "Faust" and "Romeo and Juliet" are tame. He was a profound student of Palestrina, Mozart and Cherubini, and strong traces of the styles of these masters are apparent in his works. His most famous Mass, the "St. Cecilia," is inferior in breadth and force to the Mass of the "Sacred Heart." His remaining Masses and Oratorios display occasional flashes of extraordinary brilliancy, but their vigor is spasmodic and easily sinks into commonplace.

Somewhat similar qualities, although far less sensational, are found in the works of that admirable band of organists and church composers that now lend such lustre to the art life of the French capital. The culture of such representatives of this school as Guilmant, Widor, Saint-Saëns, Dubois, Gigout is so solidly based, and their views of religious music so judicious, that the methods and traditions which they are conscientiously engaged in establishing need only the reinforcement of still higher genius to bring forth works which will confer even greater honor upon Catholicism than she has yet received from the devotion of her musical sons in France.

The religious works of Verdi might be characterized in much the same terms as those of Gounod. In Verdi also we have a truly filial devotion to the Catholic Church, united with a temperament easily excited to a white heat when submitted to his musical inspiration, and a genius for melody and seductive harmonic combinations in which he is hardly equaled among modern composers. In his "Manzoni Requiem," "Stabat Mater" and "Te Deum" these qualities are no less in evidence than in "Aida" and "Otello," and it would be idle to deny their devotional sincerity on account of their lavish profusion of nerve-exciting agencies. The controversy between the contemners and the defenders of the "Manzoni Requiem" is now somewhat stale and need not be revived here. Any who may wish to resuscitate it, however, on account of the perennial importance of the question of what constitutes purity and appropriateness in church art, must in justice put themselves into imaginative sympathy with the racial religious feeling of an Italian, and make allowance also for the undeniable suggestion of the dramatic in the Catholic ritual and for the natural effect of the Catholic ceremonial and its peculiar atmosphere upon the more ardent enthusiastic order of minds.

The most imposing contributions that have been made to Catholic liturgic music since Verdi's Requiem are undoubtedly the Requiem Mass and the "Stabat Mater" of Dvorak. All the wealth of tone color which is contained upon the palette of this at present unsurpassed master of harmony and instrumentation has been laid upon these two magnificent scores. Inferior to Verdi in variety and gorgeousness of melody, the Bohemian composer surpasses the great Italian in massiveness, dignity and in unfailing good taste. There can be no question that Dvorak's "Stabat Mater" is supreme over all other settings—the only one, except Verdi's much slighter work, that is worthy of the pathos and tenderness of this immortal Sequence. The Requiem of Dvorak in spite of a tendency to monotony, is a work of exceeding beauty, rising often to grandeur, and is notable, apart from its sheer musical qualities, as the most precious gift to Catholic art that has come from the often rebellious land of Bohemia.

It would be profitless to attempt to predict the future of Catholic church music. In the hasty survey which we have made of the Catholic Mass in the past three centuries we have been able to discover no law of development except the almost unanimous agreement of the chief composers to reject law and employ the sacred text of Scripture and liturgy as the bases of works in which not the common consciousness of the Church shall be expressed, but the emotions aroused by the action of sacred ideas upon different temperaments and divergent artistic methods. There is no sign that this principle of individual liberty will be renounced. Nevertheless, the increasing deference that is paid to authority, the growing study of the works and ideals of the past which is so apparent in the culture of the present day, will here and there issue in partial reactions. The mind of the present, having seen the successful working out of certain modern problems and the barrenness of others, is turning eclectic. Nowhere is this more evident than in the field of musical culture, both religious and secular. We see that in many influential circles the question becomes more and more insistent, what is truth and appropriateness?—whereas formerly the demand was for novelty and "effect." Under this better inspiration many beautiful works are produced which are marked by dignity, moderation and an almost austere reserve, drawing a sharp distinction between the proper ecclesiastical tone and that suited to concert and dramatic music, restoring once more the conception of impersonality, expressing in song the conception of the fathers that the Church is a refuge, a retreat from the tempests of the world, a place of penitence and restoration to confidence in the near presence of heaven. There can be no question, it seems to me, that this is the true ideal of Catholic church music. Such Masses as the "Missa Solemnis" of Beethoven, the D minor Mass of Cherubini, the "Messe Solennelle" of Rossini, the "St Cecilia" of Gounod, the Requiems of Berlioz and Verdi, sublime and unspeakably beautiful as they are from the broadly human standpoint, are yet in a certain sense sceptical. They reveal a mood of agitation which is not that intended by the ministrations of the Church in her organized acts of worship. And yet such works will continue to be produced, and the Church will accept them, in grateful recognition of the sincere homage which their creation implies. It is of the nature of the highest artistic genius that it cannot restrain its own fierce impulses out of conformity to a type or external tradition. It will express its own individual emotion or it will become paralyzed and mute. The religious compositions that will humbly yield to a strict liturgical standard in form and expression will be those of writers of the third or fourth grade, just as the church hymns have been, with few exceptions, the production not of the great poets, but of men of lesser artistic endowment, and who were primarily churchmen and only secondarily poets. This will doubtless be the law for all time. The Michael Angelos, the Dantes, the Beethovens will forever break over rules, even though they be the rules of a beloved mother church. Yet the time is past when we may fear any degeneracy like unto that which overtook church music one hundred or more years ago. The principles of such consecrated church musicians as Witt, Perosi, Tinel and the leaders of the St. Cecilia Society and the Schola Cantorum, the influence of the will of the Church implied in all her admonitions on the subject of liturgic song, the growing interest in the study of the masters of the past, and, more than all, the growth of sound views of art as a detail of the higher and popular education, must inevitably promote an increasing conviction among clergy, choir leaders and people of the importance of purity and appropriateness in the music of the Church. The need of reform in many of the Catholic churches of this and other countries is known to every one. Doubtless one cause of the frequent indifference of priests to the condition of choir music in their churches is the knowledge that the chorus and organ are after all but accessories; that the Church possesses in the Gregorian chant a form of song that is the solid, legal, universal and absolutely unchangeable foundation of the musical ceremony, and that any corruption in the gallery music can never by any possibility extend to the heart of the system. The Church is indeed fortunate in the possession of this altar song, the unifying chain which can never be loosened. All the more reason, therefore, why this consciousness of unity should pervade all portions of the ceremony, and the spirit of the liturgic chant should blend even with the large freedom of modern musical forms and methods.

The devotee of Catholic music will be wise if he imitates the prudence of the Church in refraining from dogmatic and intolerant assertion in regard to the style of music proper for worship. All the historic forms employed in the Christian centuries are not equally good, but all have had a reason for existence which is to be found in the inevitable conditions of the periods which produced them. The students and practitioners of church music will be greatly aided in the attainment of true catholicity of judgment by means of the examination of the history of church music through some such method as I have feebly tried to indicate in the series of articles now closed. He will be better able to discover and hold to the good by obeying the apostle's injunction to test all things.

EDWARD DICKINSON.

Oberlin, O.

THOMAS, CARDINAL WOLSEY, ARCHBISHOP OF YORK

THE great statesman of the first part of the reign of Henry VIII., Thomas Wolsey, is one of those characters which have always fascinated historians. But as Fiddes says: "There have been few persons, if any, to whom mankind has been obliged for any considerable benefactions that have met with such ungrateful usage in return for them as Cardinal Wolsey. It may be questioned whether in all the histories that are extant a like instance can be found in any nation of so general a prejudice as that under which his name has suffered."[1] Nor has this prejudice been confined to Protestant writers. Indeed we may say that in their hands the memory of the great churchman has suffered less than in those of Catholics, who, not knowing the real state of affairs, have attributed to him the disaster of the Divorce with its subsequent miseries. But Time brings forth strange revenges. A spirit is now abroad which considers bare Truth a virtue in itself; which does not imagine the cause of Religion can be served by a lie, however pious may be the intention. This spirit of historical enquiry, blessed as it is by Leo XIII., who says the Church has nothing to fear from the Truth, is determined to see things as they were and not as that misnamed word "Edification" would have them. We have suffered too much from this policy, and the inevitable result has come about. Those who initiated and furthered that line of action are being found out and their credit is going; and men, no longer children, are unwilling to be led by such guides. They are resenting attempts at keeping out the Light which is now pouring in from all sides. It is not forgotten, to take no other case, how in England Lingard was made to suffer for his honesty and plain speaking. And he has had fellow martyrs in the same cause.

Since access has been granted to the Public State Papers, both in England and abroad, it has become possible to form a true portrait of such a man as Wolsey. We have enough to tell us what the man was doing and why he did it, and to put together from the scattered remnants of the Past a picture sufficiently intelligible in all its main features. Wolsey was by far the greatest statesman England has ever produced; and it is, perhaps, not going beyond what records reveal if we say he was the master-mind of his age. No one could come up to him. Spain was no match, and France was only too glad to obtain his support. For a time he held the destinies of Europe in his hand. He raised England from a third or fourth rate power to the position of arbiter of Christendom, and had for one of his most glorious titles that of *Cardinalis Pacificus*. Grand in his conceptions and magnificent in his dealings, he was the truest servant king ever had. The devotion of men like Wolsey and More to Henry VIII. is somewhat difficult to understand nowadays. It was something more than personal affection, although in his earlier days Henry had a character which won all hearts. It was the fact that he represented the Power from God. He stood for Peace which had returned at last after the Civil Wars of the Roses. To oppose him was considered not only disobedience to the ordinance of God, but risking an opening of old wounds. Henry was the centre of all English nationalism. "Round him revolved all parties with unhesitating obedience; alike those who wished to see him independent of all spiritual control and his authority enlisted in favor of the Reformation, as those who believed such authority was the strongest barrier against dangerous innovation and the surest safeguard for the Church. So both are concerned to magnify the royal authority as much as possible and oppose it as little as they might, not criticizing narrowly Henry's actions or his wishes, but blindly believing that in serving him they were serving the highest interests of the Faith which they professed."[2] This description of the state of affairs will go far to explain much that is difficult for us to understand in days when the importance and rights of the individual are paramount; and Authority itself is happily exposed to the search-light of that wholesome Public Opinion which asserts that those who claim to rule should themselves be worthy of ruling.

---

[1] "The Life of Cardinal Wolsey," p. 111. (Ed. 1726.)

But it is not our purpose to consider the secular work of the great Cardinal of York. This has been done beyond compare by the late Mr. Brewer in the historical Introductions to the Calendars of State Papers (1509-1530) which he edited for the Master of the Rolls.[3] In summing up the character of Wolsey, he says: "In spite of all . . . the Cardinal still remains and will ever remain as the one prominent figure of this period. The interest concentrated in his life, character and actions is not eclipsed by any of his contemporaries. The violent calumnies resting on his memory have in some degree been already lightened by Justice and clearer views of the events of his times and the character of the chief agents. It needs not apprehend an examination still more rigid and more dispassionate. Not free from faults by any means, especially from the faults and failings the least consistent with his ecclesiastical profession, the Cardinal was perfectly free from those meaner though less obtrusive vices which disfigured the age and the men that followed him—vices to which moralists are tolerant and the world indulgent."[4] It is just this "more rigid and more dispassionate" examination we propose to undertake. One side of the character of the Great Cardinal, perhaps as was natural, Mr. Brewer did not understand. And it is this side, the ecclesiastical, with which we are here concerned. Hitherto Wolsey's name has stood for that of a great statesman. He has a higher claim, we think, to be known as a great churchman. "The faults and failings, the least consistent with his ecclesiastical profession," will be found by the student to be but results of the circumstances of his age, instead of departures from the laws of Christian virtue.

---

[2] Brewer: "The Reign of Henry VIII." Vol. II., p. 456. [3] Since Mr. Brewer's death these Introductions have been published separately in two volumes under the title of "The Reign of Henry VIII." 1509-1530.

As we have given the picture of the political feeling of his age, we must also rapidly sketch the state of the Church, at any rate as far as the Popes were concerned. The English Benedictine historian, Dom Gasquet, has recently treated the subject of the "The Eve of the Reformation" and has given us vivid studies of what the people in England were thinking and doing before the Crisis came. To his scholarly pages we refer the reader; and in them he will find that the state of religion in England, the relations of priests and people, the intellectual and moral tone, were all excellent; and that the rock upon which the English church, driven by the storm of the Divorce, split, was not that of a need of reformation in the religion of the English people themselves. We have to bear in mind that the life of Wolsey was spent under the influences of such Popes as Sixtus IV. (1471-84), Innocent VIII. (1484-92), Alexander VI. (1492-1503), Pius III. (1503), Julius II. (1503-13), Leo X. (1513-21), Hadrian VI. (1522-23) and Clement VII. (1523-34). From this list of unworthy Pontiffs the name of Pius III., who only reigned twenty-six days, may perhaps be excepted, and also that of Hadrian VI., who reigned only twenty months and who showed himself alive to the real nature of the priests of the Church.[5] Thus Wolsey's earliest impressions as an ecclesiastic were received during the unfortunate reign of Alexander VI. He saw by the fate of the heroic Savonarola, the last of the prophets, the answer made by the *Curia* to the cries for Reformation of abuses which, for nearly 200 years, had gone up from a long-suffering and distracted Christendom. It will be well to bear this in mind. Moreover, Wolsey saw the realities of the Church sacrificed to the lust of temporal dominion and Popes neglecting that which is God's for what they could get from Cæsar. Writing in the days of the fulness of his power, Wolsey says: "I do not see how it may stand with God's will that the Head of the Church should involve himself in war by joining with temporal princes. Since these leagues in the Pope's name began God hath sent affliction upon the Church and upon Christendom. Contentions to advance particular families have not furthered the Papal dignity."[6]

---

[4] Brewer: "The Reign of Henry VIII.," Vol. II., pp. 457-8.

[5] Adrian VI. told his nuncio, Chieregati, to declare at the Diet of Nuremburg (1522): "We knew that for a long time there have existed many abominations in this Holy See, abuses of spiritual things, excesses in jurisdiction (*mandatis*); all things in short changed and perverted. What we deplored in Alexander VI. should be pointed out. Nor need we wonder that corruption has descended from the head to the members, from the Supreme Pontiff to the inferior prelates. We have all, prelates and ecclesiastics, turned aside each one to his own way; for none of us have done well—no, not one." Raynaldus: Annal Ecc., ed. 1755, Vol. XXXI., p. 396, note 667.)

In Ipswich, the county town of Suffolk, there lived in the reign of Edward IV. (1441-83) two worthy Christian souls, Robert and Joan Wolsey or, as they spelt it, *Wulcy*.[7] According to tradition, they dwelt "in St. Nicholas' parish and street on the left hand going down at the left corner of a little avenue leading to the churchyard."[8] There seems to be absolutely no foundation for the report that Robert Wolsey was a butcher.[9] All the evidence goes to prove that he was a grazier in well-to-do circumstances. Wool at that time was England's chief export, and Suffolk was one of the centres of the trade. Giustinian, the Venetian Ambassador, in his report of 1519, when speaking of the Cardinal simply refers to him as of "low origin."[10] The family appears, from a petition of the Cardinal's nephew to Henry VIII. in 1515,[11] to have been living at Steinfield, an agricultural village twenty-four miles from Ipswich.

To Robert and Joan Wolsey were born several children, three sons and one daughter. One, born probably in March, 1471, was Thomas, the future Cardinal. The exact date of his birth is uncertain. Richard Fiddes, in his "Life of Cardinal Wolsey," gives the above date and he is corroborated by George Cavendish, sometime gentleman-usher to the Cardinal. Cavendish (a first rate authority for what passed under his eyes and who was his master's confidant in the hour of affliction) says that he was fifty-nine in 1530; and, as we shall see, gives a particular reason for making that assertion. In spite of other evidence which disagrees and places the birth somewhere between 1471 and 1476, we are inclined to hold Cavendish's date as being based on an official statement. The day of his birth is not known, but we offer it as a conjecture that he got his name from St. Thomas Aquinas, whose feast falls on March 7.

The Grammar School at Ipswich was founded at least in 1477, and here we know Thomas began his letters. He seems to have been a child gifted with talents of the highest order and with the power of intense application. Such progress did he make that when only eleven years old he was sent to Oxford. There is no reason for supposing that any one else than his father paid for his university expenses, though Anthony Wood speaks of "other good friends" as helping.

---

[6] Wolsey to Clerk (16 Jan., 1525.) See Brewer: "State Papers of Henry VIII.," Vol. IV., Part 1, No. 1017. (Quoted hereafter as "Brewer."

[7] It is not an uncommon name in early English days and is of Teutonic origin. It is probably the same as Wolseley, the *Wolf-slayer*.

[8] Gough's Camden's "Brit.," Vol. II., 85. (Ed. 1789.)

[9] It is said that Charles V. said of Buckingham's execution (1521) that the best "Buck" in England had been slain by a butcher's dog, Henry being the butcher and Wolsey the servant. This may account for the idle tale concerning Wolsey's parentage.

[10] "Calendar of Venetian State Papers," Vol. II., p. 560.

[11] Brewer, II., N. 1368.

Wolsey entered at St. Mary Magdalen's College,[12] which had been founded by the pious Bishop Waynfleet some forty years before. The present building was begun on May 5, 1473, when Wolsey was but an infant. Once entered, the boy lost no time, and in the words of Cavendish: "He prospered so in learning that as he told me (in) his own person, he was called the Boy-bachelor; for as much as he was made Bachelor of Arts at fifteen years of age, which was a rare thing and seldom seen."[13] This was in 1485, two years after he became master. The old world system of education by the Trivials and quatrivials was then in full force, and Wolsey made a name for himself in the art of Disputation which was necessary for taking a degree. He had then to choose either the course of Law or Divinity to qualify for the doctorate, and it is worth noticing that the one who was destined, as Lord Chancellor, to initiate many a reform in legal procedure did not follow the course of Law, but chose the ecclesiastical subject of Divinity and applied himself so ardently to the study of St. Thomas that he became noted for his knowledge. Even his arch-enemy, Polydore Vergil, is obliged to allow he was *in Divinis litteris non indoctus.* So brilliant a scholar was an honor to his college and he was therefore elected Fellow. These fellowships were preparatory to ordination for which they gave a title. But of the date of his fellowship we are not certain. For the College records are silent about him till the year 1497, when in a *Liber Nominum*, or Dinner-Book, of that date he appears as a Master of Arts and fourteenth on the list of Fellows; and as there are the names of four or five other Fellows after his, it is probable that he had been elected Fellow some two or three years previously. In the *Liber Computi* for 1498 we find his name as holding the position of third Bursar.[14]

In connection with the College of St. Mary Magdalen was a common grammar school founded in 1456, and to this Wolsey was appointed schoolmaster. According to the *Liber Computi*, he held the post for only six months and succeeded one Scarbott. But he also held the position of tutor in his college, and thus got into the larger world for which his abilities so well qualified him. "The Lord Marquis Dorset had three of his sons at school there with him, committing as well unto him their virtuous education as their instruction and learning."[15]

---

[12] From the imperfect state of the Records it is not known whether he was admitted as a chorister, servitor, demy or commoner. [13] "Life of Cardinal Wolsey," (Ed. Singer), pp. 4-5. [14] Bloxam's "Register of St. Mary Magdalen's College," Oxford (1857), p. 25.

Wolsey was already twenty-five when his father died, and at that time he was not yet a priest. A few days before his father died, in the autumn of 1496, he made his will, in which he says: "Item, I will that if Thomas my son be a priest within a year next after my decease, then I will that he sing[16] for me and my friends by the space of a year, and he for to have for his salary 10 marks;[17] and if the said Thomas my son be not a priest, then I will that another honest priest sing for me and my friends the term aforesaid, and he to have the salary of 10 marks." Thomas was appointed one of the executors of the will, under which he received no other legacy than the official one. It would seem from this that Wolsey was not yet in sacred orders. He had reached the canonical age for the priesthood, and in those pre-Tridentine days interstices were not observed. It speaks for his righteousness that the bequest did not make him take any step to secure it. It was "another honest priest" who said the Masses and received the 10 marks; for it was not until the Lenten ordinations of 1498, held in the parish church of St. Peter at Marlborough by Bishop Augustin Church, titular of Lydda and suffragan to John Blyth of Sarum, that Wolsey was ordained priest. In the Register of John Blyth there is entered, on folio 113, the following: *"M. Thomas Wolsey artium magister Norwicen. dioc diaconus socius perpetuus collegii beatae Mariae Mag. Universitatis Oxon. per literas, etc., ad titulum ejusdem collegii, in presbyterum, etc."*[18]

In 1499 Wolsey was elected senior bursar to his college, and under him the tower, so loved by all who know Oxford, was finished.[19] That same year, 1499, at the Christmas vacation which began on *O. Sapientia*[20] (Dec. 17), he received an invitation from the Marquis of Dorset to spend the holidays with his pupils at Bradgate Park, seven miles to the west of Leicester, where in late years that hapless victim of others' ambition, Lady Jane Gray, was born. Cavendish, in his quaint style, thus relates what occurred: "It pleased the said Marquis against a Christmas season to send as well for the schoolmaster as for his children, home to his house, for their recreation in that pleasant and honourable feast. They being then there, my lord, their father, perceived them to be right well employed in learning for their time; which contented him so well that he, having a benefice in his gift, being at that time void, gave the same to the schoolmaster in reward for his diligence, at his departing after Christmas upon his return to the University."[21] The living thus bestowed on Wolsey was the quiet one of Lymington, in the county of Somerset and Diocese of Bath and Wells. The village is situated about one and a half miles east of Ilchester, where Roger Bacon, the famous gray friar, was born.[22] As he had to finish the University year,[23] it was not until October of 1500 that "having the presentation thereof (he) repaired to the Ordinary for his institution and induction; then being fully furnished of all necessary instruments at the Ordinary's hands for his preferments, he made speed without further delay to the said benefice to take thereof possession."[24] He was instituted October 10, 1500.

---

[15] Cavendish, p. 5. [16] i. e., "Missas canere." [17] About £60 of present money. [18] The *English Historical Magazine*, Vol. IX., p. 709. [19] It had been begun in 1492. [20] See "Munimenta Academica," (Roll Series), II, 447.

Hardly had he been inducted and had time to settle down, that is to say in the summer of 1501, than there happened to the new parish priest one of those incidences of which the bare fact is known and the cause is wrapped in obscurity. The fact is related by Cavendish in these words: "One Sir Amyas Pawlet, knight, dwelling in the county thereabouts, took an occasion of displeasure against him, upon what ground I know not, but, sir, by your leave, he was so bold to set the schoolmaster by the feet during his pleasure."[25] In other words, the new parish priest was subjected to the indignity of being set in the public stocks. This is all we really know of the circumstance. After his fall the friends of the New Learning in religion, who were also of the Boleyn interest, spared no means of insulting the great Cardinal's memory. It was said, and the tale seems to read no further back than Sir John Harrington (1561-1612),[26] that Wolsey had been drunk at a village fair. From all we know of the man, his intense application, power of detail and administration, nay, even his desire to stand well with those who could advance him, and his incessant bad health, we are at once led to reject such a tale. At no time, before or after this event, has drunkenness or the slightest approach to such a thing ever been brought against him by contemporary witness. Another tradition of like malice has it he was thus punished for the sin of incontinency. Sir Roger Wilbraham, master of requests to Elizabeth, says so, but this is by no means first hand nor is it an unbiased testimony, for a courtier of Anne Boleyn's daughter is not likely to speak favorably of Wolsey. Moreover, it must be remembered that in the days of his greatness his enemies never dared to bring up the subject of the stocks against him. His subsequent action proves also that in the occurrence there was nothing to his discredit, for when Chancellor of England (1515) he sent for Sir Amyas Paulett, "and after many sharp and heinous words enjoined him to attend upon the Council until he were by them dismissed and not to depart without license upon an urgent pain and forfeiture."[27] Had there been any shameful fault on the part of the parish priest, Wolsey was far too prudent to have stirred up muddy waters and far too just to have punished the knight. Neither would it have been in accordance with the details of the most ordinary common sense had Wolsey been at fault to have kept Sir Amyas in London at large for five or six years and free to spread abroad anything to the discredit of the Chancellor. The only punishment meted out to the knight was the "sharp and heinous words" and an enforced residence in London, where, in 1521, we find him holding the honorable position of Treasurer of the Middle Temple, a post, by-the-bye, he could hardly have held in opposition to the will of the powerful Lord Chancellor. Whatever the cause of the indignity may have been, Sir Amyas seems to have admitted his own fault and to have tried to atone for it in a way soothing to Wolsey's feelings. During his residence in London the knight rebuilt the Gate-house of the Middle Temple and decorated it with Wolsey's arms, badges and cognizances.[28]

---

[21] *Op- cit.*, p. 5.

[22] The church dedicated to St. Mary is of thirteenth century work and has a nave 87 feet by 24. It is stone-vaulted. A perpendicular tower stands at the west end, and on the north side is a chantry (dedicated to St. Leonard) which belongs to the Gurney family. An old oak bench is said to exist with Wolsey's cipher carved thereon.

[23] His term of office as Senior Bursar was from 29th September, 1499, to the same day in 1500.

[24] *Op. cit.*, p. 6.

[25] Ibid, p. 6. Hinton St. George, the seat of Earl Poulett, is to the southwest of Lymington, and Sir Amyas (d. 1537) was the grandfather of the gaoler of Mary, Queen of Scots.

[26] "Brief View of the State of the Church of England" (Ed. 1653), p. 184.

What was really the cause of Wolsey being set in the stocks will probably never be known. We have given the adverse tradition, but it must be remembered there is also another. Thomas Storer (1571-1604), in his metrical "Life and Death of Thomas Wolsey," says that the parish priest was the injured party:

"Wronged by a knight for no desert of mine."

If we may be allowed to add to the conjectures it was very likely the result of a quarrel between the rich man and the vicar, such as are not unknown even in these days. The quarrel increased and at last the knight won a temporary triumph by inflicting insult by force. It was probably for some gross injustice like this that Lord Chancellor Wolsey, who was noted for sternness in dealing with cases of oppression, thought it well in after years to rebuke him with "many sharp and heinous words."

No sooner was he inducted into his living at Lymington than other preferments came upon him. He applied for dispensation to hold certain extra benefices, and this was granted on November 3, 1500. As Wolsey was a noted pluralist, perhaps a word might not be amiss as to this practice. Pluralism or ecclesiastical bigamy has always been against the law, but the great offenders were the Popes of the time, who, to take no other example than England, were accustomed to reward their Italian agents with benefices in this country which they never saw. What is known as the Avignon system of finance became a well developed system of plundering the Church at large for the benefit of the Roman *Curia* in its temporal pretensions. The necessary duties attached to benefices were performed by others who received a small pay, whilst the rest of the income went out of the country. And it sometimes happened that money received in this way from one country was lent by the Pope to help another nation then at war with it.[29] So great had the scandal become that at the Council of Trent a strenuous attempt was made to declare the obligation of residence a divine precept, and to put down so many abuses connected with this traffic. But the first proposition was thwarted by the Italian prelates, who were in the majority and who acted in accordance with the instructions received from the *Curia*. In England long before the time of Wolsey the Civil Power had taken the matter in hand and measures were passed to check the system of Papal provisions. But the nation having vindicated its right, still allowed in practice the Popes to have a free hand in otherwise disposing of moneys left by Englishmen for the benefit of religion in their own country. It is worthy of remark that England always acted towards the Holy See in a most generous and filial manner, and often to her own immediate detriment she allowed the Popes, in temporal matters, to exercise a power which in Spain, in France and Germany was sternly disallowed. If Wolsey fell in with the prevailing practice of pluralities, sanctioned and encouraged as they were by the *Curia*, who profited by the money the dispensations cost, one can say at least that he was no worse than his neighbors. And perhaps we shall find that the moneys accruing to him from pluralities was better spent for the purposes of religion than were the wars of Julius II., which exhausted the Papal treasury.

---

[27] Cavendish, p. 6. [28] The Gate-house was burnt down in 1666.

His patron, the Marquis of Dorset, died September 20, 1501. Wolsey must have been already known favorably[30] to the high dignitaries of the English Church, for, by the end of 1501, we find him one of the Chaplains of Henry Deane, Archbishop of Canterbury and Lord Chancellor of England. But this appointment did not last long. The Archbishop was old. He resigned the Great Seal July 17, 1502, and seven months afterwards died (February 15,

---

[29] Clement VI. lent enormous sums to the French King during the long war. He used to say: "My predecessors did not know how to be Popes." See Pastor's "History of the Popes" (English Ed.), Vol. I., p. 92. [30] He knew at Oxford Thomas More, Erasmus and Grocyn.

1503). Wolsey and another were appointed to carry out the funeral ceremonies of the primate of all England. A short while after Deane's death Wolsey was at Calais with "Sir John Nanphant, a very grave and ancient knight, who had a great room in Calais under King Henry VII. This knight he served and behaved so discreetly and justly that he obtained the special favor of his said master, in so much that for his wit, gravity and just behavior he committed all the charge of his office unto his chaplain, and as I understand the office was the treasurership of Calais, who was in consideration of his great age discharged of his chargable room and returned again into England intending to live more at quiet. And through his instant labor and especial favor, his chaplain was promoted to the king's service and made his chaplain."[31]

It was in 1505 or 1506 that Wolsey first came into direct relations with the court. The ability he had shown at Calais could not fail to impress Sir John Nanphant, whose recommendation told with the king. Truth to tell, Wolsey was a born administrator, and he knew his powers. There was no false humility about the man. He felt he had it in him—if he had the chance—to serve his country; and he was determined to make the best of any opportunity that presented itself for his advancement. "For many times he used to say: If he could get but one foot in the court, he did not doubt but to obtain anything he could wish for."[32] Some folk would call this ambition; others a healthy, plain, commonsense view of his own capabilities.

He became one of the king's chaplains and had to say Mass before his royal master. "And that done he spent not the day forth in idleness, but gave his attendance upon those whom he thought to bear most rule in the Council and to be most in favor of the king, the which at that time were Doctor Fox, Bishop of Winchester, then Secretary and Lord Privy Seal, and also Sir Thomas Lovell, knight, a very sage counsellor and witty, being master of the king's wards and constable of the Tower."[33]

Wolsey knew how to choose his friends and how to keep them. The friendship thus begun at court with Bishop Fox, one of the saintliest prelates of his age, was of a deep and lasting nature; and the admiration of the old man in his retirement for the younger and more able churchman is one of the beautiful side lights of history. His friends saw his power and recommended him to the king as a fitting and trusty messenger for a certain mission then to be sent to the Emperor Maximilian concerning Henry's proposed marriage with Margaret of Spain (1507). How Wolsey went to Flanders, executed the mission and returned before the king even knew that he had started is a story well known. For his services he was made Dean of Lincoln (February 2, 1508), and six days after was presented with one of the most valuable prebends in the same cathedral, which, however, was soon exchanged for a more valuable one. He was installed, by proxy, into the deanery on Lady Day, but not until two years had passed did he personally take possession. Among the preferments which were showered upon the rising man was the Rectory of Redgrave in Suffolk by the Benedictine Abbot of St. Edmunds (1506), the vicarage of Lydd in Kent by the Cistercian Abbot of Tintern (1508), the post of Royal Almoner (November 3, 1508), and a prebend in Hereford Cathedral (July, 1510). His original benefice at Lymington was resigned some time before July 2, 1508.

---

[31] *Op. cit.*, pp. 8-9. [32] "The Reign ot Henry VIII.," I., p. 298. [33] Cavendish, p. 9.

Henry VII. died April 22, 1509, and was immediately succeeded by his second and only surviving son, Henry VIII., then a young man of eighteen years of age and full of promise. Wolsey was, of course, known at court; but it seems that it was one of his old pupils, the young Marquis of Dorset, a favorite of the young king's, who first introduced him to the particular notice of Henry,[34] who day by day came to appreciate his worth more and more. At court, where Wolsey was now firmly established, he displayed "that natural dignity of manner or aspect which no art can imitate and which no rule or practice will ever be able to form."[35] "Fashioned to much honor from his cradle," as Shakespeare says, Wolsey by his handsome face, majestic figure and winning expression of countenance was sure to make his mark. He was graced, too, with "a special gift of natural eloquence, with a filed tongue to express the same, so that he was able to persuade and allure all men to his purpose,"[36] a trait happily hit off in the lines:

"He was a scholar and a ripe and good one;
Exceeding wise, fair spoken and persuading:
Lofty and sour to them that loved him not,
But to those that sought him sweet as summer."[37]

The first preferment he seems to have received directly from his new master was on November 27, 1510, when he was presented to the parish church of Great Torrington in the Diocese of Exeter;[38] the next year saw him Registrar of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, and February 17, 1511, canon and prebendary of St. George's Chapel at Windsor.[39] On January 16, 1512, Cardinal Bainbridge, then in Rome, made him a prebendary in York Cathedral. Nine months after, through the good offices of Bishop Fox and the Earl of Shrewesbury, the deanery of the Collegiate Church of St.

---

[34] Campbell's "Lives of the Lord Chancellor," Vol. I., p. 445. [35] Fiddes, p. 11. [36] Cavendish, pp. 21-22. [37] "Henry VIII.," act iv., s. 2. [38] Brewer, I., n. 1359. [39] Rymer: "Fœdera," XIII., 293.

Stephen's, in Westminster Palace, was Wolsey's; and on February 19, 1513, he became Dean of York and received the rich benefice of the Precentorship of St. Paul's Cathedral. Henry appointed him Bishop of Tournai, but before taking possession of the see the Diocese of Lincoln became vacant early in 1514 by the death of William Smith. The yearly income of the see was worth £896 18s. 1d., which equals in the money of to-day considerably more than £10,000. The bull for Wolsey's appointment to Lincoln was issued by Leo X., and is dated February 6, 1514;[40] and on the following day the Pope wrote to the king (who had asked that the heavy fees demanded by the *Curia* for the expedition of bulls might be in part remitted in this case), and informed His Majesty that he could not comply with the request, as it had been rejected by the College of Cardinals as detrimental to the Holy See.[41] It was on occasion of his appointment to Lincoln that Wolsey first appears to have come into contact with Julius, Cardinal de Medici, afterwards Clement VII., who wrote a special letter to say that he rejoiced to hear of Wolsey's elevation.[42] Wolsey was evidently looked upon as a rising man, who had to be cultivated; for, as one of the Popes is reported to have said: "Truly England is our storehouse of delights, a very inexhaustible well; and where much abounds much can be extorted from many."[43] A letter of Sylvester de Giglis, the English agent in Rome, throws a light upon matters concerning this appointment. Writing on February 11, 1514, to Wolsey, he says: "The consistory would not listen to the application (for the diminution of the *annates*,[44] saying that the church (of Lincoln) was very rich and had always paid the tax. The Pope, whose portion amounted to 1,700 ducats, asserted that he had nothing except *annates* for his support, as he received nothing from . . . as his predecessors did, and is much in debt for his coronation and his intolerable daily expenses. . . . The Pope, however, will forego the *annates* for the deanery of St. Stephen's. The expediting of the bulls amounts to 6,821 ducats 10 cat. The officials are angry with him for having brought it down so low."[45]

Wolsey was consecrated on March 26, 1514, by William Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, and at once gave up most of his other benefices. He was never enthroned in his Cathedral, nor did he personally visit it; for, before the year was out, Cardinal Bainbridge, Archbishop of York, was poisoned and the new Bishop of

---

[40] Rymer, XIII., 390. [41] Brewer, I., n. 4724. [42] Cotton MS., Vitell. B. II., 64. As soon as Julius, who was cousin to Leo X., was made Cardinal he wrote at once to offer his services to the English King. [43] Matthew Paris: "Chronica Majora," (Roll Series), IV., pp. 546-7. [44] The first year's income, which the *Curia* now demanded from every newly appointed bishop and high official. [45] Vitell, B. II., 66. The sum comes to about £17,496 in modern value.

Lincoln by August 5 was Elect of York.[46] Thus in one year three bishoprics fell upon Wolsey.

But already, while Bishop of Lincoln, Wolsey was interested in negotiations Henry had begun at Rome to secure the Cardinal's hat for his Minister; and Polydore Vergil, the sub-collector of the Papal dues in England (May 21, 1514), wrote to tell him that on returning to Rome he had sounded the Cardinal of Bath and asked him to use his influence with the Pope to secure his elevation to the Cardinalate. Leo thought it would be expedient, as Wolsey had great authority with the king, to make him a Cardinal. The matter was so to be arranged that it was to appear that it was the spontaneous proposition of the Pope.[47] From this letter, if Polydore Vergil can be trusted, it would seem that Henry did not know of the proposal which appears to have emanated in the first place from Wolsey himself. But it was not long before Henry himself wrote to Leo (August 12, 1514) requesting that Wolsey should be raised to the dignity of the Cardinalate, and he bore witness that he esteemed Wolsey above all his dearest friends and could do nothing of the least importance without him.[48]

Elect of York, Wolsey had reached the highest position save one in the English Church. York was primate of England, while Canterbury was primate of All England. There had been a long-standing quarrel for precedence between the two metropolitans. But that was an old story in Wolsey's time, and the precedency of Canterbury had been settled. The election of Wolsey to York meant more bulls, and consequently more money to the *Curia*. As Elect of York Wolsey entered into a bond (August 18, 1514) with Anthony de Vivaldis of Genoa, W. Botry, mercer, and Tho. Raymond, grocer of London, whereby they engaged to pay for Wolsey's pallium and the expenses for his promotion in the Court of Rome the sum of £2,000.[49] In due course, after the fees were paid, the Pope issued the bulls (September 15, 1514) and sent the Pall as the sign of archiepiscopal jurisdiction.[50]

But now the matter of the Cardinalate was pressing. Leo wrote to Henry (September 24, 1514) in reply to his request, saying the honor the king desired for Wolsey was surrounded with difficulties. It was much desired, and admitted the wearer at once to the highest rank. He promised, however, to comply with the king's wishes at a suitable time.[51] What some of the difficulties were may be gathered from the diary of de Grassis, Papal Master of Ceremonies, who says: "Men say that an English Cardinal ought not to be created lightly, because the English behave themselves insolently in that dignity, as was shown in the case of Cardinal Bainbridge, just dead. Moreover, as Wolsey is the intimate friend of the king, he will not be content with the Cardinalate alone, but as is the custom for those barbarians, will wish to have the office of Legate over all England. If this is granted, the influence of the Roman *Curia* will be at an end; if it be not granted, the Cardinal will be the Pope's enemy and will favor France."[52]

---

[46] Rymer, XIII., 411. [47] Vitell, B. II., 76. [48] Add. MS., 15,387, f. 25. [49] Brewer, I., n. 5334. [50] Rymer, XIII., 450. [51] Brewer, I., n. 5445.

Already it seems to have been known in Rome that Wolsey, though a "barbarian," was a man who had the strength of his convictions and was able, if need be, to take up a position not agreeable to the worldly traditions which ruled the *Curia*. What was dreaded above all things was a reform of abuses.

Pastor, in his "History of the Popes," does not hesitate to say that it was the Italians, whose incomes in great part depended on abuses, who like a leaden weight impeded every movement in the direction of reform;[53] and he quotes the German Carthusian Jacob von Jüterbogk as saying that "no nation in Christendom offers such opposition to reform as Italy; and this from love of gain and worldly profit and fear of losing its privileges."[54] Wolsey saw this as well. He was already in a high position as Archbishop of York, and he knew quite well that he was hated and feared in the *Curia*. But quietly and firmly he put on the screw in the matter of the Cardinalate. There were interests of religion in England that demanded attention quite as much as the welfare of Italian ecclesiastics. He knew very well the sort of people he had to contend with, and he also knew the only arguments that would have any effect. And these he used to the utmost. If nothing could be done at Rome without bribery, one cannot blame those who made use of these means. The blame lies on those who made it necessary. Leo X., who had a personal hatred against the great Archbishop, tried compromise. How would it be, he suggested, if Wolsey became Cardinal and lived in Rome?[55] This would put a stop at any rate to reformation in England. Then the offer was made that Wolsey should receive a bull of promotion on condition he did not carry the *insignia* publicly.[56] But the shifts would not serve. At last, according to de Giglis (April 25, 1515), Leo asserted that the promotion could not take place for the present without the greatest scandal.[57] Meanwhile political reasons made the Pope change his mind. The French king, Francis, was threatening an invasion of Italy, and the help of Henry was sorely needed. The Pope had been informed (July, 1515) that "the king's grace marveled that he delayed so long the sending of the red hat, seeing how tenderly, instantly and often His Grace had written to His Holiness for the same;" and a message had been sent by Wolsey that "if the king forsake the Pope he will be in greater danger on this day two years than ever was Pope Julius."[58] Francis was already at Milan, so by the beginning of August Wolsey knew that Leo had given way. Early in September Wolsey heard from Rome that "the Pope was so on fire that he will insist on his promotion in spite of all the Cardinals,"[59] whom he summoned from their vacations for a consistory. At last, on September 10, Leo notified Wolsey that the creation had taken place, and in ten days[60] a king's courier arrived in London with the important document. The Cardinal's hat, together with a valuable ring, was sent over in the care of Boniface Collis, "*S. D. N. Scutifer,*" and secretary to de Giglis. With extraordinary pomp and splendor Wolsey received at Westminster Abbey, on November 18, the *insignia* of his new dignity, together with the title of St. Cecilia beyond the Tiber.

---

[52] Quoted in Creighton's "Wolsey," pp. 39-40. [53] Vol. II., p. 48. [54] Ibid. [55] "Pace to Wolsey." Ellis' Original Letters, II., 1, 178. [56] P. R. O. [57] Cotton MS. Vitell, B. II., 138.

So far had Wolsey succeeded. He had been set in a position which gave him honorary precedence over the See of Canterbury; but in order to carry out what he seems already to have planned, a far greater position and powers more ample were needed. His master mind had seen the disease, and he also saw that the remedy must be applied by one man. He alone was the one man in England capable by genius, power and energy of carrying out the work. No sooner did he know that the Pope had consented to make him Cardinal than he applied at once to be made Legate of the Holy See; or, if Leo made difficulties in giving Papal powers, his agent was to press at least for faculties for making a visitation over monasteries even the exempt.[61] Were he created legate he would have supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the land and would supersede in authority every other ordinary, including even Canterbury, the Primate of All England. It was no mere vulgar love of power which animated the Cardinal. He had set a work before him, and to do this he had to be unrestricted except by his conscience. He valued ecclesiastical dignities as so many means for advancing the end he had in view. They were to him occasions of more work and more responsibilities. How highly he esteemed the dignity of a Cardinalate is shown by his reply to the Venetian Ambassador (January 2, 1516), when he said: "We would prefer not being honored with the dignity rather than do what is unworthy of it."[62]

Meanwhile Leo's dislike of Wolsey increased. In the Spanish State papers of the period we have reports of the Imperial Ambassador at Rome, in which we catch glimpses of the political shifts to which Leo was reduced. Writing June 13, 1520, Juan Mainel says: "The statesmen in Rome are persuaded that the Cardinal will do what is most lucrative for himself; and the Pope *(said)* to him (the Ambassador) that the Cardinal, who is the governor of the King of England, is a very strange person and makes the king go hither and thither just as he likes."[63] This is so absurdly in opposition to all the facts, as they are now disclosed to us, that one sees what Cardinal Manning said was true three hundred years ago, viz.: "I hardly know in Rome a man high or low who understands the position of the Church in England."[64] Writing again on the 5th of July, 1520, he refers to the Pope's dislike of the Cardinal: "Although there is no man on the face of the earth whom His Holiness detests so heartily as the Cardinal, he will be constituted Legate if the Pope is given to understand that in no other way can he get out of the difficulties in which he is placed."[65] And on the same day he writes again: "The Cardinal of England is much disliked at Rome."[66] And the endeavors of Wolsey to persuade the Pope to send him a commission empowering him to reconcile the Holy Father with all the Christian princes instead of pleasing the Vicar of the Prince of Peace did not even get a civil answer.[67]

---

[58] "Wolsey to de Giglis," ibid, No. 132. [59] No. 160. [60] "Dispatches of Sebastian Giustinian," p. 128. [61] Cotton MS. Vitell, B. II., 153. [62] Calendar of Venetian State Papers, II., n. 671.

Leo, who was driven almost mad with fear, was "reputed to be very feeble in ecclesiastical matters but very constant in political affairs,"[68] now gave himself over to be ruled in all matters ecclesiastical and political by the Emperor on condition that his enemies, the French, were attacked.[69] He had no desire for peace, for he knew that if the negotiations then proceeding at Calais came to anything neither the Church,[70] nor his person, nor the family of the Medici would be safe from the attacks of France. He was determined, he said, to spend as much as he had, and even more, to prevent the Emperor from being so grossly imposed upon and abused in his dignity by the Cardinal of England;[71] and in his fear tried to kill the cat by proposing that some one should show Henry what sort of person Wolsey was.[72]

With these feelings against Wolsey, it is no wonder that Leo for a long time demurred granting the Legateship. The one thing which did not seem to enter at all into his calculation was whether the Legateship would be to the advantage of the Church. He only thought of playing off the Emperor against his enemies, the French; and the Legateship was made simply a matter of political advantage. While he was thus hesitating Wolsey increased his power by receiving, on Christmas Eve, 1515, at the king's express command, the great Seal of England as Lord Chancellor in succession to Warham, who, of his own accord, resigned the charge. It has been the fashion to insinuate a rivalry between these two illustrious men. We have not been able to find any real grounds for such a supposition; on the contrary, Warham, an old man, and wearied out with secular employment, was only too glad to retire to a learned and scholarly retreat. From the documents that remain we can see the excellent and more than friendly terms upon which they stood one towards the other. The new position Wolsey had, and was to have, in law made him supreme; and no doubt, in asserting it, as he was obliged to do, official difficulties arose which their mutual friendship soon settled. But naturally there were officious friends of Warham's, or rather enemies of Wolsey's, who did their best to set one Archbishop against the other. But without success. Each was too magnanimous to bear jealousy, and if, at times, the older prelate doubted or hesitated about accepting the more energetic doings of the younger man, this was only in the nature of things.

---

[63] Bergoroth's Spanish State Papers, Vol. II., No. 281. [64] Purcell: "Life of Cardinal Manning," Vol. II., p. 741. [65] Bergeroth, II., n. 283. [66] Ibid, n. 284. [67] Ibid, 285. [68] Ibid, n. 312; 288. [69] Ibid, 286. [70] That is of course the local Church of Rome. [71] Ibid, 2358. [72] Ibid, 359.

Leo still held back about the Legateship. In November, 1517, a bull was issued to Wolsey relating to the building of St. Peter's and the appointment of a banker for the money received by the preaching of indulgences. Warham and the Bishop of St. David's were appointed Papal commissioners for this purpose.[73] Henry had something to say to this business. He would not allow the Indulgence to be published in England unless he received a commission on the same. In this he was only following the practice of other countries. Negotiations were entered into with the Pope on the matter; and while Leo was willing to allow the king one-fourth of the proceeds, Wolsey stood out for one-third, and successfully. Whether this Indulgence, which was the cause of Luther's protest, would have been entirely devoted to the building of St. Peter's, seems somewhat uncertain. Leo was in pecuniary difficulties. Five days after the issue of the bull to Wolsey the Pope wrote (November 6, 1517) to Warham that he had called Henry's attention on various occasions to the expenses of the Papal See and the debts incurred by his frequent wars. Therefore he hopes that the English clergy will comply with the request shortly to be laid before them for a subsidy to the Holy See.[74] The Pope then announced his intention of sending a Legate to England on the ostensible business of raising funds for an expedition against the Turks and for establishing a five years' truce between Christian princes. This was Wolsey's opportunity. According to English law no Legate could come into the country without the king's consent and express knowledge of the limits of the legation. Henry refused to allow the Legate to enter unless Wolsey was joined with him in the Legateship and, indeed, made first Legate. After much haggling this was agreed to, and on May 17, 1518, Leo X. wrote to Wolsey to announce that Cardinal Campeggio was coming as Legate and that Wolsey was associated with him.[75] Three days after Wolsey's faithful agent, de Giglis, notified that his master was appointed Senior Legate. Campeggio, who had been detained at Calais by Wolsey's orders until the Pope had become amenable to circumstances, arrived in England on July 23, 1518; and Wolsey entered upon his Legateship. In the following month he received from Rome a bull for the visitation of monasteries. We now see the great aim Wolsey had in view when demanding the Legateship; and we can also gather the cause for alarm that existed in the *Curia.*

---

[73] Brewer, II., Part 2, No. 3768.

[74] Ibid, No. 3776.

The Cardinal had gathered up power into his own hands in order to bring about a general reformation of ecclesiastical affairs in the country. He was fully alive to the necessity of the day. The Renaissance had brought in a new spirit. He had seen its effects in Italy, where the supineness of churchmen had allowed it to drift into a semi-paganism. The Church, to do its work, had to rise to a consciousness of the times. The torrent of New Life then rolling through men's intellects was too mighty a force to be dammed. But a wary and skilful hand might turn it to the good of religion instead of allowing it to sap the foundations of Faith and morality. In order to do so, it was necessary to raise the priesthood up to the level of the needs of the time and to renew the spirit of their holy calling. Such and no less was the Cardinal's grand object and one which he planned and worked for, and in great measure, effected in spite of the obstacles met with from quarters which should have rather helped on such noble attempts. To do such work properly required time and a slow process. It was largely an educational measure, both for old and young, and such is not the work of a day nor of a year. The first obstacle Wolsey had was the knowledge that at any moment his power might be snapped by the withdrawal of his legatine faculties. We find him, therefore (March 25, 1519), writing to his agent in Rome, asking that, when Campeggio leaves, he may retain the Legateship with increased faculties, not for extorting money, but for effecting reforms among the clergy.[76] But Leo was in no humor to do this. He would not be disturbed with such business during holiday time, and put off the matter of the reforming of the clergy on the plea that it would supersede the authority of the Bishops. Moreover, he said, Rome (and this was the real point) had not received an equivalent for doing such an extraordinary thing. The Pope was sore that he had not yet received the oft-promised subsidy.[77] At last, however, Leo was forced into granting the extension of the legatine authority for three years. In writing to thank him, the king says (January 20, 1520) that he was sorry it was not for an indefinite period as it would have enabled the Cardinal to prosecute with greater vigor the reformation of the clergy.[78] The Legateship was continued to Wolsey for varying periods by both Leo X. and Hadrian VI., and was subsequently confirmed for life by Clement VII.

---

[75] Rymer, XIII., 606.

[76] Martene: "Mon. Ampl., II. 1285.

It is in the role of an Ecclesiastical Reformer that Wolsey owes his right to the title of a Great Churchman, and this aspect of his character has been strangely neglected by historians or only attended to in the most casual way. What Wolsey planned and what he executed would have certainly, as far as one can judge, saved England from the defection in Faith had not that fatal Divorce, with all its side issues, intervened. Mr. Dixon, in his "History of the Church of England," remarks: "A clerical Reformation, a reformation without meddling with the Catholic faith, had been attempted already by the best sort of the clergy throughout Europe. Three great Councils had been held to bring it about within the last hundred years, and to each of these Councils England had sent representatives. The defeat of this attempted reformation by Councils, which was effected by the intrigues of Rome and above all by the skill of the last of the great Popes, Martin V., is the most mournful event of modern history. It caused despair; it gave weight to the clamors that no reformation was to be expected from the Church herself; and thus it opened the way for the invasion of the temporal power and for the doctrinal revolution which presently overswept Europe."[79] How Wolsey's proposal of effecting a reformation of discipline was regarded by such prelates as Fox, of Winchester, can be gathered from the following beautiful letter[80] in reply to an official notice of a legatine measure:

"Great was the contentment and joy, most reverend father, which I received from your recent letter, which told me that your Grace is set upon reforming the whole body of the clergy, and that you had notified and fixed a day on which the work shall be begun and proceeded with. This day I have truly no less longed for than did Simeon in the Gospel desire to see the Messias waited for by all men. And on reading this letter of your Grace's, I persuade myself and have in a manner a clear setting forth of a more entire and whole Reformation of the Ecclesiastical hierarchy of the English

---

[77] Cotton MS., "Vitell," B. IV.. 3. [78] Martene: "Mon Ampli," III., 1304. [79] *Op. cit.*, I., pp. 23-24. [80] The original is in Latin.

people than I could expect or even hope to see brought about or even so much as attempted in this age. As in duty bound, I indeed did strive to carry out that same design within the limits of my own small jurisdiction which your Grace will soon bring about in the two provinces of this kingdom. For the space of three years this great affair was the object of my studies, labors, watchings and travail, till I discerned, what I have not before thought of, that all things pertaining to the primitive integrity of the clergy, and especially to the monastic state, were perverted either by dispensations or corruptions, or else became obsolete and depraved by the iniquity of the times and being antiquated. As this, in a declining life, increased my will and desire, so it took from me all hopes of ever seeing a renewal even in my own diocese. But I do now gather from your Grace's most welcome letter an assured hope and full expectation of seeing a reformation both entire and public. For I am fully persuaded by many instances that whatsoever your Grace at any time may design or undertake, as it will be wisely concerted, so with prudence and resolution you will accomplish it without difficulty or delay. For so surprising is your skill of things both Divine and human, so extraordinary is your favor and authority with our Sovereign Lord the King and His Holiness the Pope, an advantage your Grace has in such a manner improved, that you have gained the highest renown in the whole world; and certainly an account of your most illustrious Legateship—by your sole conduct you have composed the differences and settled peace among Christian princes, and now you have determined to employ it in reforming and settling the ecclesiastical state and discipline. By this you will deserve solid and undying honor from God and from all posterity, and will be distinguished by a name so far beyond that of any other who in memory of man hath been sent here as Legate from the Pope, as Peace is more to be desired than War and the Clergy ought to be more holy and reverend than the Layfolk.

"For if, while the names of several other Legates are forgotten, these two whose decrees were only drawn up and left imperfect by their early return to Rome, are still justly celebrated and esteemed by all men, what Time or Envy will be able to erase or dim the lustre and fame of your Grace's name, when you shall restore to dignity and integrity the whole clergy and religious of England, and enact laws for their preservation and lasting establishment?—laws which you shall cause to be confirmed and recommended by being carefully and conscientiously observed.

"I doubt not but that your Grace will with less difficulty and greater success carry out this business, since our most Christian king, by whose exhortations, encouragement and advice (as I think) you have undertaken this task, will even lend his authority and aid to your godly desires; and the prelates, especially the Bishops, will heartily concur by their best endeavors; and as I judge by myself and so far as my own mind suggests, this Reformation of the clergy and of religious persons will so abate the calumnies of the laity, so advance the honor of the clergy and so reconcile our Sovereign Lord the King and nobility to them and be so much more acceptable to God than all the sacrifices we can offer, that I intend to devote to its furtherance the short course of my life I have now to run, as I shall more openly declare to your face on the day fixed by your letters, if it be granted to me to see it, living and well. Meanwhile, whilst I live I shall daily and constantly in my Mass pray our good God to keep your Grace and to further all your projects both happily and prosperously."[81]

This letter of the aged Bishop shows the high hopes that Wolsey's Legateship inspired in those who had the true interests of the Church at heart. "In their eyes it appeared to be a supreme effort to carry the clerical reformation. The extraordinary power of a Legate exercised by an Englishman and always limited by the supreme power of the Crown, was not repulsive to the nation."[82]

From Wolsey much was expected, and as far as we can gather from what he did, his scheme of Reformation seems to have been laid on the following lines. He proposed: (1) To hold a general visitation of the monasteries and of the whole clerical body by an authority which could not be resisted. The purpose of this visitation was to restore sound discipline and morals and to enforce the due performance of the duties of each state. (2) To provide the means for higher education for the clergy, both in the colleges and universities. (3) To found new bishoprics in the larger towns. (4) To guard the nation against the poisoning New Learning in religion by strengthening their faith and by the solid work of education.

This was the great work he tried to do in England and which he aspired to do for the world at large by means of the Papacy. If in that evil hour of the Church's need the cool, far-seeing Wolsey had sat in St. Peter's chair and ruthlessly set his knife to cut away abuses, might not the religious history of Europe have been a brighter page instead of a harrowing and disheartening remembrance?

We must now proceed to investigate Wolsey's work of Reformation, and for convenience sake we will follow the above plan.

---

[81] Fiddes: "Collections," p. 85.

[82] Dixon, *Op. cit.*, I., p. 28.

I.—THE VISITATION OF RELIGIOUS AND OF THE CLERGY.

To touch the clergy and religious and to speak of Reform in connection with these bodies is always an invidious task; for Protestantism has had such an effect that the word Reformation at once connotes immorality; whereas such a conclusion is unwarranted by any impartial view of the whole case. Clergy and religious may stand in need of a reformation, and yet have nothing, or but little, against them on the score of morals. It may also very easily happen that highly organized bodies, jealous of privileges granted in the course of centuries, are content, perhaps too content, to enjoy these privileges to the letter and to allow the spirit to take care of itself. All such bodies are in danger of an excess of conservatism; and the closer the bond which binds the members to each other the more do they suffer from the abuse of the *ésprit de corps*. To bring them up to the needs of the present requires a strong hand and a firm one; and he who sets his hand to the work is sure to be unpopular with those whose repose he has troubled. That such should be the case both with clergy and religious is no wonder. If the clerical state, *in se*, is of Divine institution, the same cannot be said of the religious state; and of neither can it be predicated as regards their artificial methods of organization. They therefore come under the universal law of Decay, and hence the necessity, from time to time, of Reformation.

Our first attention must be directed to the religious bodies. We find two great divisions. The first was the English Benedictines, who by a thousand years had become native to the soil, and as a body managed their own affairs. They had outside England no superior, save the Pope, the Abbot of Abbots. This is the normal Benedictine constitution; and any attempts at interfering with it have always been made at the cost of efficiency. Then there was the large body of friars of various colors—black, gray, white and parti-colored, with Cistercians, Carthusians, Cluniacs, Gilbertines and the Black and White Canons, *i. e.*, the Augustinians and Premonstratensians. There were also many other smaller bodies. All these were, as a rule, of thirteenth century introduction and more or less under the jurisdiction of foreign superiors.

Wolsey seems to have had a great belief in the old English order of St. Benedict. And besides being Abbot (1521) *in commendam* (the only known example of this practice in England) of the first monastery, that of St. Albans, he held letters of fraternity in others. The great proof of the reality of his interest was that the Benedictines trusted him and in many cases put into his hands their most cherished and sacred right, the election of Abbots. As Legate he had the rights of visitation over these houses; and he secured also the right of visitation over the few (six at most) which beyond St. Benedict's idea were removed from episcopal jurisdiction.

According to Polydore Vergil,[83] in 1518, that is as soon as he became Legate, he summoned the various religious orders before him and after expressing his good will to them, spoke very plainly of their defects and of the desire he had of seeing them live according to their rules, attending more to education in letters and good deeds. He announced his intention of taking the matter himself in hand, lest their orders should become extinct. In accordance with this warning he seems to have made a surprise visit to the royal monastery of Westminster in that very same year, where, according to the same author (who is, however, never to be trusted either when he praises or dispraises the Cardinal), the monks were treated with considerable rigor. Truth to say, the Westminster monks, perhaps on account of the court, were not a favorable specimen of Benedictine energy. They had been removed, too, from the healthy supervision of their Bishop, and no doubt they needed a stirring up. But we need not take too literally Polydore Vergil's words:

"De statu monachorum severe cognoscit, intemperanterque omnia agit, miscet, turbat, ut terreat cæteros, ut imperium ostendat, ut se terribiliorem præbeat."

On January 20, 1524, Richard Beere, Abbot of Gloucester, died; and, by act of the prior and community, the election of his successor was put into Wolsey's hands. The delegates of the Abbey met in Wolsey's private chapel at York Place[84] on March 3 of the same year, and there met the Cardinal on this business. After mature deliberations and consultations with learned and prudent men, as he said, he elected Brother Richard Whiting, of that same monastery, to be the Abbot thereof. He was a man, said Wolsey, who was provident and discreet, commendable in life, morals and knowledge, circumspect in spiritual and temporal matters, with the knowledge and power of safeguarding the interests of the Abbey.[85] How well the Cardinal judged history tells. When the evil days fell upon Glaston, no fault could be found with the monks of Whiting's house. "They were kept so straight," and the Abbot laid down his life in defense of the rights of his Church and is one of the Blessed Martyrs of the order.

We find other Benedictine houses, such as Gloucester, Peterborough, Aldeney, besides Cistercian and other houses, putting the elections into his hands. And how in the case of the Abbess of Wilton[86] he went directly against the king's desire and the Boleyn influence, and appointed one who would rule discreetly and strictly, is a story that can be seen in the State papers of the period. He also knew how prejudicial to the discipline and welfare of a house old and feeble superiors were. There are many instances of his urging such to resign. Not that his efforts always were successful at once. Richard, Abbot of Hyde (New Minster), was an example. He had been Abbot thirty-eight years when he received a letter from the Cardinal in which, after being complimented upon ordering his house discreetly, he was told that now from old age and imbecility he was unable to attend to it and was therefore urged to resign. While thanking the Cardinal for his commendations, the Abbot assures him that he is not so aged or impotent of body or wit but that he is able to exercise his office to the pleasure of God, increase of good religion and wealth of his house. He has no intention of resigning, and trusts that Wolsey will rather conserve and aid him than "experiment any sharper means" to remove him. He seems to have kept to his office till his death. The Abbot of Peterborough was another case. The Bishop of Lincoln reports (June 14, 1527) to Wolsey that the Abbot will not resign, but says he will keep his office, as he is as able as ever for it, and that he will ride to London town to Wolsey to prove it. Whether he died or was deposed is not clear. The next Abbot was appointed in 1528 by Wolsey, to whom the election was committed by the monks.

---

[83] Cf. Polyd. Verg. "Aug. Hist.," (ed. 1555), p. 657. [84] Now known as Whitehall. [85] Hearne: "Adam de Domerham," Vol. I., pp. 97-103. [86] The nuns at Wilton were obstreperous.

In 1524 Wolsey summoned all the black monks of St. Benedict to a chapter. Former Legates, such as Otho (1236-7), had done so. They did not realize the English Benedictine spirit, and had forgotten the discretion which characterizes the rule and which leaves so much to the decision of the local superiors. These Italian Legates tried to force a discipline, easy enough in Italy, upon a more northern nation. This was especially in the matter of perpetual abstinence from flesh meat. The result was always the same. Benedictines bow to authority; they tried over and over again to undertake the perpetual abstinence and failed, and dispensations had to be obtained from Rome.[87] Wolsey seems to have read the decrees

---

Thomas Bennet, Wolsey's commissary, writes to his master (18th July, 1528) that he has used every effort to bring the nuns over to Wolsey's wishes, but finds them so untoward that three or four of the "captains" had to be put into ward. Only the new abbess-elect and her sisters were compliant. On the same day the abbess writes to the Cardinal that since his coming home she had followed the advice of Bennet and urged her nuns to be more "reclused within the monastery against which they showed many considerations. She hopes in time to order herself according to his pleasure, and to rule her sisters according to their religion, without any such resort as has of late been accustomed." (Brewer, IV., n. 4528-4529). The new abbess-elect, Isabel Jordane, had been prioress and had been reported to Wolsey as being "ancient, wise, and discrete." The question of reform was evidently mainly that of a due observance of the law of enclosure, which results from the Benedictine law of obedience. [87] On the whole question of eating meat the reader can be referred to the author's "English Black Monks of St. Benedict," Vol. I., p. 16, where it is found that in the days of St. Dunstan the eating of flesh meat was allowed.

of these other Legates and determined to enforce them. He drew up certain constitutions and laid them before the assembled chapter. We can only judge what he proposed by the reply the chapter made to him. After thanking him for his book of statutes and saying that many of his regulations ought to be received by all good monks, they point out that others were too austere for the times, and that as the number of monks and monasteries in England was too great to allow of them being enforced without exciting murmurs, the fathers of the chapter begged the Cardinal so to modify the reformation of their order as not to drive the weak into flight, apostasy or rebellion, nor to keep away those who wished to enter the order. They fear that if the Reformation be conducted with too much austerity there will not be sufficient monks left to inhabit the monasteries.[88] From this interesting document we can gather that the Benedictine chapter was quite willing to be brought up to the level of the needs of the day, if they were not already in that position. This has always been their characteristic. But they had had plenty of experience in the past of the ill effects of a tinkering legislation by those who did not in the least understand their spirit. As far as we know, Wolsey had the wisdom to see this and did not reform them away. But the good effect of his interest in the order is to be seen when the Dissolution came and the black monks stood out conspicuously among the religious men as having their houses thoroughly in order.

In the year 1519 he began the work of reforming the Black Canons of St. Augustine. There were several bodies of Black Canons, and these Wolsey formed into a congregation modeled after the fashion of the English Benedictine Congregation, which, in its turn, is the only one which has followed the Church's legislation as laid down in 1215 at the Fourth Lateran Council.

Indeed, Wolsey seems to have taken bodily the greater part of his Augustinian Reform from the famous *Bulla Benedictina* of Benedict XII. (1334). He added, however, certain regulations of his own, and one on the regulation of divine service is worth quoting. After saying that the Office was to be said neither too quickly nor too slowly, and that each one was to be present at the services, especially at matins and the principal Mass, the Cardinal enacts: "And with all ecclesiastics, and especially religious, that method of singing is divinely approved which is not intended to gratify the ears of those present by the levity of its rhythm nor to court the approval of worldlings by the multiplicity of its notes. But that which in plain song raises the minds of the singers and the hearts of the hearers to heavenly things." Therefore plain song is to be used, and the use of the *Cantus fractus vel divisus,* called "prick-song," is forbidden except at Our Lady's Mass and such like non-conventual offices at which lay singers are allowed in most religious houses. On Sundays and feast days the canons, if they can do it themselves, may use some simple melodies at Mass and Vespers, provided that all the words be sung and the music express the sense. There were also wise rules, besides those of discipline, which secured the intellectual life of the body and brought them into touch with the national universities.[89]

---

[88] Brewer, Vol. IV., n. 953.

These constitutions were to last till 1521, when the General Chapter of the body would consider and ratify them.

Wolsey, as it was clearly impossible for him to visit in person all the religious houses, delegated his power to various Bishops. For instance, when he was in France, on his way after the famous meeting known as the Field of the Cloth of Gold, he wrote to the Bishop of Salisbury (October 20, 1521) empowering him as his deputy to visit the nunneries of his diocese and proceed against such as were guilty of "misgoverance and slanderous living," and to remove the nuns into other places of the same order as he best and most conveniently can.[90] Many of the smaller houses, especially of women, had become disorganized through want of members; and discipline had necessarily fallen where there were only three or four to keep up an observance which required at least twelve. One of these convents, Bromehall Priory, in which there were only two or three nuns, was dissolved December 5, 1521.

At the beginning of January, 1524, Clement VII., then newly elected, confirmed Wolsey's Legateship and granted it him for life with all faculties, "which was never heard of before."[91] Wolsey when thanking the Pope (February 24, 1524) says it was "an immense addition to his obligations to Clement, and that he will devote every effort to fulfilling the Pope's commands and omit no opportunity of forwarding his interests with the king." The Cardinal promises solemnly that he will execute his office with "as great care for the honor of the Holy See as for his own safety."[92]

Wolsey then turned his attention to the other class of religious, that is to the friars. The Dominicans or Black Friars took the proposed visitation sensibly. Wolsey's agent, Clerk, writes from Rome (July 28, 1525) that they are content to submit their suits to the Pope and sue to Wolsey. The general of that order, a very wise, learned and virtuous man, was about to communicate with Wolsey on the matter, and Clerk advises the Cardinal to "deal somewhat better with them as they take their way."[93] The White Friars or Carmelites also submitted. But the Gray Friars, or Franciscans, were not so minded. Even before Wolsey, in accordance with his faculties, announced his intention of holding a visitation of the Gray Friars there seems to have been a great outcry. The Pope himself was in fear. He remembered the rebellion of the Friars Minor against John XXII., and that their dispute went from theology to secular politics. He wrote (July 7, 1524) to Wolsey that the Order of Friars Minor Observants seems to suspect that he was about to visit and reform them. While Clement is sure that Wolsey will act with wisdom, he begs him not to attempt anything on account of the magnitude of the order and the estimation in which it is held throughout the world; for though good may be done in England, it would occasion disturbances elsewhere. The Pope reminds him that the friars could not have obtained their present position without God's blessing and their own good works, and he is to remember that in these troublesome times their good will and the opinion of others about them can do a great deal. They might indeed bear Wolsey's visitation quietly, but they would fear that the same thing would be attempted elsewhere, which they could not stand, as they have rules and superiors of their own. He therefore asks Wolsey to think of the good of Christendom rather than that of England and to make use of gentleness and tact rather than severity in admonishing them.[94] The real motive of this letter will be seen a little later on.

---

[89] Wilkin's "Concilia," IV., pp. 683-88 [90] Fiddes, p. 224. [91] Clerk to Wolsey, 9th January, 1524. Cotton MS., "Vitell," B. VI., 17. [92] Add. MS., 15, 387 f. 101.

The Cardinal Protector of the order also writes the same day to beg Wolsey to give up the visitation on the ground that while they have no personal feeling against him they are afraid of creating a precedent.[95] What Clement did not put in his letter he, however, did not hesitate to say to Wolsey's agent, Clerk, and bade him write to Wolsey (August 31, 1524) and tell him "for God's sake to use mercy with those friars, saying that they be as desperate beasts, past shame that can loose nothing by clamor."[96]

Wolsey, however, was not the man to be frightened away from what he considered the good of religion. He promised the Pope that he would use his legatine authority with such moderation that no complaint should arise.[97] But still the friars troubled, and advantage was taken by their General Chapter held in July, 1525, at Rome to urge the Pope to exempt them altogether from Wolsey's control. Again, by Clement's order, Clerk writes to his master in the Pope's name "to deal moderately with them, for they are clamorous, importunate, bold and passed shame because they have nothing to lose, have great assistance here in court and credit everywhere among the lay folk." Clerk told the Pope that "no lucre, nor glory, nor envy" would move Wolsey to do anything against them, for they were poor, evil and few and of little estimation compared to other religious in England. Clement said he knew this right well and had put the matter off until the General came to Rome. Clerk hereupon said that it concerned Wolsey's honor that the Pope should not too easily credit their vain and untrue complaints. The Pope, of course, had to listen to both sides; but he promised that all he should do would perhaps be to write some *breve* to Wolsey to exhort him to be kind to the friars, but that there should be nothing derogatory to the Legate, whose honor he would rather increase than decrease.[98] The friars so far gained the day as to secure a two years' restraint upon Wolsey's power, but their triumph was of short duration: within a few weeks it was withdrawn. A matter which has never yet received attention seems to be one connected with this visitation of the Friars Minor. Their General was the famous Quigñones, afterwards Cardinal. He was also Charles V.'s agent in the matter of the Divorce.

---

[93] Cotton MS., "Vitell," B. VII., 178.

[94] Brewer, IV., part 1, n. 477.

[95] Cotton MS., "Vitell," B. VI., 96.

[96] Ibid, n. 180.

[97] Theiner, p. 544.

As Wolsey stood or fell with the success or failure of Henry's case and as the Franciscans were strenuous opponents of the Divorce, one is tempted, knowing how many things influence the mind of man and how rare simple intentions are, to ask whether the attitude the Friars Minor adopted may not have had something in it of a personal revenge on the great Cardinal who brought them under the power of his visitation. We shall better be able to judge this when we know exactly what was the Cardinal's attitude in the matter of the Divorce.

As regards Wolsey's project of reforming the clergy, we have already seen the way in which such prelates as Fox regarded it, and it is not saying more than the facts of case warrant when Mr. Blunt, in his "Reformation of the Church of England," says: "It may reasonably be thought that if the Reformation had been fully developed under Wolsey's continued guidance many of the miserable divisions which ensued would have been avoided by his astute statesmanship and the barbarities of each side checked by his humane policy."[99]

The provincial constitutions he issued for the Province of York in 1518 (1515?), while showing that he did not neglect his own diocese or province, are models for ecclesiastical government. Wisely he mainly contents himself with reinforcing the salutary enactments of his predecessors and draws them up into one body of constitutions. The greatest care is taken that the people are properly instructed in the essentials of their religion, and it is worthy of remark that the course of instruction laid down is supremely solid and to the purpose. Four times in the year every priest with cure of souls had to explain to the people "in the vulgar tongue, and without any subtility or fantastic turning about of words," the fourteen articles of faith,[100] the ten commandments of the Law, the two Evangelical precepts of charity, the seven works of mercy, the seven capital sins, the seven opposing virtues and the seven sacraments of Grace. Residence was enforced on all clerics with loss of income unless they had Papal dispensation or were absent with the Bishop's leave for purposes of study, or otherwise engaged in his service. Special arrangements were made for securing the sanctity of the houses of God which are to be kept as places for prayer and for humbly asking forgiveness of sins. As regards the private lives of the clergy, the Cardinal renews the enactments of Archbishop Greenfield prohibiting them from attending unlawful spectacles, especially from duels, tournaments and other sport in which blood might be shed; and as the life of priests should be distinguished from that of lay folk so ought they to be in dress and deportment. On the question of morality, excommunication and the power of the secular arm are threatened. The whole document is published in Wilkins' "Concilia," and is worthy of study.[101]

---

[98] Cotton MS., "Vitell," B. VII., 178.

[99] Vol. I., p. 43.

This Provincial Constitution will show upon what lines Wolsey desired to proceed as Legate of the whole of England. No sooner did he receive this office than he set about preparing for the general reform. His measures had stirred up the Archbishop of Canterbury to summon his suffragans to Lambeth to keep a general council for "the reformation of enormities." Warham seems to have based his action on some advice of the king's. As the right of holding councils now appertained to the Legate, whose jurisdiction in England was universal, it was necessary formally and at once to vindicate his position. Wolsey, therefore, wrote a dignified remonstrance to Warham saying that he was assured the king will not have him (the Cardinal) so little esteemed as Legate that "you should enterprise the said reformation to the express derogation of the said dignity of the See Apostolic and otherwise than the law will suffer you without mine advice, consent and knowledge, nor ye had no such commandment of His Grace, but expressly to the contrary; and that will appear where His Grace and Highness willed you to repair to me at Greenwich sitting in administration of divines in the quire." He therefore summoned the Archbishop to explain his disobedience to the king's commands, and courteously

---

Seven as regards the Blessed Trinity and seven as regards the Sacred Humanity. [101] See Vol. IV., p. 662.

proposes that they should meet at Richmond, "which shall not be much incommodious" to the old Archbishop.[102] This letter is undated, but it was probably in the midsummer, for Wolsey had summoned a Legatine Synod to meet at Westminster on September 8, 1518; but on account of the "sweating plague," which was then raging, it was prorogued first to December 8 and then to the first Monday in Lent, 1519. The decrees or acts of this synod have not yet been discovered. It was probably a preliminary meeting, as we know that Wolsey had not yet obtained from the Pope a free hand for his proposed reform. It was at this period when he was asking for increased faculties that he was met with the significant reminder that Rome had not received an equivalent for doing so extraordinary a thing as to supersede local authority in the reformation of the clergy.[103] Warham, urged on by those who represented Wolsey as his adversary and "the great Tyrant," took advantage of the delay in the arrival of the Legate's full powers to cause the official of the Province of Canterbury in the Diocese of Worcester to propose to visit the monks of that Cathedral Monastery. They refused to admit his visitation, as the duty belonged to Wolsey, and were excommunicated by the official in return.[104] But extended powers came in 1523 from Hadrian VI., who is reported to have had more confidence in Wolsey than in all the other prelates in the world. He also expressed a great wish to see the Cardinal and to confer with him about the state of Christendom.[105]

Strype, quoting from York Registers, says that in 1523 Wolsey summoned the clergy of both provinces to treat of reformation. They were to come before him at Westminster. Like a wise prelate he desired to take the clergy themselves into his confidence and to secure their coöperation. We know at this time Warham had summoned the Convocation of Canterbury to meet at St. Paul's. There was a grant to the king to be levied. Wolsey ordered them to attend his Legatine Assembly instead, and issued a special summons to this effect. What was done there in the way of Reformation we do not know. But evidently Wolsey disturbed by his vigor the calm and serenity of some of the clergy. It was probably a cleric who wrote (May 14, 1523) that the Cardinal on the first day of Convocation when Mass was finished at St. Paul's cited the clergy to appear before him at Westminster. There was another Mass, and within six or seven days the priests proved that the Convocation was void because they were summoned to appear before My Lord of Canterbury. Wolsey, therefore, sent out new citations for eight days after the Ascension: "and then I think they should have the third Mass of the Holy Ghost. I pray God the

---

[102] Wilkins, IV., p. 660. [103] Cotton MS., "Vitell," B. IV., n. 3. [104] Ibid, n. 131. [105] Ibid, n. 169.

Holy Ghost be among them and us both." "I do tremble," says he, "to remember the end of all these high and new enterprises. For oftimes it hath been that to a new enterprise there followeth a new manner and strange sequel. God of His mercy send His Grace into such fashion that it may be for the best."[106]

We shall see better in the course of this study what it was that Wolsey did, and so we can make up for the loss of the acts of his synods and convocation. He seems to have urged the Bishops to revise their Cathedral statutes and to have them confirmed by his authority. In 1526 the statutes of Lichfield Cathedral were revised and submitted to him by the Bishop and Chapter. He held a visitation of St. Paul's Cathedral in 1518, when he made salutary decrees to free the chapter from the heavy burthen of debt then weighing upon it.[107] From a letter of the Bishop of Ely (December 28, 1520) we can see that he ordered the prelates to attend at their cathedrals at the times for holding ordinations, and in his own Diocese of York ordinations were duly held. He received from the Pope (May 12, 1528) special faculties to degrade unworthy clerics.[108] He set about a reformation of the spiritual courts, making strenuous efforts to put the provincial courts, the Courts of Arches and Audience, upon proper and new footings and tried to introduce an altogether simpler form of legal procedure.[109]

The consideration of the reform of the clergy leads us to the subject of the way in which he sought to bring it about. And this was mainly by the process of intellectual development.

II.—THE FOUNDING OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES.

There are two ways of bringing about a reform where it is needed, and they can be summed up in two words—"Don't" and "Do." It is easy enough to issue prohibitory laws, and it is just as easy to evade them. This Wolsey seems to have realized, and one notices the absence of such decrees in all his work. He wanted to build upon a more reasonable and lasting foundation to teach men to know and then to work. He felt that it was ignorance that was at the root of most of the mischief of the day. Educate men, and they will know better. This accounts for the treatment he often meted out to those who were brought before his Legatine Court accused of heresy. For instance, when Tavener, organist of St. Frideswide's, at Oxford, was brought before him on that charge, Wolsey set him free, excusing the man and saying he was "only a musician."[110]

---

[106] **Cotton MS., Titus, B. I., 112.** [107] **Dugdale: "History of St. Paul," Appendix, p. 53.**
[108] **Rymer, XIV., 239.** [109] **Dixon, p. 17.** [110] **A. Wood, "Althene," I., 338.**

In the educational foundations which cover the Cardinal's name with undying fame, it must be distinctly remembered that they were for the education of the clergy. His own words were that they were for scholars "to be brought up in virtue and qualified for the sacerdotal dignity."[111] It was part of his reform to secure for England a priesthood that should be in the front rank of learning and whose lips should guard wisdom.

In the beginning of 1518 the Cardinal attended Queen Katherine on a visit to the University of Oxford. He was already held there in the highest estimation and seems always to have kept up the friendliest relations with his old college,[112] and since June, 1515, the University had decreed that every one preaching before it should pray publicly for the good estate of the Archbishop of York, and after his death for his soul among the dead.[113] After assisting at an entertainment at Magdalen College he went to the Convocation House, where he harangued the University and professed his willingness to serve it in all noble offices. They trusted him. He began his plans for colleges at least as early as April, 1518, and in June the University by a solemn decree of convocation surrendered all their privileges and statutes, except those of the colleges, to be by him disposed and reframed. Whether he ever did have time to reform the University statutes so as to do away with a great deal of worn out and antiquated machinery is not certain; but he founded seven lectureships, viz.: Theology, Civil Law, Physics,[114] Philosophy, Mathematics, Greek, together with Rhetoric and Humanities. The readers he appointed were all men of the first ability: Thomas Brinknell, reader in Divinity, wrote against Luther in the name of the University; Ludovicus Vives read in Law and Humanity, Thomas Musgrave in Physics, Richard Catelin in Mathematics, Calphurnius in Greek, with Clement and Lupset.

One of Wolsey's plans was to found at Oxford a great college to be called "The College of Secular Priests," conceived on the largest scale and to hold more than five hundred students, all of whom would be future priests. And as a feeder for this, as Eton was to King's and Winchester to New College, he determined to found a large school likewise. His birthplace, Ipswich, was to be the seat of this home of learning. But such grand and important schemes, regulated with all that magnificence and detail which the Cardinal knew how to value as an attraction, was a most costly undertaking.

---

[111] Brewer, IV., 5212.

[112] In 1507 the Fellows had a present of venison from him (Bloxam, 28), and again in 1520.

[113] Bloxam, p. 24.

[114] Wolsey also was the chief promoter of the establishment of the College of Physicians in 1518. "To check the boldness of those men who prefer physic more out of avarice than any confidence of a safe conscience, to the great damage of the ignorant and credulous people." See Goodall's "Royal College of Physicians" (ed. 1684), p.6.

Its object was for the benefit of the Church to provide a higher education for the clergy. It was, therefore, but right and proper that the Church should supply the greater part of the means. And it was in carrying out this that Wolsey has reaped undeserved obloquy.[115] Looking round England, he saw that many of the religious houses were suffering from the dire effects of the Black Death. The number of the communities had decreased and those who remained were often crippled by debt. It was an open question whether such houses, in spite of old associations and local interests, were of any real benefit to religion at large, and whether, as the inmates could not or did not fulfil the conditions under which they received their benefactions, a use could not be found for the goods to the greater benefit of the Church. Also with the greater "solemn monasteries" a like question arose. Did they expend sufficient of their wealth in the wider interests of the Church, or did they look to home too much? The way that Wolsey acted shows the solution he gave to the problem. He procured bulls from the Pope[116] to dissolve such smaller houses as were reduced to the number of six inmates. The rights of the existing members were not neglected, and provision was made for their support. Their property was made use of for the College at Oxford and the School at Ipswich. Likewise with the abbeys, Wolsey, by course of visitations and other influences, made them know that they would have to exert themselves for the general welfare of the Church in England, and that they were bound to work for the common good of the country. However, we find the abbots and other religious persons propitiating the great Cardinal with presents of money and plate for his foundations. Undoubtedly it often happened that the agents Wolsey employed in this affair acted harshly and without due consideration for those they were dispossessing. Wolsey had to bear the blame, and his enemies were quite ready to seize upon the slightest occasion of damaging his reputation with the king. Henry, who had written (October 10, 1524) to thank Clement VII. both for the extension of Wolsey's legatine authority and for the faculties granted him for suppressing certain monasteries on behalf of the new college,[117] now on the adverse reports causes the Cardinal to be informed of these by Sir Thomas More.

---

[116] As an example of the hatred and calumny the Cardinal incurred by touching the monasteries we may take what Warham says in a letter he wrote (14 July, 1526) to Wolsey, saying that when he was last in Canterbury a white monk (*Cistercian*) of Sutton reported that Wolsey had suppressed that house and expelled the religious, taking away their lands and goods, so that they were obliged to beg or use some craft. He offered to sew at a tailor's and other occupations. Warham examined him and the other White Monk confessed that he had spread the report and that it was untrue. (Brewer, Vol. IV.) [116] Ghinucci wrote to Wolsey (21 August, 1526) that the Pope was much interested in the details of Wolsey's College and feels sure that the Cardinal will not omit Greek literature, though there was no mention of it in the account Wolsey sent of his plan. The Pope requests that there may be at least two Greek lectures established in the New College. (Cotton MS., "Vitell," B. VIII., 113.)

Wolsey promptly wrote to the king (February 5, 1525) "touching certain misorders supposed to be used by Dr. Allen and other my officers in the suppression of certain exile and small monasteries wherein neither God is served nor religion kept. These, with your gracious aid and assistance, converting the same to a far better use, I propose to annex unto your intended College of Oxford." He then tells the king that though "some folk which be always more prone to speak evil may have informed the king otherwise, I have meant, intended, or gone about, nor also have willed mine officers to do anything concerning the said suppression, but under such form and manner as is, and hath largely been, to the full satisfaction, recompense and joyous contentation of any person which hath had or could pretend to have, right or interest in the same;" and he concludes by saying he would be wrong to acquire anything *ex rapinis* in the foundation of his colleges which were intended for the king's honour, the advancement of learning and the weal of his own soul."[118]

In a letter of Henry's to Wolsey (July 14, 1528) about the election of the Abbess of Wilton,[119] after saying: "I understand which is greatly to my comfort that you have ordered yourself to God-ward as religiously and virtuously as any prelate or father in Christ's Church can do. Wherein so doing and persevering there can be nothing more acceptable to God, more honour to myself nor more desired of your friends, amongst whom I reckon not myself the least," he then refers again that many "mumble it abroad" that the goods for building the colleges "are not best acquired and come from many religious houses unlawfully the cloak of kindness towards the edifying of your college."[120]

Wolsey replied (July 15, 1528): "I humbly thank you for your great zeal in desiring the purity of my conscience and that nothing should be done by me in the matter of my college or otherwise which should give occasion to others to speak ill of me. I have received from many old friends and exempt religious persons various sums of money, but not so much as is reported; nor has any been corruptly given, as I shall be ready to prove to Your Grace. But to avoid all occasion for the future I promise Your Majesty that if I should be compelled to sell all that I have, neither I nor any other by my consent, shall take anything for the use of my college, however frankly offered, from any religious person; purposing so to order my poor life that it shall appear that I love and dread God and also Your Majesty."[121]

---

[117] Add. MS., 15,387, f. 123. [118] Harleian MS., 7035, f. 174. [119] As regards Anne Boleyn's nominee, her sister-in-law, Henry writes to her and says that Wolsey had examined her and that she had confessed to immorality. "Wherefore I would not for all the gold in the world cloake your conscience nor mine to make her a ruler of a house which is of so ungodly demeanour; nor I trust that you will not that neither for brother or sister I should so distain mine honour or conscience:" (Brewer, IV., 4477.) [120] Fiddes, p. 174.

His colleges were started. That at Oxford, which was to be known as the College of Secular Priests, had its name changed by the king to *Cardinal's College;* but on the fall of Wolsey the college, with all its rich and sumptuous furniture, was seized by the king; and, perhaps in answer to Wolsey's piteous appeals "for his poor college," the institution was reformed on a much smaller scale and Henry took to himself all the credit of the foundation, changing the name to King's College, which is now known as Christ Church. The school at Ipswich was entirely destroyed and was never refounded. All that remains of Wolsey's munificence is the gateway. *Sic transit gloria mundi.*[122] The noble plans for building up a learned and prudent clergy, which had been Wolsey's aim, came to naught through no fault of his. But Oxford still cherishes the great Cardinal as one of her most illustrious sons and, as Convocation wrote to him, "not so much as a founder of a college, but of the University itself."[123]

III.—TO FOUND NEW BISHOPRICS IN THE LARGER TOWNS.

Wolsey knew that in the immediate action of the episcopate lies the strength of the Church. He would have had but little sympathy with those who try to exalt the Papacy at the cost of the episcopacy. He felt, doubtless, as Nicholas V. said, that the Roman Pontiffs had "stretched out their arms too far," and had "left scarcely any power to the other Bishops," and that he "hoped the better to uphold his own jurisdiction by not assuming that which was foreign to him."[124] We shall have to deal later on with Wolsey's attitude to the Holy See; and shall show that his conduct was always that befitting his high dignities and offices of Archbishop, of Cardinal and of Legate. But here we must examine his work of reform and compare what existed in his day with his magnificent and statesmanlike plan.

For hundreds of years England had been divided into two historic provinces, and the names of Canterbury and York are dear today. Canterbury, with its primatial Benedictine chapter, numbered among her suffragan churches Rochester (Benedictine), Winchester (Benedictine), Norwich (Benedictine), Worcester (Benedictine), Ely (Benedictine), Bath and Wells (a double chapter, Benedictine and secular), Coventry (also a double chapter), London (secular), Chichester (secular), Exeter (secular), Sarum (secular), Hereford (secular), Lincoln (secular) and four small Welsh dioceses. In all sixteen, out of which six had purely Benedictine chapters, two had a double and ten (including the four important Welsh dioceses) had secular canons.[125] The province of York was much smaller in number. Besides the Metropolitan Church of York (secular) there were only the Benedictine Cathedral of Durham and the Augustinian Cathedral of Carlisle.

---

[121] Brewer, IV., 4513.

[122] Ever witness for him,
Ipswich and Oxford! one of which fell with him,
Unwilling to outlive the good that did it;
The other, though unfinish'd, yet so famous,
So excellent in art, and yet so rising,
That Christendom shall ever speak his virtue.
"Henry VIII.," act iv., s. 2.

[123] Wood, "Annales," II., 27.

[124] Pastor, Vol. II., p. 30 (English ed.)

Wolsey's plan was taken from existing examples. He mapped out the country, and where there was a great abbey and a large town there he determined to set up a bishopric. It is more than probable that Henry VIII. followed the plan drawn up with his consent by Wolsey when he made a part restitution of his ill-gotten goods after the dissolution of the monasteries. Thirteen new sees were arranged for, though only six, viz.: Westminster,[126] Oxford, Chester, Gloucester, Bristol and Peterborough, were actually founded. And within recent years, when the authorities of the Anglican Church were increasing the number of bishoprics, they followed out the plan traced by Wolsey. But he never saw it realized. The difficulties he had to contend against in this necessary work of reform may be seen by the following extracts from the State papers:

From Casale to Vannes. (October 30, 1528.) [Rome.]

The erection of the Cathedrals was proposed in the Consistory, and all seemed ready to consent to the king's desire; but as it is a matter of the greatest importance it should be granted with greater authority than could be done then. The matter was therefore referred to the Legates (Wolsey and Campeggio), and then for them to report to the Pope.[127] This was, of course, to gain time. The matter having already been settled in England, and all that was asked was for the Pope's authority, the next step the *Curia* took was to issue (November 12, 1528) a bull empowering Wolsey to do what he had already done.[128] Perhaps from a letter of Casale to Wolsey (December 17, 1528) one may see what was at work. Wolsey had been lately appointed to Winchester. Casale says: "The Cardinals are very much offended seeing how much they have lately suffered at the remission of fees required by the Cardinal for the expedition of Winchester bulls."[129] On January 28, 1529, Gregorio Casale writes to Vincent Casale that: "Many of the Cardinals are contented that everything should be done in England and the Bishops elected there; but that the biretum and the rochet should be conferred from Rome. Cardinal de Monte showed him an article which he had found, of a previous license to create Bishops in England."[130] Evidently from this, as we see in his arrangements for Ireland, Wolsey wanted to do away with the pernicious system of Papal Provisions, which was the result of the Avignon System of Finance and was also against the law of the land. He was probably going to act as Francis, by his concordat with Leo X. had secured for France, or to revert to the older English way of capitular election. Formerly it was only the election of an Archbishop that required to have Papal confirmation; and, as Papal representative, the metropolitan had the right of confirming the capitular election of Bishops without resorting to Rome. Pope Honorius I. in 634 gave to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York the right of conferring the pall upon new Archbishops without recourse to Rome.[131] It was when the *Curia* found the expediting of bulls a profitable office, and that *annates* were not only worth having, but could be got, that the old system was done away with and the Pope himself "provided" the Bishops.

---

[125] The system of monastic chapters which was once so marked a feature in the pre-Reformation days is almost peculiar to England and is a mark of the debt which the country owes to the Black Monks of St. Benedict. [126] Westminster ceased to be a bishopric from the days of Mary Tudor, who restored the church to the Black Monks. Her sister made it a collegiate church and a "peculiar." [127] Cotton MS., "Vitell," B., X., 119. [129] Rymer, XIV., 273.

Casale carries on the account in a letter to Wolsey (January 30, 1529) and says: "The difficulty about the bull for erecting abbeys into Cathedrals arises from this, that most of the Cardinals think it will detract from the honour of the See of Rome if Bishops are created except at Rome or receive their investiture from any one except the Pope." But all were agreed on one thing: the *annates* must be paid.[132] It was not until May 29, 1529, that Clement issued the bull erecting certain abbeys into Cathedral churches,[133] but does not mention the names. It was left to the Legate to decide whether these new Cathedrals were to be served by religious or seculars. But it came too late for Wolsey to make any use of it.[134]

---

[129] Cotton MS., "Vitell," B. X., 164. [130] Ibid, 46. [131] Bede: "Ecclesiastical History" (Bk. II., c. 17 and 18.) [132] Cotton MS., "Vitell," B. XI., 50. Spain had, however, by this time settled the matter in its own way. [133] Rymer XIV., 291. [134] Nor did Wolsey confine his attention to England only. The Lordship of Ireland shared in his solicitude, and a paper of "Remembrances for Ireland" shows part of his scheme for giving peace to that distracted portion of Henry's dominion. In this paper Wolsey notes that: As the bishops and clergy of the Irishry give most help to the rebels, be it provided that no clerk be promoted to any bishopric there unless he be of English birth or of the English nation and language. The bishoprics are so poor that "no honest and learned man" of England will accept them; for while in England there are but two archbishoprics and nineteen bishoprics, there are in Ireland four archbishoprics and above thirty bishoprics. The Pope should be applied to to unite the sees, so as to make but two archbishoprics and nine or ten bishoprics. Also: That the churches of Ireland be built and repaired, the ministers reformed and that no temporal man have any spiritual benefice, and no provision from Rome be henceforth allowed. And:

We must now consider Wolsey in his capacity of Guardian of the Faith. Some have ventured to look upon him as a favorer of the Reformation in matters of Faith. This is an utterly untenable theory; for the Cardinal was perfectly orthodox in Faith. He was, as we are showing, a great Reformer; but only of abuses. He was seeking to reform the Church from within; and without laying sacrilegious hands upon the Deposit of Faith, he was eager to cleanse the Church from the ill effects of human passions. We have already seen how zealous he was that the people should be instructed in the knowledge of their Religion and how he labored that they should have worthy pastors. It remains now to consider how he guarded them against the teachers of the New Learning, who came from Germany and revived the smouldering embers of an almost expired Lollardy.

How Martin Luther began a legitimate protest against abuses, abuses by-the-bye which for the most part the Council of Trent reformed, and how from protest he went into revolt, it is not necessary here to tell.[135] A letter, however, from Rome to Wolsey throws some little light on the subject. The Bishop of Worcester, Wolsey's agent in Rome in 1520, writes (May 28) that six months ago the writings of Friar Martin arrived. Much of their contents was disapproved of by the theologians of Rome on account of the scandals to which they might give rise; and part they condemned as heretical. After long debates it was decided by the Cardinals to declare Martin a heretic; and the Bishop announced that a bull was in preparation on the subject.[136] The bull was published in Rome July 15, 1520, and Wolsey wrote, as one of the official advisers of the Holy See, to offer his counsel for remedying the evil. He forbade at once the circulation of Luther's writings in England; and for this Leo X. wrote to thank him (March 16, 1521).[137] He wanted, however, to show by a public act that the English king and Church equally condemned the false doctrine. On May 12, 1521, Wolsey held a solemn service, surrounded by the Bishops and Abbots, at St. Paul's, where a sermon was preached at the Cross in

---

That Wolsey as Legate of England and Ireland appoint some bishop there as his substitute (about 1524.) (See Brewer.) From Wolsey's point of view he seems to have had reason for his proposal, for the Archbishop of Dublin wrote (23 February, 1528) to the Cardinal, telling him of the lamentable decay of the land, both in good Christianity and in other things, for lack of good prelates and curates in the Church, and that he would do well to promote good men to bishoprics to be examples, etc. (Ibid, p. 3952.)

[135] The various treatments Luther met with are instructive. After a cultured and good-humored contempt for the barbarian friar, Leo X. anathematized him. Clement VII. is reported to have been willing to make him Cardinal to quiet him, provided he chose to accept the grade. ("Calendar of Venetian State Papers," III., 796.) While the Emperor Charles in 1525, when threatening to bring Clement VII. to his knees by invading Italy, told the Florentine Ambassador: "Some day or other perhaps Martin Luther will become a man of worth." (Ibid, IV., n. 920.) The Reformation in Germany, as in England, was mainly an affair of secular politics.

[136] Brewer, III., n. 847.

[137] Brewer, III., 1197.

the churchyard by Bishop Fisher, of Rochester, against the New Learning in religion; and during the sermon Luther's books were burnt.[138]

The Cardinal issued orders that every one possessed of any of the incriminated writings should deliver them up within two weeks, and he caused the Bishops to punish the refractory with the sentence of excommunication.

But though stern towards heresy and clearly alive to the danger, the great minded Cardinal had no taste for controversy and had pity on the poor wretches who, through ignorance, had become infected. Not one of the many brought before the Legatine Court on the charge of heresy was burnt. And this Christian tolerance on the part of Wolsey is all the more creditable to him when we recall the hideous butcheries which prostituted the name of Religion in the later years of Henry and the reigns of his daughters, Mary and Elizabeth. When Henry VIII. wrote his book against Luther the Cardinal seems to have doubted its use. Pace writes to him (June 24, 1518) that the king "is very glad to have noted Your Grace's letter that his reasons be called inevitable considering Your Grace was sometime his adversary herein and of contrary opinion.[139] When, a few years later, Luther entertained hopes of securing Henry to the side of the Reformation through the Divorce, he wrote a humble letter of apology for his virulent attack on the king's book and says that he had been under the impression that Wolsey, "that monster, the public hate of God and man, that plague of your kingdom," had been the author, and he offers to make a public recantation if the king will signify in which way he wishes it to be done.[140] But it was not then a wise thing to abuse Wolsey. Henry, in reply to Luther, says that the Cardinal is too prudent a man to be moved by Luther's abuse, and that he will be dearer to the king the more he is hated by Luther and those like him. Though he calls the Cardinal "the plague of England," the king would have Luther to know that the country owes him many benefits, not the least being his opposition to heresy.

At that time Lutheranism was, as Jansenism in the following century, a favorite charge to make against opponents. Many of the learned men favored by the Cardinal and introduced into his foundations were so accused by his enemies. But without any real cause. A pleasing note is his attitude towards one who, though afterwards joining the reforming party, remained the sincerest and truest man of the number. Latimer had Wolsey's leave to preach throughout the kingdom; and this proves, as Mr. Dixon remarks, that the great Cardinal considered him not as a Lutheran or heretic, but as one inclined to help forward a constitutional and proper reformation, such as he would have carried out if he had been allowed.[141]

---

[138] See Roscoe: "Leo X.," Vol. II., Appendix 9. [139] Brewer, II., n. 209. [140] "Epist. Lutheri," III., 24. This offer was probably the result of Charles V.'s more favorable attitude o Luther.

Dr. Barnes, who afterwards, in 1541, was burnt at Smithfield, seems to have taken scandal at the magnificence affected by Wolsey and preached a sermon in Cambridge against it. As this savored somewhat of Lollardy, officious persons summoned Barnes before the Cardinal, who good-naturedly reasoned with him and asked him if he thought it good and reasonable that he should lay down the silver pillars and pollaxes and other paraphernalia with which he, as Legate, Cardinal and Chancellor, appeared in public, and whether it would be better to coin them into money for the poor. On receiving an affirmative answer, Barnes tells us that the Cardinal said: "Then how think you were it better for me (being in the honour and dignity that I am) to coin my pillars and pollaxes and to give the money to five or six beggars than to maintain the Commonwealth by them as I do? Do you not reckon (quoth he) the Commonwealth better than five or six beggars?" It opens to us, as Dr. Wordsworth justly remarks, some part of the philosophy upon which the Cardinal defended the fitness of the pomp and state which he maintained.[142] The Cardinal only dismissed him, saying: "Well, you say very well." There was nothing heretical, but only a matter of opinion, and Wolsey was tolerant.

From his death bed at Leicester Abbey, almost his last words were to send to the king a message by "Master Kingston," who was taking him under arrest to the Tower, about the danger of heresy. This had been his dread all during the Divorce; for he knew that the Boleyn faction were inclined to Lutheranism. The dying Cardinal said: "And say furthermore, that I request His Grace in God's name that he have a vigilant eye to depress this new pernicious sect of Lutherans, that it do not increase within his dominions through his negligence, in such a sort as that he shall be fain at length to put harness upon her back to subdue them."[143] And he brought forward many examples of the evils that come to a kingdom in temporal matters through supineness in dealing with false teachers.

One thing remains to be said on this point. While Wolsey had power heresy made no way in England, and as soon as he fell and no longer could guide the English Church then the floodgates were opened. He read a lesson, too, to kings, churchmen and people that false teaching is best put down by true teaching, and that the safety of the Church is not to be found in persecution by fire and sword, but in the blessings of education.

---

[141] Cf. *Op. cit.*, I., p. 118. [142] Cavendish (ed. Singer), p. 47—8 note. [143] Cavendish, p. 321.

We have now drawn out the picture of Wolsey in his rôle of Reformer. To finish our study of the Great Churchman we shall have to see him in his relation to the Papacy, in his attitude in the Divorce, in which he alone (saving Katherine) emerges with clean hands, in his personal piety and, greater still, in the hour of his fall. But these are beyond the limits of the present article, and must be dealt with another time. With them the picture of Thomas Wolsey, Cardinal and Archbishop, will be complete and he will take his rightful position as the greatest Churchman of his times.

ETHELRED L. TAUNTON.

London.

UNIVERSITY AND SCHOOL IN THE LATE SPANISH COLONIES.

TOO little attention is bestowed by the press and the teaching class on the periodical literature issued from the Department of Education. People for some inscrutable reason instinctively avoid official documents whenever possible. The air of formality about them, the idea of statistics and departmental data and bloodless recital, make one shrink from their examination. This is a very grave mistake. Matter of the highest importance and utility is not infrequently to be found between rigid and cold-looking official covers.

Before touching specifically on what interests Catholics most in the latest Report from the Commissioner of Education, it is permissible to say a word with regard to the manner in which such voluminous work is done. Each report is a miniature library on pedagogics in itself. The year's progress in education all over the area of civilization is as a rule presented for review. Nor is it a mere cursory glimpse that is afforded. Clear synopsis and ample detail always accompany each separate statement. The early genesis and development of the schoolmaster's science is shown in the cases of countries whose chronicle had not been previously presented. Data are collected in every available field of study. Pedagogic conditions are examined from Alaska to Tierra del Fuego. The remotest parts of the Far East, such as Corea and Kamtschatka, are explored in search of information bearing on the progress of letters and ethics. Each year's Report consists of two large volumes containing in all about two thousand five hundred quarto pages of closely printed matter. The gathering, arrangement and proper classification of such an enormous stock of facts and figures and historical review is a colossal task for one year, in any one department. Every State in the Union has its own separate report each year. This in itself would be, one would think, sufficient work for any single bureau. But the rest of the world comes in for an equal share of attention—if not in the one report, at least in seriatim instalments. It may be doubted whether any other government possesses so complete an annual chronicle as this. Its scope and completeness are fully in keeping with the vastness of the country and the daring character of its enterprises in all things, public or private.

Nor is it merely that the bird's-eye view of the mental field here presented is both exhaustive and minute. There is a breadth and a philosophical grasp of the subject revealed in the preliminary review by the Commissioner such as could only be shown by one who not only understands his theme, but is in closest sympathy with the higher aims and ends of study. Only a ripe scholar and profound thinker could offer such a review year by year, going over much the same ground every time and carefully noting the progress made as well as the directions in which further progress is possible and desirable.

One great drawback to the value of Reports claiming to be complete was the regular omission of reference to the work of the Catholic schools. This remarkable omission was lately brought under the notice of the Department by some of the Catholic organs, and the Commissioner immediately set to work to correct the anomaly. In the Report issued last year there appeared an exhaustive statement of the Catholic effort to provide education for children of this faith. In the promptitude with which the omission was rectified and the generous spirit in which the paper was drawn up were shown the enlightening influence of true scholarship and the judicial quality of mind which a position of such high responsibility requires for its proper discharge.

The feature of importance in the Report for 1897-98, so far as Catholic interests are concerned, is a statement of the educational conditions in Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines, by R. L. Packard. As a vast amount of misconception, based not only on ignorance, but deliberate misrepresentation, has been prevalent in respect to the work of Spain in these widely separated regions, it is useful to have some statement, accepted by authority, on the subject. The statement here presented does not claim to be more than an approximate one on many important points. Its purview embraces many localities concerning which but little specific information can be had. It stretches away into a past period over which the dust of antiquity has too deeply settled to allow things to be seen in their proper light. Any one who has had the ordinary experience of searching a parish register for the entry of a certain birth, or marriage, or death can witness how difficult a thing it is to get at the truth in modern days, when orderly methods are more in vogue in all the concerns of the world's bookkeeping than they used to be before the days of the Social Science Association and the Bertillon system of measurement. When we consider how primitive must have been the methods of the tropical colonies in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the wonder must be not that statistical information is not the pink of perfection, but that any useful sort is available at all.

While it is of supreme value to the cause of truth and the verdict of the future that Spain's real work be made known in those distant colonies, at a period when other colonies were being utilized only as penal settlements by nations who rail against Spain as despotic and unprogressive, the more practical immediate is involved in the disposition of our present Government toward the educational claims of the late Spanish possessions. This is the period of transition in those places. The old order has vanished; the social fabric is in the dangerous condition of haphazard reorganization. New people, new language, new ideas are surging in. Sub-tropical languor is disturbed by the feverish haste of a strange civilization which despises the midday siesta and feels a felicitous aptitude in the institution of "quick lunch."

From the most ignoble of motives the policy of Spain and the objects of Spanish conquest and civilization have been deliberately held up, on this continent as well as in England, to popular execration. Enslavement of the conquered people in spirit and in body, it was sought to be shown, was the primary object; the superimposition of ignorance upon barbarism one of the means by which the thraldom was to be established and confirmed; the cultivation of superstition as a substitute for true religion the main desire of a gross, sensual and designing clergy. All these untruths have been dinned into the public ear, without fear of contradiction and without remorse or compunction, by a long series of historians and politicians, either from sordid motives looking to the eventual acquisition of Spain's colonies as the result of a popular clamor against the Spanish system, or else to gratify the rancorous spirit of religious dislike. But the truth is great and difficult to repress or bury away even under mountains of falsehood. Mr. Lummis, in his valuable work, "The Awakening of a Nation," brings forward an overwhelming mass of proof of the nobility of Spanish effort to educate, to uplift and to make free the Indians whom the conquests of Cortez and Pizarro and the other great but unscrupulous adventurers had brought under the yoke of Spain. Beside the Cross in Mexico were planted the university, the industrial school and the printing press, a century before ever either school or university was heard of in the English settlements here. These are hard facts for non-Catholic writers to have to face, and it is not all of them who can write on the subject when they are called upon with the frankness and magnanimity of Mr. Lummis. Mr. Packard, the author of this present paper in the Education Report, is obliged at the outset of his historical introduction to admit the vast difference between the early Spanish explorers and the English ones who followed them to other portions of our continent. "We observe," he says, "the contrast between the Spanish conquistadores, the utterly bold, determined, large-minded adventurers, and the English and Dutch colonists of the next century on the northern seaboard. These latter had little of the conquering spirit about them. They left their native country to better themselves in a quiet way and to trade, and their ideas were principally limited to the unambitious parts they had to play. Their natural leaders stayed at home to attend to the promoting and financiering of the colonial interests instead of leading exploring parties in the wilderness. This contrast crops out in many ways. Governor Winthrop wanders three or four miles away from his companions and passes an anxious night alone in the hut of a friendly Indian. A hundred years before a Spanish monk thought nothing of undertaking an expedition of a thousand miles in a wild country abounding in savages, and the English never undertook any such expedition as Coronado's march."

Mr. Packard is painfully overweighted with the consciousness of the Puritan's shortcomings in the matter of benevolent intentions toward the aborigines, and he endeavors to make the most of the very slender capital their records show in this regard, though not a little at the expense of truth and justice. Here, for instance, is a passage which must have required some nerve to indite: "There was one point of resemblance between the Spaniards of the sixteenth century and the English of the seventeenth. Both felt a responsibility for the lost souls they fancied they had found, and were zealous for the conversion and, incidentally, the education of the Indians."

The evidences of such a sense of duty on the part of the early English settlers have been, as a rule, so carefully concealed as to be almost irrecoverable. It seems that Mr. Packard has either overlooked or forgotten what such historians as Mr. Parkman had to say on the subject, or else is confounding labors of the French missionaries with the efforts of the Puritan settlers to convert bad Indians into good by means of a well-known formula.

Great allowance must be made for a man in the position of Mr. Packard, called upon to make out a case in favor of a system which has little claim upon the respect or gratitude of mankind and whose effects upon the aborigines have been much the same as those of the Egyptian plagues. Neither salvation nor education was the motive of English action in regard to the Indian population, but something that seemed more compatible with the principles of modern political economy. He appears to have been haunted with the consciousness of New England shortcomings all the time he was searching up and examining the proofs of Spain's vast services in the other direction. There was no necessity for referring to New England or the Dutch, so far as the reader can see. The subject was Spain in the Spanish settlements and what Spain's priests and educators and statesmen did therein from the time of their discovery until we laid violent hands upon them. But, like the ghost of Banquo, they will keep on looking in at the feast unbidden, even "with twenty mortal murders on their crowns." To offset their manifest shortcomings it is necessary to say something by way of disparagement on the other side, lest it might feel vain-glorious over the praise which justice had compelled at the outset. Something is due to the spirit of the Pagan Renaissance, injured and depreciated by the bare act of justice rendered a more unselfish source of learning. Thus painfully labors Mr. Packard:

"Wherever the Spaniards went they carried the university with them. No matter how narrow and perverted the education of the monks may have been, there was still in it a reminiscence of the humanities, if in nothing else than the monkish Latin they used, and some of the conquistadores themselves were imbued with letters. Even the private soldier Bernal Diaz was able to write his recollections of the mighty deeds he had witnessed, and he left an account which historians have used as an authoritative document. Like superiority of birth, superior education gave (as it still gives) an intellectual superiority of view, which was due to the European university, whose root fibres, when traced, will be found to penetrate that buried civilization from which all modern civilization has sprung, which once dominated the world with grandeur and magnificence and yet filled it with beauty and taste."

Here the question arises: Was it "the humanities" which brought the monks, with their "narrow and perverted" education, or the monks who brought the humanities? A tree is known by its fruits. If a "broader" system has been at work among the aboriginal as well as the exotic peoples brought under the sway of New England ideas, its tangible results ought to be in evidence, either in the morals, the literature or the institutions of the country or the manners of its inhabitants. The Spaniard brought not only the university with him; the Cross was the first thing he planted on the soil. If the conquistadore was cruel and selfish, the priest was there beside him to stay the hand of murder and rapine and teach mankind who is one's neighbor. This arrangement, in the eyes of political economy and the Pagan Renaissance, may appear "narrow and perverted," but for the Christian and the philanthropist it will serve.

Mr. Packard makes a laudable attempt at impartiality when he comes to review the facts of the beginnings of education in the Spanish colonies. Although he prefaces these by a very long and analytic historical résumé by the eminent authority, Blumentritt, having little apparent relevancy to the special subject of education, he sets out his own synopsis by a glance at the backward condition of education in the leading European countries down to the end of the last century. As a means of helping us to a knowledge of the facts he offers an extract from the diary of President Ezra Stiles, of Yale, A. D. 1794, telling how on that day (July 17) he had had a visit from M. Talleyrand Perigord and M. Beaumez, deputy for Arras. Talleyrand explained to him a scheme he had for public education in France. President Stiles asked what was the proportion of those who could not read in that country. M. Beaumez said he thought twenty millions out of the twenty-five millions of population. Talleyrand corrected this estimate; he thought the proportion was about eighteen millions.

A Cuban gentleman, Aurelio Mitjanes, has written a history of the development of education in that island. By its light we are enabled to gather what the much-anathematized Spanish Government did for the promotion of the liberal arts in the "pearl of the Antilles," and if we contrast it with, say, what the English did in Ireland for the same cause, within the same period, it requires no temerity in assertion to declare that the record of Spain is one of Boreal brilliancy beside that of the nation which this public has been taught to regard as incomparably superior. Mitjanes' history is founded upon two much earlier ones, those, respectively, of Arrete and Bachiller. As early as the year 1522, or nearly a hundred years before the University of Dublin, otherwise known as Trinity College, was founded, a Bull of Pope Adrian VI. established the Scholatria of Santiago de Cuba, for the teaching of Latin; and in 1571 a school was founded in Bayamo out of funds left by a Spanish military gentleman, Captain Francesco de Paradas. At Havana, in 1689, the College of San Ambrosio, with a dozen bursarships for the education of young men for the Church, was established, but was ultimately condemned by the Bishop of Havana, because it did not prove capable—probably for lack of teachers—of carrying out its programme. At the Convent of La Merced also a chair of elocution and literature had been founded by Fr. José Maria Penelvar in 1788, but this, too, failed to realize its object, and was ultimately relinquished.

At a time when the cause of education in Cuba seemed to be in low water, the Jesuits appeared upon the scene and with characteristic energy addressed themselves to the task of recovering lost ground. The municipality of Havana early desired to have the services of the order in the establishing of a college, but the differences between the Jesuits and the resident prelates for a long time prevented the realization of the project. At length, in 1717, a wealthy citizen of Havana, Don Gregorio Diaz Anget, donated forty thousand dollars toward the establishment of a college, and seven years afterwards the institution was opened, under the name of the College of San Ignacio, and with it was incorporated the older foundation of San Ambrosio, which, since 1689, had been carried on under the management of the Jesuit order. But the desire of the Havanese for higher education did not stop here. To obviate the necessity of young men of the wealthier class going to Spain to gain the advantage of a liberal education, the City Council had, as far back as the year 1688, appealed to the home government for a charter for a university. The request was forwarded, with an endorsement by Bishop Valdés; but it was not until the year 1721 that the desire was gratified. In that year there came a letter from Pope Innocent XIII. authorizing the fathers of the Convent of San Juan Latran to found a university. It was not, however, until seven years later that the institution opened its doors; but for some years prior to that time its work was being partially done; the Dominicans had been teaching in the chairs of morals, philosophy and canon law even before there was any money available for the purpose. From the beginning the principal offices in the university were given into the hands of the Dominicans, and this arrangement was the cause of discontent and rivalry down to the year 1842. The first rector was Father Tomás de Linares, and he received his appointment, in 1728, from the King; but all his successors were elected in the constitutional way by the university authorities. Mr. Packard states that the university was never very successful as to results, and only served to enable Spain to boast that she had introduced her civilization into Cuba; but he adds that in Spain itself the university ideal was antiquated, inasmuch as it stuck to the

Aristotelian philosophy, and the philosophical system was the scholastic. We may take his opinion for what it is worth. It has to be demonstrated yet that the Aristotelian system was inferior to the Baconian, which was at that time the gospel of Oxford; and if by the "scholastic philosophy" the writer means the Thomist system, we fear he might find some difficulty in demonstrating a superior one in any of the English or American richly-dowered institutions. He is on more rational ground when he assigns as a reason for the indifferent results of the university in Havana the dearth of competent teachers. Not many of these, it may well be believed, were to be found in Cuba—at least in the early days of the university. A striking instance of the extent to which this dearth prevailed is found in the fact that the chair of mathematics was for a long time vacant at Havana because there was no competent man to fill it. Many attempts to reform the system of the university were made from time to time, but it is said that the Spanish Government usually threw cold water on the proposals. This, of course, is set down as one of the sins of Spain; but we would ask any one who knows, and who is impartial-minded, how many attempts were made in our own time to reform the system of Dublin University and open its doors to the people at large, instead of keeping it as a close borough and a fat prize for the favored Protestant few, and in how many cases these were successful. If we had any means of instituting a fair comparison it is likely enough that the University of Havana might prove to have as good a record for intellectual progress in the island as that of Dublin in Ireland.

Besides the institutions named above, there was founded also in Santiago the Seminary of San Basilio Magno for ecclesiastical students. This was started by the same Bishop Valdés already referred to. Institutions somewhat but not altogether similar in their scope were the college and seminary of San Carlos and San Ambrose, in Havana. These had, in their later period, courses in philosophy, theology, law and mathematics.

A great impetus to education and literature was given in Cuba under the administration of Don Luis de las Casas—a generous and enlightened administrator whose name is still held in high honor in the island. He was the founder of a famous association for the advancement of learning and literature, the Sociedad Económica. His efforts were ably seconded by Archbishop Penalver and several other men of wide reputation in different fields of letters and science. This society was, by royal order, given charge of the educational interests of the whole island. It received great help from the religious orders in the work of founding new schools—particularly of the school of the Beneficenzia and the Ursulines. It found that whatever gratuitous education was being given in places outside Havana was altogether owing to the exertions of the religious orders. The society labored in the field of secondary as well as primary education. In the year 1816 we read that a regular department of education was formed and a grant of $32,000 was made by the home government in aid of primary education. We do not believe that any other European country could be shown to have done so much at that comparatively early period—certainly not England, where grants for educational purposes by the State are things of very recent date. Again, in the year 1818, the Spanish Government ordered that the science of political economy be taught in all the universities, and the Sociedad Económica accordingly established a chair in the San Carlos seminary.

Political disturbances exercised later on a disastrous influence upon education throughout the island. Still the Government from time to time took steps to improve the general condition of education, both primary and secondary, and to place the university courses on a level with those at home. The practical character of the education aimed at elicits the approbation of Mr. Packard.

Regarding primary education in Cuba, as early as the year 1821 it was declared free and general by order of the Spanish Cortes. The decree which made this a law ordered that a public school be established in every town of 100 inhabitants, and that there should be one school for every 500 inhabitants in cities. This antedated the passage of the similar law in France by twelve years. Besides the foregoing, the royal decree of February 23, 1883, made primary education obligatory for all Spaniards. The fathers and guardians or others having charge of children should send them to the public schools from their sixth to their ninth year of age unless they gained the same grade of instruction at home or in some private school. As early as the year 1813 the Spanish Cortes proposed to make reading and writing a condition of citizenship, a measure which excited Jefferson's admiration.

Many things conspired to hinder the spread of popular education in Cuba. The political troubles of the island have been a serious drawback. The natural disposition of the populace was one not less formidable. The lower classes are indolent, and careless about either work or education. They do not see life as people in the United States see it. The system of large plantations, where children were widely scattered and where large numbers of them were found useful to their parents in field work, was particularly unfavorable to the spread of education. Then, again, the chronic impecuniosity of Spain proved a terrible stumbling-block. For months and sometimes years there was a hiatus in the payment of teachers' salaries. A still more deadly obstacle was found in the frequently-recurring insurrections on the island. During those years of trouble, the chief anxiety of the Cuban Government was to find money for the payment of troops to put down the insurgents, and large numbers of schools were entirely shut. What the actual condition of elementary education now is throughout the island there is no present means of determining.

The latest tables available for a knowledge of present conditions relate to the year 1893-94. The population given for that year was 1,175,000. The public and private schools numbered 1,255, and the attendance in these was set down at 47,752—a proportion of one school to every 824 inhabitants.

Concerning the position of higher education the particulars are more definite. The Royal University of Havana had in the year 1892 a total of 1,083 students. The expenditure in 1889 was 126,859 pesos. Much of the income was derived from fees. In 1880, for the advancement of secondary education, an institute, incorporated with the central one at Havana, was established in the capital of each province. In Havana 28 colleges were affiliated; in Matanzas, 8; in Santa Clara, 18; in Puerto Principe, 1; in Pinar del Rio, 3; in Santiago, 12. Besides these there is a superior normal school for male teachers, another for female teachers, a "professional" school in Havana, a provincial school for artisans, a large number of "colleges for primary instruction" for boys and girls and Sunday schools for poor servant girls and other young women. Thus it will be seen that for higher and secondary education generous provision was made.

On this subject a writer in the *National Quarterly Review* in 1866 said: "Far from being behind the age in the provision which it made for education, there is not one of our cities, not even the modern Athens, which excels it in that respect. Boston, Philadelphia, New York and one or two other American cities have, indeed, better public schools than Havana. They afford better facilities for the education of the poor. But the higher educational institutions of Havana are on an extensive and liberal scale. We must admit on due examination that we have no institutions that are equal to their free school of design and painting, or their free school of mathematics. The professors in each of these schools have been selected for their superior qualifications in different countries of Europe, a large proportion of them being Germans, French and Italians. If it still seems incredible that Havana has some educational institutions which are superior to those of Boston or New York, we ask is the fact more incredible that the same city has a fine botanical garden in which botany is taught in all its branches by professors who have graduated at the famous Jardin des Plantes, in Paris, and other similar schools, while we have no botanical garden worthy of the name? The capital of Cuba has also a first-class university, one which may be compared to that of the city of New York, and which has separate chairs for jurisprudence, medicine, chemistry, theology, comparative anatomy and agricultural botany."

In Havana, as in most other large Catholic centres, the Jesuits lead in the work. Mr. James Anthony Froude went to Havana in 1887, and thus describes a visit to the Jesuit college of that city and its famous observatory, conducted at that time by the eminent Father Viñez: "They have a college there where there are 400 lads and young men who pay for their education; some hundreds more are taken out of charity. The Jesuits conduct the whole, and do it all unaided on their own resources. And this is far from all that they do. They keep on a level with the age; they are men of learning; they are men of science; they are the royal society of Cuba. They have an observatory in the college, and the Father Viñez, of whom I have spoken, is in charge of it. His name is familiar to students of meteorological science, and he has supplemented and corrected the accepted law of storms by careful observation of West India hurricanes."

One of the most usual bills of indictment brought against the rule of Spain is her alleged neglect of the education of people brought under her dominion. Looking at the situation in Cuba as a whole, and taking into account the conditions which have prevailed there, the charge falls to the ground. Free popular education is an idea of modern days. It did not begin to be realized in the most progressive countries until very recently. Spain appears to have been as early in the field with it as any other power, and if local circumstances interfered with her purposes, it is not fair to lay the blame altogether upon her shoulders. Again contrasting the rule of England in Ireland with that of Spain in Cuba, it will be found that down to the middle of the last century the position of the Irish masses as regards education must have been on a par with that of Cuba, for all the Government did for them, were it not for the splendid services of the Christian Brothers. There were no public schools until after 1840, and these when started had so strong an anti-Catholic bias that the people shunned them. As for higher education, there is no comparison whatever possible between the two cases. To the present hour the British Government stubbornly refuses to propose a grant for a Catholic university, or to give any support whatever to higher education for Catholic purposes.

Bearing in mind the slow pace of general education on the two great continents and the European islands which lead the way, no one will be astonished to read of Puerto Rico that until the year

1837 education of all kinds was greatly neglected, and that many of the towns were without a primary school. The same thing might be written with perfect truth of many countries whose geographical position was a million times more favorable for the reception of the early impulses of the mind-wave which breathed over the world only when the eighteenth century had passed into the vortex of the had-been. But what does really astonish one to read is that in that remote dependency, where plantation life and agricultural pursuits formed a constant clog on intellectual effort, by the year 1861 there was in every town in it a public school, besides private ones in the towns of the higher grade! There were no fewer than six public schools in the one town of San Juan in that year, besides four private ones, together with a seminary which boasted of three professorships, with teachers of French, English, mathematics and design. In the year 1879 Don Manuel Quinisna y Corton published a text book on Puerto Rico in which he gave particulars of the school conditions, there being at the time an estimated population of seven hundred thousand on the island, one-half being whites, the rest presumably plantation negroes. In that year there were three hundred and sixty-three public schools in operation, with an attendance of more than twelve thousand pupils. Various tables and statements regarding the rate of educational progress are presented in the Report now under consideration, some representing the condition of affairs as deplorable, others putting forth such facts and figures as are calculated to produce the very contrary impression. The impartial reader, after weighing the contradictory testimony, cannot, however, resist the conviction that from the period when the educational impulse was first felt in Puerto Rico—namely, about the year 1861—down to the time when it passed from under the dominion of Spain, the rate of progress has been tolerably good. A brief tabular statement from the report of the Governor of the island, through his secretary, to the Madrid Government, covering the period from 1864 to 1881, will give a better idea of the energy with which the movement was taken up once a beginning had been made:

Year.	Public Schools.			Attendance			Expenditures.
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Pesos.
1864	74	48	122	2,396	1,092	3,488	36,857
1867	240	56	296	7,543	1,929	9,472	90,834
1869	246	67	313	6,192	1,937	8,129	88,133
1878	238	91	329	7,523	3,474	11,097	129,456
1880	328	104	432	10,736	4,482	15,218	191,158
1881	384	117	501	18,025	6,095	24,120	262,669

There is a big hiatus in the official reports—from what cause does not appear—nothing being shown in the way of school statistics from 1881 down to 1898, when Dr. Carbonnell, secretary of an institution called "Fomento," in Puerto Rico, prepared some for the United States Government. His figures give a total of five hundred and ten public schools and forty-four private ones, with a total attendance of twenty-eight thousand, and entailing a total outlay of over three hundred thousand pesos. The number of children (white and black) left without school accommodation in the same year was close on ninety-four thousand. In considering the large disproportion of children thus left out in the cold, so far as school was concerned, we must not forget the fact that the war with Spain had arisen to disturb conditions in the island, and that with the cessation of the Spanish system came a breakdown in various sources of sustenance for the public schools as well as for religious and charitable purposes. There had been more agencies at work, however, for the education of the people of Puerto Rico than those enumerated in these tables. In a work published in 1878 by Don Manuel Ubeda y Delgado, a Spanish military officer, we read:

"In the capital also we find several charitable institutions where gratuitous instruction is given, notably (1) the Casa de Beneficencia, constructed in 1841-1847 with donations from the people of the province, and which gives asylum to an average number of 140 boys and 120 girls, who are given primary instruction as well as taught music and for whom there are workshops in which they are taught shoemaking, carpenter work, tailoring and cigar making for boys, and needle work, washing, etc., for the girls, under the direction of eighteen Sisters of Charity. (2) The College of San Ildefonso, erected by the charitable efforts of benevolent bodies, occupies a vast edifice, in which poor girls to the number of 36 are educated up to the age of 20 years, and there is room for 24 boarders besides outside scholars, all under the direction of the Sisters of Charity. Under their guidance also is the school for infants, in which an average number of 150 children of both sexes are instructed, the age limit being from three to seven years. There is also a military school with the captain general as director and the chief of battalion occupying the barracks as sub-director."

True to their policy of always leading the van, the Jesuits appear to have been foremost in the work of education in Puerto Rico from an early period. Their professors taught in the college of secondary instruction, and with the most excellent results. Those who took the degree of bachelor of arts in this institution, remarked Don Manuel Ubeda y Delgado, ranked with the best of those who enter universities. The list of studies he enumerates shows, indeed, that the intellectual fences to be taken by the contestant were high stone walls and water jumps. They included Latin and Spanish grammar; Latin analysis and translation; Greek translation; psychology, logic and moral philosophy; rhetoric and poetry; Christian doctrine and sacred history; Spanish history, descriptive geography; Latin and Spanish composition; general history; arithmetic and algebra; elements of geometry and plane trigonometry; elements of physics and chemistry; outlines of natural history.

A tolerably good attempt at both *trivium* and *quadrivium*, one may say, looking over this programme of essentials. Besides the college wherein these studies were carried on, the Jesuit professors also conducted a special seminary wherein a few students were trained for particular professions.

In any exegesis of the educational conditions of Cuba and Puerto Rico account must be taken of the indolent character of the creole population. Temperament has much to do with the natural desire for intellectual advancement. A proof of the enormous power of this sort of *vis inertiæ* is found in the small attendance of children in the Puerto Rican schools, even now that the law of compulsory education is supposed to be operative.

It is useful here to pause and contrast, so far as the relative conditions enable us to contrast, the efforts which Spain made to educate her colonial Indian population with those made by England among similar populations elsewhere. England has been nearly as long the dominant power in the East Indies as the Spaniards had been in the Western ones when we expelled them. It is remarked by Professor Reimer, in a paper on "Education in India" given in the same Report, that England paid no attention to the educational status of her dependency until the year 1781, when Warren Hastings, the notorious Governor General, founded the Calcutta Madrasa for the education of Mahommedans, and incidentally gave some help toward educating Eurasians and Hindoos. The world has been making gigantic strides forward in the same direction since then, but it can hardly be said that either the East India Company or its successor, the British Government, did much to enable the Indian people to keep pace with the leaders. There is not even now any general system of education, nor any compulsory law of school attendance. No doubt there are peculiar difficulties in the way, owing to the multiplicity of races, religions, philosophical systems and languages, and, most formidable of all, the all-pervading and all-paralyzing caste system. But this apology or excuse may be met with the rejoinder that where it has been found feasible, with all these difficulties, to establish a generally operative and uniform system of taxation for revenue purposes, it ought not to be found altogether impracticable to provide for the public school. But how disproportionate to the magnitude of the object were the efforts made by the British rulers of India may be gleaned from the few facts on the present situation set forth synoptically by Professor Riemer:

"From the census of 1813 it was discovered that on the average in British territory one person in thirty-nine, including women, could read. In the native States of Northwestern India in 1849, before England annexed those provinces, one in forty-one males could read.

"In the year 1822 Sir T. Munro, then governor of Madras Presidency, distressed at the rapid decline of literature and the arts, began a series of investigations in his province on educational lines. From his report, made in 1826, we give this summary: The number of schools and colleges, so called, in the Presidency is 12,498 and the population is 12,850,941, which supplies a school for every 1,000 people. But the governor argues that half the people are women, who are not regarded by the Hindoos as proper subjects of education, so that existing schools are in the ratio of one to every 500 of the people.

"The Board of Revenue, commenting on this matter, concluded that only one in sixty-seven of the population is receiving any education whatever. It then proceeds to halve the population, enumerating only males, then it reckons only those boys between the ages of five and ten years, or school age, then it adds the number of private pupils discovered by the census, and thus makes as its final result that one boy out of three of school age is receiving instruction. Naturally we demur at such juggling with figures.

"Later investigations were made by Lords Bentinck and Elphinstone in the Calcutta and Bombay Presidencies. The general result arrived at by these worthy investigators was that on the average about one boy out of every ten of the proper age was, in 1820-1840, receiving some kind of indigenous education."

Much is now being heard in the way of comparison between the civilizing power of England and that of any other of the colonizing nations. We may very well place the policy of the much-anathematized Spaniard beside that of the Englishman on many matters connected with relation to outside races, and ask any candid critic which of the two really deserves to be regarded as an exponent of civilization. That much-abused word should never be judged by isolated instances, but from the plane of broad historical permanency. Not long ago an unimpeachable Irish witness, Mr. Alfred Webb, making a tour of India, found in many hotels a notice hung on the wall requesting guests "not to beat the servants"—a striking comment upon the present attitude of the people who for three hundred years have been introducing the ways of European refinement into the Indian peninsula. In all the countries settled by Spain, on the other hand, the absence of distinctive barriers between the different races is the chief fact which challenges the attention and compels the admiration of every truth-seeking traveler. The bringing about of such a state of mutual contentment among different races was in itself an educational achievement, if the end of education be to soften natural antagonisms and allay the jealousies and suspicions of man toward his fellow. Not the faintest notion of striving for such a result has the British Government, so far as India is concerned, ever entertained. The mutual hatred of the different races, the scorn of caste toward caste—the irreconcilable feuds of mountain tribes—these discords are her towers of strength and imperial citadel.

Perhaps the paper devoted to the Philippines is the most valuable of Mr. Packard's trilogy, as indicating the frame of mind in which he approached the general subject. The postscript, as in a good many other cases of literary composition, contains the motive of the whole. The author concludes that "the few Spaniards in the Philippines, while they have not made a radical or decided change in the customs and habits of thought of the natives, have nevertheless imposed their religion upon them to a considerable extent, have taxed them successfully and have them under military control." This is one of the conclusions arrived at, and before proceeding to examine any of the others, it is useful to take the foregoing sentence asunder and observe the volume of self-stultificatory assertions it succeeds in cramming into a couple of score words. How can it be possible, one may ask, to impose a new religion like the Christian upon a people formerly steeped in paganism without making a radical change in at least their "habits of thought?" Of the "customs" of such a people there can be nothing useful said, since of what these customs were previous to the arrival of the Spaniards there is nothing known beyond the broad facts that slavery was an institution in the archipelago, that piracy prevailed wherever opportunity presented itself, that the natives worshiped sun, moon and stars, thunder and lightning, the trees, the rocks, the rivers and springs, the sea, the clouds and other things of nature. But these general statements give no clue to the customs which pertained to institutions and beliefs. In the absence of such knowledge it is safer to say that if the Spaniards succeeded in imposing their religion upon such a people, they made as radical a change in their "customs," when these included barbarity and immorality, as they did in their habits of thought. The Spaniards might not have attempted to break down the rude political system—a sort of tribal one—which they found existing in the islands when they came; but we have unquestionable evidence, in the shape of numerous royal decrees on the subject, that the first great reform to which the Government devoted its attention was the abolition of slavery in the archipelago, so far as their jurisdiction extended. In the voluminous evidence cited by Mr. Packard as proof of their action this fact is more than once prominently brought forward. How any dispassionate chronicler can reconcile such a reform with the statement that no change of any consequence followed the introduction of Spanish rule and the Spanish religion it is not easy to divine. It is impossible to avoid the suspicion that such clumsy reasoning is the consequence of a desire to make wild theories of prejudiced and ill-informed writers fit in with the indisputable facts of the present situation in the Philippines, both as to religion and education. It is the old hackneyed myth, so often urged by jaundiced rivals, that the great spiritual conquests of Loyola, Xavier and the illustrious bands who followed in these great souls' wake were mere slapdash feats—baptism without instruction, alteration without conversion. One of the authors relied upon by Mr. Packard (Semper: "Die Philippinen und ihre Bewohner") puts this scandalous charge very plainly in the case of the islanders. "The ceremonial of the monks," he says, "appealed for several reasons to the imagination of the natives, and they were eager to adopt or assimilate the religion which it represented. With comparatively few exceptions they have never understood the symbolism, but have remained half Christian and half pagan to this day."

Many other authorities are cited by Mr. Packard in support of this favorite theory of Spanish success in the conversion and civilization of aboriginal races. It is needless here to adduce more. What we have reproduced serves to indicate the spirit in which he has approached his subject. Weighing it all and recalling the fact that the grand ruling principle in most American pedagogic minds in the secular world is the dissociation of religion from education, one is naturally inclined to ask why it is that in this inquiry so much care is taken to implicate one with the other, as if in the writer's mind they are and should be interdependent, the sins of the one being traceable to the inactivity or neglect of the other? But in refutation of the charge that the religion of the mass of the Philippine islanders is only skin-deep, we may appeal to one pregnant sentence from a Protestant writer, Mr. Peyton, of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, who recently returned from a considerable tour of the region: "They are the most religious and moral people in all the world."

When one takes into consideration the numerous formidable obstacles which had to be surmounted by those heroic religious who undertook the civilizing of the Philippine tribes, even the most prejudiced must admit that the results are astonishing. The tribute paid by Mr. Peyton is perhaps the highest that can be extorted, if we concede that the chief end of education ought to be to make people exemplary in their lives and pious in their hearts. Letters are but a means to this end—in themselves valueless, save as stepping-stones to the higher life of thought and spirit. The distinguished German ethnologist, Blumentritt, who made a prolonged study of the Filipinos, arrives at the conclusion that inherently they possessed a high capacity for education, and rates their intellectual qualities above those of the best race of American Indians. This fact explains in some measure the very large percentage of the Filipino masses who are able to read and write. No doubt this high natural capacity was greatly favorable to the religious orders when they set about their task of instructing the natives; but over against this advantage must be placed the obstacle arising from the multitude of dialects spoken in the archipelago. These dialects—or more properly speaking, languages—are no fewer than thirty-one. The seemingly partial writer previously quoted (Semper) asserts that before the Spaniards came the natives could read and write in alphabets of their own, and that consequently the task of teaching them was easy. He does not adduce any authority for this statement, and the reader is therefore entitled to take it at his own valuation. Seeing that Semper also tries to show that the conversion of the natives to Christianity was little more than the giving new names to old forms of pagan superstition, one is justified in attributing a jaundiced motive to his writings on religion and education in Catholic countries. The large percentage of natives who availed themselves of the secondary schools and the university, as soon as the Spaniards placed such superior facilities within their grasp, confutes the argument of Blumentritt (who, too, seems utterly unable to say a good word for Catholicity or Spain) that "the whole Spanish colonial system signifies a policy which makes great promises and wakens ambition, but does not keep its promises and disappoints the aroused ambition." From the Philippine colleges and universities have come forth many bright living refutations of that invidious charge. The author who advances it himself furnishes the names of the most illustrious—statesmen and soldiers like Dr. Rizal, Marcelo H. del Pilar, Mariano Ponce; artists like Juan Luna y Novicio, whose great painting, "Spoliarium," was reproduced in the Leipzig *Illustrirte Zeitung;* ethnographers like Isabel de los Reyos y Florentino, and linguists like Pedro Serrano Laktar—men whose reputation is world-wide amongst learned circles.

As in South America, the first thing to which the Spanish religious orders devoted themselves, beside the salvation of souls, was the erection of the school house and the establishment of the college. Mr. Packard quotes from numerous authoritative works an array of facts which speak eloquently for the sincerity and celerity of the Spanish orders in the prosecution of this noble aim. He shows how early the work was begun, after the establishment of Spanish rule, which could not be said to be permanently done until the close of the sixteenth century; yet as early as the year 1585 the Spanish King ordered that a college should be established in which the sons of the Spaniards of the archipelago could be educated under the direction of the Jesuits, but the institution—the college of San José—was not opened until 1601. Its first students were sons or relations of the early authorities of the country. In 1630 the college of San Juan Latran was founded by a charitable individual for the orphans of Spaniards. The founder became a Dominican, and the institution remained in charge of that order. Besides the orphans, a large number of boarders, both "Indians" and mestizas, received instruction there until both it and the college of San José were included in the institute in 1870. In 1632 the college of San Isabel, for Spanish orphan girls, was founded, in charge of the Sisters of Charity. In 1694 a mestiza named Ignacia del Espíritu Santo founded the Beaterio de la Compañía, which still exists, and which was soon attended by many Indian girls and mestizas. Other beaterios came into existence later. The convent school Santa Potenciana was founded as early as 1589. The college of Santo Tomás was founded by the Dominicans in 1611 and was formally opened in 1619. Pope Innocent X. conferred the title of university upon it in 1645 with the two faculties of theology and arts, which were subsequently enlarged by Clement XII. by the addition of the faculty of law in 1734. The King became the protector of the university in 1680, and it received the additional title of "royal" in 1785. Its courses and faculties were reorganized in 1870 with the title of University of the Philippines. It had 581 students in 1845 and nearly 1,000 in 1858. Senor Agoncillo, representative of Aguinaldo, the insurgent leader, himself a graduate of the university, says that the total number of graduates is 11,000.

As in every other place where they established themselves, the Jesuit Fathers were foremost in the great work of education. They had set up in Manila and Cavite four colleges, one each in Cebu, Mindanao and Iloilo and two in the Marianne Islands, when the order was expelled in 1767. They were reinstated in 1862 and have now a dozen colleges in charge. Besides they supervise the scientific department of the renowned University of Manila. The observatory there is one of the most valuable institutions of its kind in the whole world. The work done in this establishment would in itself furnish material for several articles; hence it must for the present suffice to mention it merely here.

Regarding the condition of primary instruction in the Philippines, while no specific data regarding its present working are available, the fact that Semper finds that "every village in the province has its public-school" speaks volumes. The larger towns appear to have an abundance of schools. That these schools are presided over by the local priests, of course affords to this and other writers a source of complaint, although for what reason it is not deemed necessary to say. To writers of this bias there is no virtue in any teaching that is not wholly secular.

The latest date at which any statistical information regarding the public schools was obtainable was the year 1890. Then there were in operation 1,016 schools for boys and 592 for girls in the Philippine archipelago, with a total attendance of 98,761 boys and 78,352 girls. That the boys and girls are not educated in the same buildings appears to be another grievance in the minds of secular commentators. The government, in the year named, appropriated the sum of $404,731 for public education.

Besides primary, intermediate and university education provision was made by the Spanish Government for other special lines. By royal decree of October 1, 1890, the School of Arts and Sciences was established at Manila. Here were taught languages, bookkeeping, higher mathematics, chemistry, natural history, mechanics, political economy, mercantile and industrial legislation, drawing, modeling, engraving, wood carving and all the trades. A school of agriculture was established at Manila July 2, 1889, for the purpose of giving such natives as had acquired a common school training a theoretical and practical education in agriculture and horticulture. Similar schools were also established in the provinces of Isabela de Luzon, Ilocos, Albay, Cebu, Iloilo, Mindanao, Leyte and Jalo. They were supported entirely by the government and managed by the clergy.

From this necessarily brief summary it will be easily discerned that no charge of neglect in the field of education, so far as the Philippines are concerned, lies at the door of the power which until lately ruled over them. Whatever the faults of the Spanish colonial system, no one can charge that it endeavored to keep the light of knowledge from the aborigine or degrade him because of the color of his skin.

It cannot but be admitted that the Commissioner of Education is fully sensible of the magnitude of the work done by those who brought this civilization to the Philippines, though he is conservative in his comments upon the subject. He makes a number of recommendations respecting the lines upon which the work should be taken up by the American Government, and we have no doubt that his views will carry weight. The general principles he lays down do not exclude religion from the purview of the pedagogue. The ends of civilization, for instance, he thus summarizes:

"Civilization enables man to conquer nature and make it his servant; to command the services of heat, light, electricity and of all inorganic elements; to command the plant world of vegetation for his uses; to command also the animal kingdom for the same service; in short, to command the services of nature for food, clothing and shelter. Besides this control over nature, civilization should give man access to the history of his race, access to its literature, access to its scientific discoveries, access to its various inventions, and, *above all, access to its moral and religious ideals.* Civilization, in short, should give man command of the earth and likewise command of the experience of the entire race. This shows the goal ahead of us and not merely our partial realizations."

The clause here italicized (by us) is very significant. "Above all" the moral and religious ideals of a people are those barred out by the public school policy of this country, so far as the school house is concerned. They may be striven for outside by the pupils and their friends, if they are desired; but if they are not, they may be relegated to the planet Mars. They had full place in all the Spanish system, and the effect of this generous policy is seen in the splendid moral qualities of the people of the Philippine archipelago. Will our Government have the wisdom to follow this large-minded policy? Will it have the courage to shake itself free from the fetish of secularism and allow those Catholic peoples, who have been always accustomed to the name of the Deity and all holy things in their school houses, to continue this salutary system? This is the question which demands more judgment and statesmanship than that of tariffs, taxation or navigation laws. It will not do to insist that "American" principles must determine it. While it is proposed to omit American principles from the form of civil government about to be introduced in those possessions, no one can consistently demand that such principles shall be imposed in the sole matter of the people's education; for such a course would be merely to stultify those who would have the hardihood to propose it.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

THE STORY OF THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

I.—LOWERING CLOUDS.

IN a former number of this *Review* the present writer endeavored to show that the movement known as the Reformation of Religion in Scotland was principally political rather than religious. It was pointed out that Henry VIII. and the traitor nobles of Scotland plotted in concert to serve their individual ends, and that the weak party of reformers were enabled to work the mischief they had in view under shelter of their powerful and unscrupulous patrons in the temporal order.

The havoc they wrought is evident to this day; yet how it was brought about, considering the means employed, cannot but be matter for surprise. There is little doubt that the reforming party alone would never have been successful without the help of the nobles; while these latter were the hands as compared with the directing brain power—brute force, incompetent if not guided. Yet still there remains scope for wonder that, spite of even the most powerful means, a whole nation could be turned as one man to execrate what they had hitherto held sacred; as though another and an unholy Remigius had mockingly repeated that historic apothegm, "Burn what thou hast hitherto worshiped: adore what thou hast hitherto burned."

Not that the whole nation did so turn; the sequel will witness to the contrary; yet to the superficial reader of history—especially as set forth by Protestant historians—it would appear as though it really did. So seemingly sudden and so appalling the catastrophe that the mind stands aghast at the contemplation of it. For, granting that the Scottish nation as a whole were not willingly and easily led into deadly heresy, yet it is beyond dispute that the reformers, in the long run, won over both a powerful and a numerous following.

What, then, was the reason of this apparently sudden change? It was not so much that the doctrines promulgated during the Reformation period were welcomed with avidity by the people as that the teaching of Knox and his fellows fructified speedily in a soil already prepared by heretics of a century earlier. This is a fact to be steadily borne in mind, for it helps to explain what would otherwise be inexplicable.

The history of England abundantly testifies that the first serious revolt against the authority of the Catholic Church was that instituted by Wickliffe and his Lollards. The principles which these heretics introduced blossomed eventually into the overthrow of religion under Henry VIII. "Out of the floating mass of opinion which bore the name of Lollardry," says Green, "one great faith gradually evolved itself, a faith in the sole authority of the Bible as a source of religious truth."[1] For it should be borne in mind that in spite of continued repression the heresy of Wickliffe continued to flourish in England up to the Reformation itself. Speaking of the reign of Henry VI., the historian already quoted remarks: "Lollardry still lived, in spite of steady persecution, as a spirit of religious and moral revolt."[2] Lingard, referring to Henry VIII., says: "In his third and thirteenth year the teachers of Lollardism had awakened by their intemperance the zeal of the bishops."[3] But better proof than all, Protestants such as Foxe in England and Knox in Scotland gloried in claiming the Lollard "martyrs" as their pioneers in the diffusion of "gospel light." Of this, more hereafter.

The precise period at which the Lollards gained a hearing in Scotland is not evident. "The seeds of *freedom*," as Froude puts it, "were scattered simultaneously in England and Scotland, and the initial symptoms of growth in both countries are visible together."[4] It seems not unlikely that some of the preachers of this heresy came to Scotland in the train of the Duke of Lancaster, their patron, who was compelled to seek refuge in Edinburgh at the time of Wat Tyler's insurrection, in 1381. If such were the case, the favorers of Lollardism followed out their opinions in secret for some years; for it was not until 1407 that they dared to promulgate their errors more openly.

It was during the regency of the Duke of Albany, while the young monarch James I. was being detained at the court of Henry IV., that the English priest, John Resby, was denounced to the ecclesiastical authorities as a teacher of heresy. A council of clergy under Lawrence of Lindores, a distinguished doctor of theology, proceeded to examine the case. Resby was charged with having upheld forty erroneous propositions. Bower, the historian, only specifies two of these—that the Pope *de facto* was not the Vicar of Christ, and that no one could be Christ's Vicar who was not a man of personal sanctity. From other sources we learn that he denied the Sacrament of Penance and necessity of confession. Lindores is allowed by even Protestant historians to have successfully refuted the arguments of the heretic, and since Resby refused to recant, he was handed over to the secular power. The regent is described by Wyntoun thus:

---

[1] "Short History of the English People," chap. v., sect. v. [2] Ibid, chap. vi., sect. I. [3] "History of England," vol. v., p. 113. [4] Froude: "History of England," vol iv., p. 57.

"He wes a constant Catholyke;
All Lollard he hatyt and heretike."[5]

It is, therefore, not surprising that Resby underwent the recognized punishment of the law as it then existed, and was burnt at the stake at Perth, together with his condemned books and writings.

As this was the first instance of the infliction of capital punishment for heresy in Scotland—for it seems probable that legislation on the subject had only recently been made, following the example set by England—it may be well to discuss briefly a mode of proceeding which has been so severely criticized by Protestant writers. Some of these seem to lose sight of the fact that at the age in question the crime of heresy was universally held as deserving the extreme penalty of the law, and that not only by Catholics, but by Protestants as well. If Lollards and Lutherans suffered under the Lancastrians and the Tudors, so also did Catholics under Tudors and Stuarts. It is, therefore, unfair to judge the matter from the point of view of the present century, when men's feelings, principles and ideas are all opposed to the theory of punishing spiritual offenses by secular penalties. Men, their manners and institutions can only be rightly judged by the standard of their own times, and at the period in question the justice of the practice of treating what was regarded as heresy as a crime against society was recognized everywhere.

Not that all men in those days advocated the extreme penalty in such cases as most expedient; we have instances to the contrary. When, for example, in Mary's reign the old laws against Lollards were revived and put into execution, Alphonso di Castro, a Spanish friar and Philip's own confessor, dared to raise his voice in protest. In a sermon preached before the court he denounced the handing over of heretics to the civil power as contrary to the spirit and text of the Gospel. By mildness, not by severity, the intrepid preacher declared, were men to be brought back to Christ's fold.[6]

Such sentiments would meet with the approbation of both Catholic and Protestant in these days, and yet, after all, they justify no one in the wholesale condemnation of men who acted according to the principles in vogue at the period in which they lived. Surely Protestant bigotry has much to do with the sweeping denunciations of the burners of heretics; for in a Protestant land such as England, as late as the reign of George III., the crime of stealing a sum of money greater than one shilling was actually punishable with hanging; yet the fact has scarcely provoked comment.

Again, it is a manifest injustice to judge the conduct of Catholics with regard to religious toleration by the standard of Protestant principles. Catholics recognize the doctrinal authority of the Church as one which all are bound to obey; Protestants allow no such authority in this world. In the case of a Catholic, every wilful departure from the fixed standard of truth is a culpable error which deserves punishment; according to Protestant principles, the only standard of truth and falsehood as regards faith is the opinion of each individual. In the one case, a theory of punishments for such offenses is at least conceivable; in the other, it is a contradiction of fundamental principle. But enough has been said on the subject to justify a practice always condemned with more or less vehemence by Protestants, and treated with reticence by timid Catholics.

---

[5] "Cronykil," bk ix., l. 2773. [6] Lingard: "History of England," vol. v., chap. vi., p. 469.

The execution of the heretic Resby did not, unfortunately, prevent the spread of Lollard doctrines. The University of St. Andrews found it necessary, in 1416, to impose upon masters of arts an oath to defend the Church against the attempts of the Lollards; later on, in 1425, Parliament passed a special act against the sectaries. Legislation, however, had no power against the spirit that was abroad. Bower tells us that the doctrines which Resby had preached were secretly cherished by his disciples, only to reappear later on in renewed strength. In 1433 a second preacher suffered the fate of Resby. This was Paul Crawar, a Bohemian, who, under cloak of exercising his profession of physician, came to Scotland to carry on the teaching which Resby had been instrumental in spreading so widely. Arrested in his turn and arraigned before the ecclesiastical authorities, he proved an able and courageous defender of his views and an acute opponent of the learned Lawrence of Lindores. As Crawar obstinately refused to give up his erroneous opinions, he also was handed over to the civil power, and was led to the stake at St. Andrews. The Bishops of Glasgow and Moray, the Abbot of Arbroath and many Scottish nobles had only lately returned from attendance at the Council of Basle, where the errors of Wickliffe and Huss had received special condemnation, and this fact probably tended to rouse the prelates of the Church to fresh vigilance and zeal in the suppression of heresy.

In 1494 we hear of the renewal of proceedings against Lollards. The district of Kyle, in the Diocese of Glasgow, became notorious from the prevalence of heretical teaching, and thirty persons, including several women, were summoned before Archbishop Blackadder, their diocesan, to give an account of their belief. Knox, who had access to records of the process which have since been lost, enumerates thirty-four charges brought against them. From these it is evident that their belief was practically identical with that of Lutherans. They are accused of denying the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist and the necessity and value of sacramental confession, of refusing to allow prayers to the Blessed Virgin and the saints, of forbidding any honor to be shown to relics or images, of maintaining that priests ought to marry and of using scandalous and irreverent language concerning the Pope, bishops and clergy. Some quotations from these charges, which are often interlarded with abusive remarks by Knox himself, will give an idea of the spirit of these heretics, with whom the later reformers were proud to identify themselves.[7] Here are some of them:

"That every faithful man or woman is a priest."

"That the Pope is not the successor of Peter, but where he said 'Go behind me, Satan.' "

"That the Pope exalts himself against God and above God."

"That the Pope is the head of the Kirk of Antichrist."

"That the Pope and his ministers are murderers of souls."

"That the blessings of bishops (of dumb dogs they should have been styled) are of no value." (The interpolation is Knox's own.)

"That they which are called princes and prelates in the Church are thieves and robbers."

"That Christ at His coming hath taken away power from kings to judge."[8]

The spokesman of the party, Adam Reid, seems to have defended his belief and that of his companions with much skill. For some reason, which has never been explained, the Lollards were not punished, but merely cautioned "to take heed of new doctrines and content themselves with the faith of the Church."[9] Knox relates a dialogue between them and the King (James IV.), which even a Protestant historian casts doubt upon. "The scoffing remarks of the accused as given by Knox," says Grub, "could hardly have been tolerated by King James, and, it is to be hoped, are exaggerated in the narrative."[10]

No more notice seems to have been taken of Lollards or their doctrines, and for the next thirty years nothing is heard of them. But, unhappily, heresy was to raise its head still more defiantly and to prove itself an adversary to be feared. As early as 1525 it was found necessary to pass an act of Parliament forbidding the importation of Lutheran books into the kingdom; for constant intercourse with the continent had brought the tenets of the German reformer before the notice of the educated. The first to preach publicly the new error, which seems to have long been spreading secretly among a considerable number of the community, especially in the northern part of the kingdom, was Patrick Hamilton. He was connected both with the royal family and with the powerful house of Arran. In early youth, according to the prevailing custom, he was made titular Abbot of Ferne; but there is no direct evidence, beyond the assertion of Frith, the English reformer, that he was ever ordained priest; indeed, his youth would seem to militate against the possibility, for he was not twenty-five when he died. Being suspected of heretical leanings, he judged it prudent to leave the country, and entered the University of Wittenberg. Here he made the acquaintance of Luther and Melancthon and became an enthusiastic convert to Protestantism. Returning to his native country, he began energetically to promulgate the doctrines he had accepted.

---

[7] "By these articles, which God of His merciful providence caused the enemies of His truth to keep in their registers, may appear how mercifully God hath looked upon this realm, retaining within it some spark of His light, even in the time of greatest darkness." Knox: "History of the Reformation," (ed. 1644), p. 54. [8] Ibid. [9] Spottiswood: "History of the Church of Scotland," Vol. I., p. 121. [10] "Ecclesiastical History of Scotland," Vol. I. p. 389 (note.)

It was not long before his zeal brought him before the notice of Archbishop James Beaton, the Primate, and Hamilton was summoned before an ecclesiastical tribunal at St. Andrews. He was accused of holding, among others, the following heretical tenets: That the corruption of sin remains in infants after baptism; that man is justified by faith alone; that auricular confession is not necessary to salvation; that there is no purgatory; that the Pope is Antichrist. Remaining obstinate in his opinions, he was sentenced to be deprived of all ecclesiastical dignities and privileges and was handed over to the secular power. In accordance with the rigorous laws of the period he was condemned to be burnt at the stake, and suffered in front of St. Salvator's College at St. Andrews, February 29, 1528.

The execution of one so nobly connected created a great impression in the country. Sympathy inclined to the side of the heretic, a man of deep religious feeling, who had in the first years of manhood met his fate with constancy and courage, and his example tended to fan the flame of heresy. Knox relates an anecdote which illustrates the state of things. "A merry gentleman named John Lindsey," he says, "familiar to Bishop James Beaton, standing by when consultation was had (i. e., concerning the punishment of heresy) said: "My Lord, if ye burn any more, except ye follow my counsel, ye will utterly destroy yourselves; if ye will burn them, let them be burnt in hollow cellars; for the smoke of Mr. Patrick Hamilton hath infected as many as it blew upon.' "[11]

As yet the bulk of the nation were free from infection, but it is evident from the continual enforcement of the laws against heresy at this time that the new opinions were gathering strength. A few years after Hamilton's execution other heretics began to pay the penalty of their obstinacy in unbelief. The years 1533-1539 saw many such called to account and punished. The first victim after Hamilton was a Benedictine monk named Henry Forrest. Knox says that he was put to death "for no other crime but because he had a New Testament in English."[12] Foxe, however, who was also a contemporary, relates that Forrest declared that "Master Patricke Hamelton died a martyr, and that his articles were true."[13] As these "articles," which have already been alluded to, were decidedly heretical, such a statement might well condemn Forrest.

---

[11] **Knox:** "History," (ed. 1644), p. 63.

Following the trial of the Benedictine came that of a layman, David Straiton, of the house of Lawrieston, and of a priest named Norman Gourlay. They were brought before the Bishop of Ross, acting for the Primate; James V. himself, "all cloathed in reid,"[14] was present. Both of the accused were condemned and burned "at the *Rude* of Greenside, between Leth and Edinbrug, to the intent that the inhabitants of Fife, seeing the fire, might be stricken with terrour and feare."[15] Their execution took place on August 27, 1534. Several other heretics suffered during this period; among them were Thomas Forret, a canon regular of Inchcolm; Duncan Simson, a priest of Stirling; a layman named Forrester and two Dominican friars named Beveridge and Keillor, who were all burned at Edinburgh in 1539, while a friar minor named Jerome Russell, and a layman, Kennedy by name, suffered at Glasgow in the same year. It should be borne in mind that all these executions were sanctioned by the provisions of an act of Parliament passed in 1535, renewing the old prohibition against heresy and forbidding the keeping of heretical books.

Many of those accused of holding Protestant opinions "burned their bill," or recanted, when brought to justice. The phrase originated in the practice of publicly burning a dry fagot, in token that the heretic destroyed the instrument which would have caused his death. Others fled to the continent at the approach of danger. Among these were Alexander Aless, a canon of St. Andrews, who afterwards became a prominent Protestant theologian in Germany, and Gavin Logie, principal of St. Leonard's College at St. Andrews, besides some of the canons regular of Cambuskenneth. Alexander Seaton, a Dominican, confessor to James V., was a preacher of heresy and a violent denunciator of the bishops. He managed to escape to England, but is said to have retracted his errors before his death. The perversion of any friar or religious is recounted with especial joy by Knox. "Light burst out in the midst of darkness," he says, "for the truth of Christ Jesus entered even into the cloisters, as well of friars and monks as of canons. John Lyn, a gray-friar, left his hypocritical habit and the den of those murderers the gray-friars."[16]

---

[12] Knox: "History," (ed. 1644), p. 66. [13] Foxe: "Book of Martyrs," bk viii. [14] Pitcairn: "Crim. Trials," Vol. I., p. 210.* The red robes were the judicial dress of the period. [15]. Ibid.

Cardinal Beaton, who succeeded his uncle in the primacy, continued the same policy with regard to the promoters of false doctrine, and won the lasting hatred of Henry VIII., as well as of all the Scottish sectaries. It was his zeal for the defense of the Catholic faith no less than his patriotism which eventually led to his assassination by some of the reforming faction at the instigation of the English monarch. Still, compared with the many who had suffered for their opinions under his predecessor, the number condemned to capital punishment during the Cardinal's primacy were few—not more than seven in all. The last of these, George Wishart, whose suspected part in the plot against the Cardinal's life has already been discussed,[17] was one of the prominent members of the Protestant sect. His death created a profound impression in the country. "No single event," says Grub, "during the persecution in Scotland seems to have caused such a deep feeling in the popular mind as the burning of Wishart. . . . The Cardinal became an object of hatred to a large proportion of the people, and those who held the new opinions increased in number and influence."[18] Yet even now, as Knox himself is forced to confess, "the most part of the nobility of Scotland had either given him their bands of manred, or else were in confederacy and promised amity with him."[19]

The only obstacle to the victory of the English party and their allies the reformers was removed by the dastardly murder of Cardinal Beaton. It was at this crisis that Knox came prominently forward as a representative of the cause, in place of his former master, Wishart. By his presence in the Castle of St. Andrews, in company with the Cardinal's murderers, he identified himself with the English party; he had long taken part in the spiritual side of the movement. It was during the fourteen months that he spent in that stronghold that Knox, at the earnest request of his companions, as he says, consented to take upon himself the office of preaching. He had already received priests' orders in the Catholic Church, but had now for some four years professed himself a Protestant. Henceforth he was to figure as the champion of the new religion in Scotland. When, by the help of French allies, the rebels inside the castle were forced to capitulate to the Scottish party, Knox, together with the others, was conveyed to France and condemned to the galleys. Liberated after three years by the intercession with the

---

[16] Knox : "History of the Reformation," (ed. 1644), p. 68. [17] *American Catholic Quarterly*, April, 1899, p. 74. [18] "Ecclesiastical History of Scotland," Vol. II., p. 27. [19] "History of Reformation," (ed. 1644), p. 98. *Manred* or *manrent* was the bond of engagement to a superior to take his part in disputes and appear in arms at his call. Vide Jamieson's "Scottish Dictionary."

French King not only of Edward VI. of England, but also of Mary of Guise, the reformer repaired to the court of his Protestant benefactor, and for some five years he did not trouble Scotland, spending his time either in England or in one or other of the reformed continental countries.

Meanwhile Mary of Guise, the Queen Mother, succeeded Arran as Regent in 1554, and her authority was recognized by the estates of the kingdom. A woman of ability and sound judgment, and a conscientious Catholic, she set herself to heal the religious and political divisions which were causing such trouble to the nation, and succeeded in preserving external peace and in gaining the respect of all. It was her policy to tolerate the reforming party as long as they conducted themselves as peaceable subjects; indeed, she has incurred the unjustifiable reproach of having privately favored the new doctrine. Such a charge can hardly stand in face of the constant revilings which Knox heaps upon the head of this much-enduring Queen. He alone of both Catholic and Protestant historians has dared to make the vilest insinuations against her moral character.

The peace which reigned in Scotland till 1555 was broken by the return of Knox from Geneva. His presence helped to rouse the sectaries from their quietude. He thus relates the state in which he found them. "At the first coming of the said John Knox, he perceiving divers, who had a zeal to godliness, make small scruple to go to the Mass or to communicate with the abused sacrament in the papistical manner; began, as well in privy conference as in preaching, to shew the impiety of the Mass, and how dangerous a thing it was to communicate in any sort with idolatry; wherewith the conscience of some being affrighted, the matter began to be agitate from man to man."[20]

The consequence was that Protestantism began again to assert itself openly. Many of the nobility attached themselves to the cause, among them being the Lord James Murray, titular prior of St. Andrews, the illegitimate son of the late King, Lord Erskine, Lord Lorn and others. Knox went from place to place, preaching and "ministering the Lord's table." The Earl of Glencairn became one of his notable patrons. "Divers from Edinburgh and from the country about assembled, as well for the doctrine as for the right use of the Lord's table, which before they had never practised."[21] The report of these proceedings reached the ecclesiastical authorities, and Knox was summoned to give an account of himself before the bishops in the Black Friars' Church, Edinburgh. For some unexplained reason this summons was recalled, and on the very day when he should have appeared before his judges, the reformer publicly preached in the capital to "a greater audience than ever before he had done in that town."[22]

---

[20] Knox: "History of the Reformation," (ed. 1644), p. 117. [21] Ibid, p. 118.

Emboldened by circumstances, Knox, at the instigation of the reforming nobles, addressed an audacious letter to the Queen Regent, in which, after declaring that the Catholic religion was "a cup invenomed, of which whosoever drinketh (except that by true repentance he after drink of the water of life), drinketh therewith damnation and death,"[23] he goes on to persuade her to embrace the grace offered, to accept the religion he preaches. The Queen read the letter, but mortally offended the writer by a mocking remark upon it, which eventually reached his ears, to one of the Catholic prelates.

Although the reformer was bold enough in writing, scrupling not to apply to black friars the title of "black fiends," to the bishops that of "dumb dogs," and to priests generally the name of "Baal's shaven sort," with many other choice epithets, yet he seems to have thought "discretion the better part of valor" when, in 1556, an invitation arrived from Geneva asking him to become pastor to the Protestant community there. His "apology for our departure," written at the time, shows that he was in fear of his life when he accepted this way out of his difficulties. "Judging with all charity," says a Protestant historian, "it must be admitted that whilst his writings at this season had all the impassioned zeal, his conduct betrayed some want of the ardent courage of the martyr."[24] Knox had scarcely left Scotland when he was again summoned by the bishops. Although he failed to appear, he was tried and judged guilty of heresy, and was burnt in effigy in the market place at Edinburgh. These proceedings led to his "appellation of John Knox from the cruel and most unjust sentence pronounced against him by the false bishops and clergy of Scotland." The very title is evidence of the arrogance with which he assumed the position of sole teacher of truth. Besides defending himself against the right of the bishops to condemn him, Knox in this lengthy document lays down the proposition that prophets and preachers divinely appointed by Christ (Knox, of course, being one) might appeal from the judgment of the visible Church to the civil authority, and maintains, moreover, the duty of every member of the commonwealth to punish idolatry and similar crimes with death. The latter argument seems put forward as a justification of the murder of Cardinal Beaton.

The bold appeal of their leader encouraged the Protestant party to greater publicity in their preaching. The Regent, anxious to keep peace, especially among the nobles, would suffer no steps to be taken against them for some time; at length, under pressure she summoned Methven, a baker of Dundee, and one of the prominent preachers to appear before a council of clergy. He came attended by such a rabble that the Regent was alarmed, and issued a proclamation that all who had no lawful business in the city should depart for the Border, the seat of war at the time, for fifteen days. A number of the Protestants in spite of this forced their way to the Queen's presence at Holyrood and boldly stated their grievances, their spokesman, Chalmers of Gaithgirth, covertly alluding to the coming bribery of the nobles by church property to take the side of the reformers in the words: "We avow to God we shall make a day of it. They (the bishops) oppress us and our tenants for feeding of their idle bellies; they trouble our preachers and would murder them and us; shall we suffer this any longer? No, madam, it shall not be." Knox's description of the scene adds: "And therewith every man put on his steel bonnet." The Regent endeavored to pacify them by gentle words. "There is something touching," says Dom Hunter-Blair, "in Mary's gentle appeal, in her simple broken Scotch, to these rude invaders of her privacy: 'My joys, my hearts, what ails you? We mean no evil to you, nor to your preachers. The bishops shall do you no wrong. Ye are all my loving subjects. . . . We will hear the controversy that is betwixt the bishops and you; they shall do you no wrong. . . . O, my hearts, should ye not love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your mind, and should ye not *luif* your neighbours as *yourselfes?*' Knox's charitable comment on this is: 'O, crafty, flatterer!' "[25]

---

[22] Knox: "History," p. 118. [23] Ibid, p, 401. [24] Fraser Tytler: "History of Scotland," Vol. II., p. 84, note.

The mildness of the Regent still further encouraged the Protestant party. The statue of St. Giles in his church at Edinburgh had been desecrated and destroyed by the reformers. On the feast of the saint, who was the patron of the city, another image was procured and borne in procession, the Queen being present. "Who was there to lead the ring," says Knox, "but the Queen Regent herself, with all her shavellings, for honour of that feast?" When the Queen had retired, the mob, instigated by the reformers, seized "the idol," as Knox terms it, and broke it in pieces, and a riot ensued.

The reformers and the nobles who favored them, growing bolder at their increase of power, invited Knox to return; they stated that persecution had ceased, that the friars were losing favor with the Queen and nobility and that they had a firm hope that God would speedily increase "his flock."[26] Knox replied in the following Octo-

---

[52] "History of the Catholic Church of Scotland," Vol. II., p. 231, note. [26] "History," p. 121.

ber, 1557. He rebuked them sharply for their lack of courage and tardiness in action, and urged them to bear in mind "that the reformation of religion and of public enormities doth appertain to more than the clergy or chief rulers, called kings."[27] Spurred on by this epistle, the Protestant leaders assembled for consultation, and on December 3 of the same year signed the bond or covenant which played so important a part in the whole subsequent conduct of these men. In it they solemnly engaged to do all in their power to advance the "Congregation" (as their party was henceforth styled) and to "forsake and renounce the congregation of Satan, with all the superstitious abomination and idolatry thereof."[28] By the "congregation of Satan" was meant, of course, the Catholic Church.

"The Solemn League and Covenant" having been formed, the reformers proceeded to carry out their designs. They forced the "Book of Common Prayer," lately drawn up for England, upon the parish churches wherever they had the power, ejecting parish priests who refused to allow of the innovation and replacing them by Protestant preachers.[29] The revolutionary character of the movement was now apparent. "Observe," says Bishop Keith, himself a Protestant prelate, "how these men give orders to the whole realm. Such an act would be justly adjudged high treason now; I know not what it might be then."[30]

The Lords of the Congregation were but applying the principle that Knox had all along inculcated upon his followers. The old Lollard doctrine had been furbished up by the new heretics; no man had a right to rule or to teach whose life was not eminent for godliness, and Knox and his followers arrogated to themselves the power of judging between the godly and the ungodly. They constituted the "true Church;" all others belonged to the "synagogue of Satan" or "the Church of Antichrist." Who can blame the Catholic prelates and nobles if, stung by the virulent tongues of the reformers and irritated at their unprecedented arrogance, they should at times have allowed their zeal to go beyond bounds in punishing these delinquents against the laws of both God and man?

The execution of the last Protestant who suffered death for religion in Scotland was certainly impolitic and, as it seems to us at the present day, uncalled for. Walter Milyn, an old man of eighty, had renounced his priesthood and married when he accepted the Protestant teaching in Cardinal Beaton's days. Thrown into prison by that prelate, he had escaped, and after years of retirement began to preach his new belief publicly. He was seized, tried, condemned and executed, his death still further exasperating the growing party of heretics. The leaders of the Congregation used every effort to fan the flame of dissatisfaction which the death of Milyn had enkindled among the people. Their agents moved everywhere, enlisting adherents throughout the country and gaining popular support by every means in their power. Emboldened by success, the Congregation ventured to petition the Regent for toleration. They demanded the privilege of meeting publicly or privately for prayer, at which meeting any qualified person might interpret hard passages of Scripture, and also of administering Baptism and the Lord's Supper in the vulgar tongue.

---

[27] Knox: "History," p. 122. [28] Knox: "History," p. 124. [29] Ibid, p. 125. [30] "History of Affairs of Church and State," p. 66.

The Catholic clergy were willing to grant the liberty of prayers and baptism in the vernacular, provided that everything took place in private; they required, however, that the Catholic teaching regarding the Mass, purgatory, prayers for the dead and the invocation of saints should be upheld. This did not satisfy the reformers. The Regent eventually promised toleration on the two points named in the petition, on condition that no public assemblies of Protestants should be held at Edinburgh or Leith. The fact was, she was anxious to avoid a conflict between parties till the marriage of her daughter, Queen Mary, with the Dauphin Francis, and the recognition of that Prince as King-consort had been ratified by Parliament. Her action towards the reformers, therefore, was dictated by policy merely, and not from any sympathy with their particular views, as Knox would fain have us believe. As a proof of this we have her subsequent refusal to accede to their wishes, when they were anxious to petition Parliament for the suspension of the laws against heresy and the protection of the Congregation in the matter of freedom of teaching.

It is not necessary to dwell here upon a subject which was discussed in a former article,[31] and enquire how it was that the common people were so easily led. An attempt to remedy the neglect of systematic religious teaching—a neglect of which all writers complain—was made by the bishops of the Scottish Church, in the authorized Catechism drawn up at the command of the Provincial Council held in 1552. Besides this work another was published in 1558 with the authority of the Primate; this was stigmatized by Knox "The Twapenny Faith," probably on account of the price at which it was sold. It comprised an instruction on the Mass and Holy Communion. Another work which produced a great effect and induced many waverers to renew their allegiance to the Church was Abbot Kennedy's "Compendious Tractate." This was a clear and detailed explanation of the doctrines of faith and a refutation of the errors then prevalent. Quintin Kennedy was abbot of the

---

[31] *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, April, 1899.

Cluniac-Benedictine House of Crossraguel, in Ayrshire. He was not only one of the most learned ecclesiastics of his time, but also one of the most pious and exemplary. The abbot employed his skill in argument in another manner. In March, 1559, an apostate friar named Willock preached in Ayr, where he had formerly been an inmate of the Dominican Convent.[32] His subject was the Mass, which he maintained had been condemned by SS. Irenæus, Hilary, Chrysostom and other Fathers. Abbot Kennedy, hearing of these sermons and suspecting that Willock was trading upon the ignorance of his hearers, offered to show by the Word of God, according to the judgment of the most approved doctors, that whosoever asserts the Mass to be idolatrous is himself a heretic. Willock accepted the challenge and proposed a discussion in St. John's Church. He, however, stultified himself by declaring that he could only abide by the authority of the said doctors as far as they were in accordance with the Scriptures. As it was impossible to accept such slippery conditions, the affair came to nought.

In the month of January, 1558-9, an extraordinary document was found affixed to the gates of all houses of friars, giving warning in threatening language of the treatment they were to expect at the hands of the reformers. The friars, be it noted, were the most fervent of the clergy in preaching the truths of faith, and consequently were proportionately hated by the heretics. The document in question bore the name of "The Beggars' Warning." It was drawn up in legal form; its title ran thus:

"The blind, crooked, bedridden widows, orphans and all the poor so visited by the hand of God as cannot work: to the flocks of all friars within this realm, we wish restitution of wrongs past and reformation in times coming for salvation."[33] After stating that the alms of Christian people belonged to the poor alone, the deed went on to declare that the friars, "whole of body, strong, sturdy and able to work," had stolen them for their own use; that they had built for themselves "great hospitals" to dwell in, and that these of right belonged to the poor. It then called upon them to give up their ill gotten goods that the rightful owners might enter in "betwixt this and the feast of Whitsunday next;" failing to leave, they, the poor, would enter "in whole number (with the help of God and assistance of His saints on earth) . . . and eject" the present possessors utterly. It is difficult to avoid seeing in this effusion the determination to carry out by force what was actually accomplished almost exactly at the date foretold.

It was now evident that a struggle was imminent between the opposing parties in religion. The cry of the reformers against the unworthy lives of some of the clergy had been dinned into the ears of the people till it began to be accepted by the unlearned as a maxim that the truth of the Church was to be tested by the moral character of her ministers. It is extraordinary how Knox and his followers continually seized the opportunity of driving home this sophistry. Some extracts will illustrate this. "The pride, ambition, envy, excess, fraud, spoil, oppression, murder . . . that is used and maintained amongst that rabble of priests, friars, monks, canons, bishops and Cardinals cannot be expressed. I fear not to affirm, neither doubt I to prove, that the papistical Church is further degenerate from the purity of Christ's doctrine, from the footsteps of the Apostles and from the manners of the primitive Church than was the Church of the Jews from God's holy statutes, what time it did crucify Christ Jesus."[34] Again, he promises the people of Scotland that he will "prove the religion which amongst (them) is maintained by fire and sword to be false, damnable and diabolical."[35] In the first petition to the Queen Regent drawn up by Knox, after complaining of the "cruel tyranny" of the clergy, the reformers state that they "seek the amendment of their (the churchmen's) corrupted lives and Christ's religion to be restored to the original purity." All through his writings Knox continually inveighs against the "idolatry" of the Catholic Church and immediately attacks the morals of the clergy as though immorality and false doctrine were inseparable companions. But such sophistry is not peculiar to Knox or to the period in which he lived.

---

[32] Lesley, the earlier writer, says that Willock was a Dominican ; Spottiswood, who lived a generation later, calls him a Franciscan. [33] Knox : "History," p. 130.

On their part the clergy, in their frequent assemblies, initiated the necessary reforms, and could the salutary decrees of the Council of Trent have been suffered to extend to Scotland, the result would have been that the Church in that country would have undergone reformation rather than destruction. But measures were taken too late to prevent the catastrophe now imminent.

Knox had been nearly three years on the continent before he made any serious effort to resume his disastrous work in Scotland. During that time he had been occupied in ministering, in company with Whittingham, afterwards Dean of Durham, to the English congregation at Geneva. The boldness which always characterized his writings, if it did not always appear in his actions, was not wanting during this period. The accession of Mary Tudor to the English throne stirred up all his bitter hatred of the Catholic Church, and he burst forth into the slanderous attack styled "The First Blast of the Trumpet against the monstrous Regiment of Women." In it he maintained that "To promote a woman to bear rule, superiority, dominion or empire above any realm, nation or city is repugnant to nature, contumely to God, a thing most contrarious to His revealed will and approved ordinance and, finally, the subversion of good order, of all equity and justice."[36] The tract abounds in abuse of Mary Tudor, whom the writer alludes to in such phrases as "cursed Jezebel of England, with the pestilent and detestable generation of papists," "that horrible monster Jezebel of England," "the monstrous empire of a cruel woman," and the like. He lays it down as binding upon "the nobility and estates by whose blindness a woman is promoted to remove from honour and authority that monster in nature; so call I a woman clad in the habit of man, yea, a woman against nature reigning above man." Moreover, he maintains that those who presume to defend "that impiety" (i. e., of female rule) are worthy of death, and it is a duty "not to fear first to pronounce and thereafter to execute against them the sentence of death."[37] This incitation to rebellion, though ostensibly directed against the English Queen, was equally applicable to the young Queen of the Scots and her mother the Regent, and was doubtless intended to be so read.

---

[34] "Appellation of John Knox." "History," (ed. 1644), p. 365. [35] Ibid, p. 367.

After the formation of the "Congregation" in 1557, the leaders once more tried to induce Knox to return to Scotland. He did not, however, think it expedient to do so, and the Scottish reformers begged Calvin to use his influence to persuade Knox to accede to their wishes. In November, 1558, Mary of England died, and Protestant exiles began to flock home from the continent. Knox at length resolved to take up the work he had begun in Scotland, and accordingly left Geneva in January. His treatise on female government was naturally as obnoxious to Elizabeth as it had been to Mary, and Knox was refused admission to England. He accordingly set sail for Leith, where he landed in May, 1559.

It was a critical moment. The Regent had publicly avowed her determination to prohibit the public exercise of Protestant worship, and to suppress any violent opposition to the established religion. A proclamation was issued forbidding any one to preach or administer the sacraments without leave from the bishops. Some of the reformers had openly disregarded the prohibition, and had been summoned to answer for their contumacy at Stirling. The Easter of that year, as though to emphasize the policy which the Regent intended to pursue, was kept by the court with unusual solemnity of ceremonial—the Queen receiving Holy Communion publicly.

Yet, in spite of the apparent intention of the government to protect religion and to repress heresy with a firm hand, the storm which had been long gathering was soon to break in all its fury over unhappy Scotland.

---

[36] "History," p. 137. [37] "Blast of the Trumpet," "History," (ed. 1644), p. 421. [38] Ibid, p. 434.

Dom Michael Barrett, O. S. B.

Fort Augustus, Scotland.

THE CHURCH AND THE CHURCH PROPERTY IN THE ISLAND OF CUBA.

THE withdrawal of the authority of Spain from the island of Cuba, effected on the 1st of January, 1899, left the Cuban territory in the hands and under the power and control of the United States of America. But this holding by us of that island, different from the holding by us of Puerto Rico or the Philippine Archipelago, is not to be permanent, or in full, as a result of the exercise of sovereign rights, acquired by conquest and confirmed by cession in the Treaty of Peace; but temporary, limited, and merely in trust for the Cubans, until they may become able, under the guidance of the United States, "to attain," as set forth by President McKinley in his Message to Congress of December 5, 1899, "to that plane of self-conscious respect and self-reliant unity, which fits an enlightened community for self-government within its own sphere, while enabling it to fulfill all outward obligations."

How long that schooling will last, or, in other words, how many years will have to pass before the United States can feel justified in launching into the family of nations a "regenerated Cuba," capable of complying satisfactorily with all her duties, national and international, no man can tell. But the fact is settled, however, and President McKinley has put it as forcibly as possible, that the United States will not "turn adrift a loosely framed Commonwealth to face the vicissitudes which too often attend weaker States whose natural wealth and abundant resources are offset by the incongruities of their political organization and the recurring occasion for internal rivalries."

The duration, therefore, of the American control of Cuba will depend to a great extent upon the Cubans themselves; but no matter how little responsive they may be to the demands of their situation, or how incapable they may prove of comprehending the grave responsibilities which the United States have assumed in freeing them from Spain, the fact cannot be overlooked, or underestimated, that the historical moment of the appearance of the "new Cuba," as a separate, free and independent State, assuming among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle it, is bound to arrive some day.

The joint resolution of Congress, approved April 20, 1898, and the Presidential Message of December 5, 1899, leave no doubt on the subject. Congress declared, and its declaration, through the approval of the President, became a law, binding upon the people and the Government of the United States, as long as it remains unrepealed or unamended, that the United States disclaimed any disposition or intention "to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over Cuba, except for the pacification thereof," and that it was their determination when that end was accomplished to "leave the government and control of the island to its own people." The President, in his turn, declared also that "the pledge contained in the said resolution is of the highest honorable obligation and must be sacredly kept." It is, therefore, doubtless that no matter how long it may take for "the future to determine in the ripeness of the events" when the coming of the "new Cuba" will take place, that coming will not fail—in the present state of the case—to be, sooner or later, an accomplished fact.

Under these circumstances the question arises naturally whether the condition of the Church in Cuba, after the establishment of the Cuban State, will be better or worse than it is now under the American control of the island, or was before during the Spanish domination, and whether any dangers are, or are not, in store for the Church, her ministers or her property, when the American interregnum ceases and Cuba becomes *de facto* as well as *de jure* an independent Commonwealth.

What has been seen in Mexico ever since 1842, what was witnessed in Spain herself during the first fifty years of this nineteenth century, and what, in greater or lesser scale, has taken place here and there in some other countries, under the influence of so-called "liberal" ideas, might justify the apprehension that, unless the American training proves to be very efficient and thorough, the future of the Church in the island of Cuba is far from being cloudless.

In Puerto Rico, on the contrary, nothing of serious moment can be feared by the Church. Ever since the 12th of August, 1898, when the Peace Protocol was signed at Washington by the representatives of the United States and Spain, Puerto Rico became an American possession, sold by Spain and purchased by the United

States, in consideration of the amounts of money represented by the expenses of the war and by the claims of citizens of the United States against Spain arising out of wrongs done to them in Cuba, from the day of the outbreak of the Cuban insurrection of 1895 to the day of the promulgation of the Treaty of Peace. When this Treaty was concluded at Paris (December 10, 1898) the cession of Puerto Rico by Spain was formally confirmed in its second article. And as that Treaty was approved and ratified and proclaimed on April 11, 1899, there is no doubt whatever that Puerto Rico, although separated by the sea from the United States, is for all effects and purposes an integral part of the national domain of the United States, and that at present, until otherwise determined by Congress, that island is as much under the exclusive control and jurisdiction of the Federal authority as the District of Columbia, or any place or territory, large or small, purchased by the United States under the provisions of No. 17, Section 8, Article I. of the Constitution of the United States, is or may be. If it should happen for Puerto Rico, in the future, to be admitted to all the rights and privileges of American statehood, such an admission will do no more than rivet the American character of the island.

This being the case, nothing in the way of persecution of the Church or her ministers, or of confiscation of her property, can be apprehended at all in Puerto Rico on the part of the Government. And if it is true that the so-called union of Church and State, which apparently, and no more than apparently, existed there under the Spanish rule, might be said to have terminated from the very moment in which Puerto Rico became an American possession, if the provisions of the Constitution of the United States were made applicable to it, it is true, also, that the Church in Puerto Rico will be, under the new régime, as free and as full of life and activity and energy, as it is everywhere else within the limits of the United States. Her action and her influence will never be hampered or restricted by civil official interference; and if she will have to look only to herself for material means of support (which in reality always happened to her) she will be free, in exchange, to acquire all kind of property, to hold it, to manage it and to use it according to her discretion, and her right to do so will never be disputed or successfully interfered with by the authorities.

The writer of this paper is not unaware of the fact that the American Commissioners, Mr. Robert P. Kennedy, Mr. C. W. Watkins and Mr. H. G. Curtis, appointed by the President to make "investigations into the civil affairs of the island of Puerto Rico," submitted a report on the 27th of May, 1899, in which, after recommending that "the Constitution and laws of the United States locally applicable shall have the same force and effect in the island of Puerto Rico as elsewhere in the United States" (Report, page 62) they felt justified in suggesting that "all property (of the Church), including cemeteries, . . . be declared the property of the Government, except that churches, used for religious worship exclusively, be allowed to remain in the possession of the congregation now occupying the same" (Report, page 66); that "priests and others who have taken the vow of celibacy may be permitted (in Puerto Rico) to renounce said vows and enter into marriage relations the same as other persons," and that in order "to remedy the evils of concubinage on the island . . . such cohabitation in good faith be declared binding as a common law (or civil law) marriage, and the children legitimate."

But the just discredit incurred by these strange utterances from the very first moment in which they were made public renders their refutation at the present moment unnecessary. Nothing as un-American and anti-American as such jacobinical ideas will ever be permitted to flourish in the United States; and the fact is self-evident that in the event, more than improbable, of any hostile movement, either on the lines suggested by the Commissioners aforesaid, or on any other lines, being ever attempted in this country, an appeal to the Catholic vote, a vote so strong and so much needed, would suffice to restore all things at once to the proper tracks of righteousness and legality.

The future of the Puerto Rican Church, even in regard to material wealth and prosperity, seems to be assured. The Puerto Ricans are Catholic, and Catholic zeal, stimulated and sharpened by the invigorating influence of American ideas and institutions, will work in Puerto Rico the same wonders it has worked in the United States, even in those localities which thirty years ago were distinctive strongholds of bigotry and intolerance. There is no reason to apprehend that the Puerto Rican Church, having become, as she has, through the effects of war and diplomacy, a member of the great American Church, and being placed, as she is, through the same instrumentalities, on exactly the same footing as all the other Churches which constitute the vast and potent unity of the American hierarchy, will not be regulated and conducted as all her sisters are, in so far as all outward manifestations are concerned, in the same manner and according to the same plans, methods and ideas. She will not be less brilliant than the Churches of Massachusetts, Louisiana or any other within the vast area of the United States of America, and the wonderful vitality and potency which characterize those Churches will be equally hers.

This might serve to demonstrate, if demonstration were necessary, the wisdom and foresight of the Holy Father in appointing for the Bishopric of Puerto Rico an American Prelate, American by birth, by education and by intelligent and disinterested attachment to American ideas and institutions. What the Right Rev. Bishop Blenk can do, and will do, in Puerto Rico for the good of the Church, the Puerto Rican people and the people of the United States, do not need to be explained or commended to them. His responsibilities are certainly grave; but his prospects are bright. At all events he is eminently fitted and equipped to bear his burdens gracefully.

In the Philippine Archipelago the situation might be the same as it is in Puerto Rico were it not for the state of war in which unfortunately one at least of its islands is plunged at present. Everything is to be feared from soldiers when engaged in hostilities against people whose language they are unable to understand and whom they consider their inferiors ethnically and in all other respects. The prospect in those islands is therefore very dark, and if the press reports and even the public utterances of over-zealous officers are to be taken as guides, a large amount of trouble is in store for the noble missionaries, whether Augustinian Fathers or Jesuits, to whom all the Christian civilization to be found in that extensive territory, inhabited by not less than 9,000,000 people of different races, customs and ideas, is exclusively due. But as the Philippine Archipelago is now, through purchase, as much an American possession as Alaska or Puerto Rico, the hope may be entertained and cherished that the Washington Government will not lose sight of the fact that by not protecting the Church, or by permitting her to be persecuted or ignored, it will simply throw away, to its own disadvantage, what always was considered with reason the most potential element for the preservation of peace and public order.

The action of the Holy Father in sending to those remote islands as Delegate Apostolic the same eminent prelate who represents his supreme authority in respect to Cuba and Puerto Rico, so well fitted in all respects for his mission, so thoroughly conversant with American ideas and sentiments and with the ideas and sentiments of the people who for convenience sake are called Latin—the Most Rev. P. L. Chapelle, Archbishop of New Orleans—while illustrating again that admirable wisdom to which reverent reference was made before, furnishes a guarantee that the interests of the Church and the interests of the United States, as well as the interests of the Philippine people, will be blended together.

Turning now our eyes to the island of Cuba, as required by the necessities of the present paper, we shall find, from the very first moment, as stated before, that the condition of things in regard to the Church and her property is full of danger and perplexities. That embarrassing condition of things which President McKinley made an effort to avoid,[1] resulting from the creation in Cuba of a dual status, one American for all practical effects and purposes, but *pro tem.* and indefinite; and another, Cuban, prospective, theoretical and full of contingencies of all kinds, confronts the Cuban Church in the most alarming degree. To all the dangers which are usually in store for Religion when revolutionary ideas, through some strange combination of circumstances, succeed in subverting, whether permanently or temporarily, an order of things which had lasted for centuries, and when infidelity and indifferentism are offered opportunities, never dreamed of before, to do their evil work, some other dangers, not less serious, exclusively depending upon this limitation of the American control of Cuba, must be added.

But while it is true that, generally speaking, the powers of the American Government in political and administrative matters and in matters concerning changes of legislation or other changes of fundamental character, are, and must be, limited by what the Attorney General of the United States very properly called "the reversionary rights of the future Government of Cuba" (Opinion of March 25, 1899, in the case of the application of the Commercial Cable Company to land a cable in Cuba), it is also true that in matters of justice, especially when, as in the case of the Church in Cuba, the faith of the United States is pledged by treaty, no opportunity for coquetting with evil or temporizing with injustice can be allowed for a moment. In matters of that kind the authority of the United States is supreme, as the obligation on their part is sacred, to fulfill their engagements.

Under Article X. of the Treaty of Peace between the United States and Spain, signed at Paris on December 10, 1898, and proclaimed at Washington on April 11, 1899, the Government of the United States bound itself solemnly to protect in the island of Cuba, as well as in all the other islands to which that instrument refers, the free exercise of the Catholic religion. "The inhabitants of the territories," so the article reads, "over which Spain relinquishes" (the case of Cuba) "or cedes her sovereignty" (the case of the other islands) *"shall be secured in the free exercise of their religion."*

---

[1] "Nor from the standpoint of convenience," President McKinley said, "do I think it would be wise or prudent for this Government to recognize at the present time the independence of the so-called Cuban Republic. Such recognition is not necessary in order to enable the United States to intervene and pacify the island. To commit this country to the recognition of any particular government in Cuba might subject us to embarrassing condition of international obligation toward the organization thus recognized. In case of intervention our conduct would be subject to the approval or disapproval of such government. We would be required to submit to its direction and to assume to it the mere relation of a friendly ally." (Message to Congress of April 11, 1898.) The prudent advice of the President was not followed, and the United States became the friendly ally and guardian of a "free and independent" people, bound to be left some day to itself.

The learned negotiators of that treaty, all of them men of exceedingly vast information as well as ability and patriotism, were fully aware of the meaning and true import of these words. They all knew what securing the free exercise of a religion means, and they knew also, as everybody does, that that religion, the exercise of which the United States bound themselves to secure in Cuba, was *de jure* and *de facto* the Roman Catholic religion. They knew that it was so, *de jure*, because they knew that the Constitution of Spain of 1876 was the fundamental law of Cuba, and that Article 11 of that Constitution reads: "The Roman Catholic apostolic religion is the religion of the State: the nation binds herself to support its clergy and pay the expenses of worship." They knew also that it was so, *de facto*, because they knew that Protestants in Cuba are *rara avis*, and that the Cubans are always either Catholics or nothing. At present, after fourteen months of American rule, the Protestant churches of Havana, according to the Havana Directory just published, are not more than three: one Baptist, one Evangelical and one belonging to the "Christian Union."

The negotiators of the Treaty of Peace were also aware, as they had to be, that neither the security guaranteed by Article X. of the instrument nor any other obligation contracted either there or elsewhere by the United States in relation to Cuba, could escape the contingency of reversion by the future Cuban Government, which the Attorney General of the United States so distinctly foresaw. In order to meet that emergency they drew up Article XVI. of the compact in the following manner: "It is understood that any obligations assumed in this treaty by the United States with respect to Cuba are limited to the time of its occupancy thereof; but it will, upon the termination of such occupancy, advise any government established in the island to assume the same obligations."

In addition to these solemn engagements, the Government of the United States entered into another (Article VIII. of the Treaty of Peace), by which it promised that "the relinquishment, or cession (of the Spanish sovereignty), as the case may be, *cannot in any respect impair the property*, or rights which by law belong to the peaceful possession of property, of all kinds, of provinces, municipalities, public or private establishments, *ecclesiastic*, or civic, *bodies*, or any other association having legal capacity to acquire and possess property in the aforesaid territories renounced or ceded." It is, therefore, self-evident, under the plain language of this article, that the Government of the United States bound itself to protect the Cuban Church in the possession of the property belonging to her, and to prevent her rights from being impaired by the change of sovereignty.

Unfortunately for all, neither the wise, strong conservatism which is characteristic of the American people and Government, nor the foresight and righteousness of the negotiators of the Treaty of Peace, has proved so far of any avail for the Church. It might be stated, on the contrary, that, as far as the Catholic Church is concerned, the first year of the American occupation of Cuba has been disastrous.

The fact cannot be ignored, no matter how sad and deplorable, that the distinguished General who established his headquarters at Havana on the 1st of January, 1899, and was in command of the island until the latter part of December, never seemed to realize the true import of the provisions of Articles VIII., X. and XVI. of the Treaty of Peace, nor to have had any desire or power to comply with them. Political necessity may, perhaps, have caused him to throw himself entirely into the arms of revolutionists, whose extremely radical ideas, or desire of revenge for supposed wrongs, found ready expression in measures of extreme hostility to the Church, her property and her doctrine; and the spectacle has been given of an American high official, personally amiable and intelligent, representing the highly liberal and enlightened Government of the United States, authorizing with his approval and signature real acts of persecution.

See, for instance, his order of May 31, 1899, in regard to marriages. What necessity he could have had for legislating on this subject and changing the wise provisions of the Spanish law, it is difficult to perceive. Article 42 of the Civil Code, in force in Cuba ever since November 6, 1889, reads as follows: "The law recognizes two forms of marriage: the canonical marriage, which is the one which all persons professing the Catholic religion ought to contract, and the civil marriage, which shall be solemnized in the manner and form provided for by this Code." But General Brooke came forth and said: "Hereafter civil marriages *alone* shall be legally valid. The contracting parties may comply with the precepts of the religion professed by them in addition to performing the formalities necessary for the solemnization of the civil marriage." In Article III. of the same order General Brooke permitted clergymen to solemnize marriages according to "their respective religious beliefs," but, he added, "the performance of this ceremony shall have *no civil effect*."

When the fact is considered that in the forty-five States of this

American Union, and in the District of Columbia, and in the Territories of the United States, there is not a single locality in which a marriage solemnized by a clergyman is not civilly valid, as valid as any other marriage legally solemnized in any other manner or form (A Report on Marriage and Divorce in the United States by Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor, page 51), the novelty of the reform introduced by General Brooke in a country so essentially Catholic as Cuba means simply an insult.

To make it still graver, General Brooke said: "Article IV. Marriages heretofore solemnized in the island of Cuba shall be deemed and adjudged to be valid, and the validity thereof shall in no way be affected by any lack of authority in the person solemnizing the same. . . . *Provided*, that such marriages be duly recorded (at a certain civil office) within one year to be counted from the date of this order." How this recording all marriages previous to 1899 was to be made in Cuba, and on what evidence, was left (Article VI. of the order) to the discretion of the Secretary of Justice and Public Instruction.

The readers can imagine the effect produced in Cuba among Catholic husbands and wives by an order which compelled them to go to a civil officer to cause their marriages, no matter how old in date, or how strongly sanctioned by the Church and the law, to be graciously validated, and which exposed their children to run the risk of being declared illegitimate.

In addition to this rude attack against the sanctity of the Catholic home and marriage, the spectacle has also been witnessed in Havana during this first year of American control of some other attacks not less rude against the property of the Church.

A house in Havana, No. 40 Cärdenas street, belonging to the Convent of St. Augustin, of that city, lawfully acquired by it through inheritance under the last will and testament of Mrs. María Teresa Entralgo, entered and registered as its property on the books of the Registrar of Property since July 19, 1896, and held and possessed by it without opposition of any kind from any quarter whatever, was suddenly seized and appropriated to the use of the Government on the 29th of April, 1899. The case has been presented and is now being examined by the War Department, and justice will, no doubt, be done without difficulty.

One of the main supports of the Church in Cuba consists in what is called "capellanías," ecclesiastical livings or investments, secured by privileged mortgage and strongly resembling the "ground rents" of the United States. It was in former times and is still frequent among Catholics in Cuba to set apart by a "deed of foundation," or by their last will and testament, a certain sum of money, to be permanently invested in such a way as to secure an interest, never exceeding 5 per cent. per annum, to be used either in alms for Masses for the repose of the soul of the founder or of some other person, or in religious festivities, devotions or other pious purposes.

Under the laws of Spain and the repeated decisions, which in explanation thereof have been rendered by the Supreme Court at Madrid, the said "capellanías" are held to be "ecclesiastical property" from the very moment in which what is called their "canonical erection" by the respective Diocesan takes place. As soon as this *auto de erección canónica* is entered on record and published, no authority other than the Diocesan himself has, under the laws, both canon and Spanish, jurisdiction over them. But those laws have been ignored on the ground that they are incompatible with the present condition of things in Cuba, and in spite of the earnest remonstrances and protests of the Right Reverend Bishop of Havana, whose communications have often been left unanswered, the civil tribunals have taken hold of the matter, a number of "capellanías" have been pronounced "free," the Diocesan has been forbidden to exercise his rights and watch over the interests of the Church entrusted to his care, and under the erroneous notion that "by the extinction of the Spanish sovereignty in Cuba the Church and the State there became separated," the Church has been allowed to sustain considerable losses and injury. Through proceedings, merely *ex parte,* called in the Spanish law of "voluntary jurisdiction," the Church may be, as she has already been, deprived of a large part of her revenue.

Things have gone to the extreme of even disputing and ignoring the right of the Diocesan to appoint an officer for the collection of the revenues of capellanías and other property belonging to the Church. By judicial decisions of November 10 and December 8, 1899, a decree of the Right Reverend Bishop of Havana, dated December 7, 1897, appointing a collector of Church revenue and ordering all payments to be made to him, it has been held that "said episcopal decree, whatever its efficiency might have been at the time in which it was issued, lacks now moral force *(fuerza moral),* because by virtue of the extinction of the Spanish sovereignty in this island the Church has become completely separated from the State."

The idea does not seem to have ever occurred to the courts which so argued, that from the fact of the extinction of the Spanish sovereignty in Cuba, or from the fact of the establishment of a republic in the same island, it does not follow at all that the Church and the State have to be separated. The Spanish sovereignty was extinguished in all the countries which are now called Spanish-American Republics, and neither the extinction of the Spanish sovereignty, nor the establishment in them of a republican form of government, brought about *ipso facto* the aforesaid separation. On the contrary, all the original Constitutions and laws of those nations were strongly Catholic; and even now the Constitutions and laws of most of them, including the richest and the most powerful, as Chile and the Argentine Republic, emphatically provide, from the outset, that the Holy Roman Catholic religion is the religion of the State, to the exclusion of all others, and that the State ought to support it and aid it.

Not many days ago the French Republic, which has in Rome an Ambassador representing her government near the Holy Father, and which gives the first place in the foreign diplomatic body at Paris to the Papal Nuncio, refused by an overwhelming vote in her Parliament to expunge from the appropriation bills the provisions intended for the support of the Church.

In this matter of "capellanías" which, owing to its various aspects, religious, legal and financial, is of great importance, clouds of dangerous character seem to have been gathering on the horizon of the Cuban Church. Whether the storm will burst, or will be dissipated, or whether, if it burst, its rage will be felt before or after the advent of the Cuban State, it is difficult to predict. But the black points are there, and prudent men are forced to look at them with concern.

In the "special report" which General Leonardo Wood, Governor of the department comprising the Cuban provinces of Santiago de Cuba and Puerto Príncipe—now Military Governor of the whole island—submitted October 5, 1899, to the War Department, on the condition of things in the territory, which was then, and is now, placed under his authority, the following statements are made:

"Another species of ecclesiastical property which bids fair to cause considerable trouble before the settlement of the country can be effected is found in what are called 'capellanías.'

"A 'capellanía' is a perpetual annuity, payable out of the income of the real property on which it is charged, usually established by testamentary provision and payable to a certain church or certain ecclesiastics, as provided by the will of the founder. It amounts to a perpetual estate in the realty so charged, although provision has been made by law for the redemption of 'capellanías' and the releasing of the property from the incumbrance. The arrears of annual payment due and unpaid accumulate as a lien on the property charged. So many of these 'capellanías' have been created on properties in these provinces and payments have fallen so much in arrears by reason of the continued disturbances in the country that the amounts now due in some cases are in excess of the value of the incumbered property. The effect of this condition is to retard, if not prevent, the rebuilding or reconstruction of properties which have been destroyed or damaged during the war."

The report does not say how or in what manner the removal of such an obstacle to the reconstruction of Cuba can be secured. Certainly no American official, and least of all General Wood, whose superiority of intellect and governmental ability are recognized without difficulty, will ever advise measures of revolutionary character, ignoring the rights of property or coquetting with base subversive feelings of a communistic or socialistic character; and more certainly still no measures of that kind, if advised or adopted, would ever stand for a moment the indignant condemnation of the American people.

On the other hand, the provisions of Article VIII. of the Treaty of Peace, which the special report seems to have overlooked, would prevent the United States from impairing the rights of the Church in regard to that property, even if it were as obnoxious and productive of evil results as intimated.

There is one feature, however, in General Wood's report which, if noticed in due time by its distinguished author, might probably have caused all his sayings on this subject to be either omitted or modified. And that feature is, that while the report dwells, with almost undisguised antagonism, on the "capellanías" belonging to the Church and now held by the Church, it maintains a prudent silence in regard to the "capellanías" of the same character taken away from the Church and now held by the State. If this kind of property is obnoxious, because it prevents the reconstruction of the country, it is not less obnoxious when it is in the hands of the government than when it is in the hands of the Church. The Church at least has not the means of coercing payment of arrears, in the shape of heavy penalties and forced sales, which the government has, and to which at this very moment it is mercilessly resorting.

The American authorities of Cuba are now holding (and collecting and using the revenue derived from them) seventy (70) "capellanías," representing a principal of $46,844, and seven hundred and fifty-six (756) "censos," representing a principal of $309,090.08, belonging to the Church, in the Archdiocese of Santiago de Cuba, and eight hundred and ninety-seven (897) "capellanías," representing a principal of $578,214.11, also belonging to the Church, in the Diocese of Havana. The interest on all this money is religiously collected by the American authorities of Cuba, and as late as in the first week of the month of January of the present year 1900 an official advertisement was published in Havana calling all the debtors for interest on these "capellanías" to come and pay into the Treasury, in Spanish gold, within the period of fifteen days, all that was due by them, with the understanding that the failure to do so would make them incur the penalties established by law.

It seems that the rule of alleged public interest which would work against the Church if she would try to enforce the collection of the annual payments due to her, ought to work with the same strength against the American authorities. The obnoxiousness of the revenue does not change when the beneficiary thereof is the American Government instead of the Church.

Those "capellanías" belonging to religious orders of men were, as will be seen hereafter, in the hands of the Spanish Government, not in ownership, but in usufruct, and in consequence of arrangements under which the government collected and used the revenue, but supported, in exchange, and within certain limits, the original owners. When the Spanish rule ceased they were transmitted and transferred, such as they were, to the American Government. If the American Government enjoys this revenue, as Spain did, it has to pay, as Spain did, its equivalent to the religious orders to which they lawfully belong.

It is perfectly clear that if it proves to be true that the accumulation of arrears of interest will entail, if the payment thereof is uncharitably enforced, the ruin of the present owners of the estates, the Church will be the first to recognize, as always, the great truth which is involved in the principle *summum jus, summa injuria,* and be ready to display that moderation and kindness which are inherent in her nature.

But one thing is to yield and to condone, by voluntary act, and for considerations of public good, what is ours and what is due to us, and another thing, very different, is to impair by legislation, or still worse by military orders, the obligations of the contracts.

The gravest blow, however, which during this first year of American control of Cuba has been aimed against the Church of that island has been the stopping at once, without notice, as if it were a matter of course, and in spite of the provisions of Articles VIII. and X. of the Treaty of Peace, of the payment of the amounts annually due to the Church by the government under laws which were in force in Cuba when the Americans took possession of her territory—laws which have not been repealed thereafter and which, owing to their own nature as involving contractual obligations, can never be repealed or amended.

As will be seen hereafter, in order to obviate the difficulties which might have arisen out of the necessity to return at once to the Church, as ordered by the Concordat of March 16, 1851, all the property which had been taken away from her during the period of persecution which preceded that solemn compact, laws were enacted under which the government was allowed to retain certain property which could not be easily returned, on condition, however, that the title of the Church to that property should not be impaired by the retention, and that the government should pay to the Church, in compensation for the use of that property and out of the revenues thereof, if sufficient, a certain amount of money to be determined annually by agreement between the Right Reverend Archbishop of Cuba, the Right Reverend Bishop of Havana and the Governor General of the island.

By virtue of these provisions the sum of $461,411 was disbursed by the government in 1890-1891 and other fiscal years for the so-called "support" of the Cuban Church: $125,840 for the Archdiocese of Santiago de Cuba and $335,571 for the Diocese of Havana. The total amount disbursed in 1896 for the two dioceses was $403,149.

The sudden stoppage of these payments might have done to the Church all the harm which was probably contemplated and enjoyed beforehand by her enemies, if the Providence of God had not, as always, been on her side. The delinquency of the American authorities in refusing to pay these sums, which were not by any means a present made by the government or a subsidy or assistance granted to the Church by the government, but an equivalent in money for the use made by the government of buildings or of revenue or property belonging to the Church, has been productive, of course, of considerable distress and anxiety among the clergy in Cuba, specially in the high ranks of the hierarchy; but it has not succeeded in stopping the "free exercise" of the Catholic religion, or in diminishing the splendor of Divine worship.

Under this new régime, which is in violation of the Treaty of Peace, in violation of the laws of Cuba, in violation of contractual obligations and in violation of all principles of justice and equity, the priests have been reduced to a condition of poverty which they had never known before, but which they have borne with that fortitude which becomes their ministry. As intimated before, only the heads of the Church, the Right Reverend Archbishop of Santiago de Cuba and the Right Reverend Bishop of Havana may be said to have been left, as far as their personal support is concerned, either to their own individual resources or to the love and religious zeal of the faithful.

It is confidently expected that the American Government, when fully impressed with the idea that it cannot *secure* the free exercise of the religion of the country in Cuba by tending to make any proper exercise of the said religion impracticable, and when fully convinced that it cannot consistently continue to retain and use the Church property and cease to pay for it, will hasten either to return to the Church what is hers, or to enter into arrangements with the respective Diocesans to pay for its use.

Let it be said here, and repeated as persistently and reverently as possible, that if the prudence and wisdom of the Holy Father have been so strikingly illustrated by his appointments for the See of Puerto Rico and his personal representation in the Philippine Islands, those made by him for Cuba are in excess of all praise. The selection of a Cuban by birth, and such a learned, pious and venerable Cuban as the Right Rev. Francisco de P. Barnada, for the Archiepiscopal See of Santiago de Cuba, and of a Prelate so near to his august person, so conversant with American matters and with the diplomacy of the Church, so learned in law and ecclesiastical sciences, so strange to any contention between Cubans and Spaniards or Cubans and Americans, so universally respected for his tact, his exemplary virtues and his piety, as the Right Rev. Donato Sbarretti, for the Episcopal See of Havana, are certainly calculated to secure the result, that whatever the storm may be through which the Church must pass in Cuba, she will come out, in the end, as she always does and has done, gloriously triumphant.

In all questions relating to the property of the Church in Cuba a distinction must be made between the property belonging to the Church as represented by the secular clergy and the property belonging to the Church as represented by the religious orders. The laws and precedents regarding each one are different, and no intelligent solution of any problem relating thereto can be given without first understanding that difference.

During the long period of 323 years intervening between the erection at La Asunción (Baracoa) in 1518, of the episcopal see, which was transferred four years afterwards to Santiago de Cuba, and was the second See erected in the New World, the first having been that of La Española or Haiti, and the importation into Cuba of the novelties introduced into Spain under the influence of revolutionary ideas interfering with the Church, her ministers and her property, the condition of the Church in Cuba, as far as property and material resources are concerned, was one of independence and ease. The Church lived and flourished, securing as she did a glorious record out of her own revenue without assistance of any kind from the government.

That most important part of the organization of the Church which constitutes its main body and is represented by the secular clergy and their work depended for its support on revenues derived from the following sources:

(1) Tithes, originally a right to the tenth part of the product of lands, and stock upon lands, and subsequently a right to collect a pecuniary tax on the same at the rates and in the manner provided by law.

(2) "Capellanías" and "censos."

(3) Voluntary contributions, donations, legacies and pious funds and endowments.

The royal decree of September 9, 1842, took pains to explain, and the explanation is, therefore, authoritative, *interpretatio authentica,* that the obligation of the landowners to pay tithes was founded upon contract, and could therefore be enforced without resorting in the least to any consideration of religious duty. In corroboration of this doctrine the royal decree set forth that the concessions of land in Cuba had been granted by the Crown upon the express condition that tithes should be paid.

This doctrine of the Spanish Government has been, *de facto* at least, endorsed by its successor the Government of the United States, as it has continued to collect the tax in the same form and manner as Spain left it when giving up her sovereignty. There is, nevertheless, a great difference between what was done in this respect by the Spanish authorities and what is now done by the American. As will be seen hereafter much more in full, the Spaniards took possession of this revenue and made it a State revenue, but this was done on condition that the Church should be paid out of it a certain amount of money. The Americans have succeeded the Spaniards in the collection, use and enjoyment of the revenue; but the idea has not as yet occurred to them that they must also succeed their conquered foes in making the payments to which that revenue was previously devoted.

The other important part of the organization of the Church which constitutes that noble branch, so powerfully instrumental to the evangelization of the people and the diffusion of Catholic doctrine, practices and habits, and is represented by the religious or monastic orders, or, as it is said in Spanish, *El Clero Regular,* depended for its support on revenues of its own derived from the following sources:

(1) "Capellanías" and "censos," founded in favor of their respective houses or convents.

(2) Voluntary contributions in money or property, donations, legacies and pious funds and endowments of various classes.

The fact is well known that the monastic orders, whenever and wherever established, have always succeeded in securing a firm hold in the hearts of the people. The essentially democratic character of most of them and the unbounded religious zeal and charity characteristic of all have placed them at all times in close contact with the people and have allowed the work of the Church to be efficiently done, even in quarters which the secular clergy cannot easily reach. But in Cuba, where Franciscans, and Dominicans, and Augustinians, and Belemites, as well as the sons of St. John of God, and others, became so conspicuous from the very first days of the settlement of the country for their staunch defense of the rights of the people, for their uncompromising opposition to tyranny and cruelty, for their efforts to propagate public instruction, whether by teaching gratuitously in their own convents or by opening primary schools free to all, rich or poor, Spaniard or native, white or colored, and crowning the whole structure with the establishment of the Dominican Fathers of the University of Havana, as high in rank and efficiency as the highest in the world, and for their practical ardor, zeal and self-denial in ministering to the poor and the afflicted, by creating homes and asylums for the orphan, the destitute, the leper and the insane, hospitals for the sick and the convalescent and charitable institutions of all kinds, the attachment and love of the people to these orders was intensified to the extreme. The result was that almost from the very beginning the Cuban convents were placed by the people in a condition, if not of great wealth, at least of independence, which rendered all assistance on the part of the government entirely unnecessary.

But the wave of "reform" which had been raging in Spain ever since the importation into her territory of the principles and ideas of the French Revolution of 1789, and had culminated in the iniquitous drastic laws of 1837, succeeded in reaching Cuba in 1841, and caused the state of things just described to be changed completely. Had the "reform" been allowed to have full sway in the island, as it had had in the mother country, the harm done to the Cuban Church might perhaps have been irreparable. But Providence permitted that at the critical moment, owing to that strange power of the Governors General of Cuba—a power which in other respects has been so prolific of evil results—in the exercise of which they could suspend the execution of any law or order of whatever kind or description emanating from the home government which they, in their own discretion, might consider obnoxious or in opposition to the best interests of the Crown or of the people—*facultades omnimodas*—an obstacle was raised against which the whole movement was compelled to stop and then divide its force and mitigate its fury. Over three years were necessary to bring about a settlement. Noble work was then done in favor of the Church and the country by an eminent Cuban, Don Claudio Martinez de Pinillos, Count of Villanueva, who, through his talents and his merits, had succeeded in reaching the position which he held at that time, second only in importance to that of the Governor General, of Superintendent General of the Royal Treasury of Cuba. Through his efforts and those of many other distinguished officials, Cubans as well as Spaniards, the compromise which is known under the name of "the arrangements of 1841-1843" was made and accepted, and became for the time being the law of the country. These "arrangements" consisted in a series of measures by which the most odious and malignant features of the Spanish "reform" were wiped out, and the new *status* of apparent dependence of the Church upon the State was made take the place of the absolute and fully avowed independence which had formerly existed.

One of these compromise measures, the vital importance of which cannot be exaggerated, because it affects the main support of the secular clergy, from Diocesan to simple priest, was raised soon afterwards to the higher dignity of a formal enactment by means of a royal decree dated September 9, 1842, which, while providing that all former laws relating to tithes and turning them from a purely ecclesiastical revenue into a government revenue, should continue to be in force, temporarily, *interinamente*, directed that the government should thereafter pay to the Church, out of funds derived from the said tithes, which were to be primordially affected to meet this obligation, and if not sufficient, out of any other funds of its own not otherwise appropriated, whatever sums of money might be found to be necessary for the support of the secular clergy and the payment of the expenses of divine worship in the Archdiocese of Santiago de Cuba and the Diocese of Havana, as estimated by a Board or *Junta*, which by the same royal decree was established. The government assumed this obligation towards the Church in compensation of the use of the Church revenue, which it assumed to collect and manage temporarily. *Con obligación*, the royal decree says, *de satisfacer las congruas y demás dotaciones que para la manutención del culto y clero de sus diócesis se estimaren necesarias por la Junta que al efecto se mandó crear por el artículo noveno.*

This arrangement, which as will be seen hereafter, was made permanent by royal cédula of September 30, 1852, created the condition of things which General Brooke found in the island of Cuba when, on the 1st of January, 1899, the Spanish flag was pulled down and the flag of the United States of America hoisted in its place at the Government's palace at Havana.

It was a situation of *do ut des,* or of *capio ut capias*—of contractual character, involving mutuality of relations and rights—in which the Government of the United States is bound to-day, as Spain was before, either to continue to pay the stipulated amounts or to return the revenue which had been seized and held upon the express condition that such payments should be made.

Another important "arrangement," subsequently ratified by a royal cédula issued on the 26th of November, 1852, and carried at once into effect with universal satisfaction of the Cuban people, was the one relating to the religious orders or monastic institutions of the island of Cuba. It consisted chiefly in excluding from the operation of the "reform" laws of Spain, for all effects and purposes, whether in relation to persons or to property, the communities of nuns and Sisters of whatever class, and in permitting said laws to be enforced with regard to the communities of monks and friars, only in a modified form, which, while preventing said communities from increasing their membership, either through novitiate or accession, and from managing and using the revenue lawfully derived from their property, allowed the said communities to remain in their convents, under the name of "Congregaciónes Religiosas," reduced to a fixed number of members, their personal expenses and the expenses of divine worship in their respective churches to be paid by the government.

With the exception, perhaps, of the magnificent Church of Saint Francis, in Havana, upon whose portal the inscription can yet be read: *Non est in toto sanctior orbe locus,* no other church was allowed to be closed to the public in the Diocese of Havana. The convent to which it was attached and the Convent of the Third Order of St. Francis, which formed part of the structure, the former being held sacred among some other things from the fact that St. Francis Solano had been for a time one of its inmates, were also the only ones which the government was allowed to retain completely. The Church, owing to its vast dimensions and to its situation on the very edge of the Havana harbor, was taken by the government for Custom House purposes, and the convents gave room to the general archives of the island, to some government offices and even to private lodgings for some favorite employés.

All other convents for men, even when partially taken by the government for public or official purposes, had a portion reserved to accommodate their former inmates, as members who were now of the "Congregación Religiosa" therein established. As to the church or chapel attached to the convent, it was left in the hands and under the care and control of the same "Congregación."

Each one of these communities was allowed to retain its own name, to live according to its own rule, to wear its own habit and to act in all outward respects as if nothing had been changed. But its respective membership could not exceed certain limits, and even the number of attendants or servants was fixed. The superior of each house became its "president." And if the number of friars existing in one convent was larger than the one which the "Congregación" was allowed to have, those forming the surplus were to have positions, if possible, in the secular clergy, as pastors of churches, etc., etc., with permission, however, to continue to wear, if they wanted, the habit of their order. If the number was found to be smaller, the lawful membership should be completed by bringing priests of other orders or, if practicable, of the secular clergy.

The "Congregaciónes" which General Brooke found in Cuba in 1899, and whose members are now laboring under circumstances of stress and poverty almost intolerable, were three in the Archdiocese of Santiago de Cuba, namely, the United "Congregaciónes" of Franciscans of Bayamo and Santiago de Cuba, that of the Fathers of the Pious Schools (Escolapios) and that of the Fathers of La Merced; and nine in the Diocese of Havana, formed respectively by Carmelites, Franciscans, Paulists, Dominicans, Augustinians, Jesuits, Escolapios, Passionists and Trinitarians.

The personal expenses of these priests and those of the cult in their charge were to be met, and met, up to the time of the American occupation, out of the revenues derived by the government from the property belonging to each order, which the government was allowed to retain, in usufruct, but subject to that condition.

The salary of the president of each "Congregación" was $600 per year. That of each "congregado," $480. Sextons, attendants and servants had respectively from $240 to $180 per year.

The expenses of divine worship in these churches were met by a lump sum, varying from $1,200 to $5,180 a year, payable by monthly instalments. The reason of the difference was because those churches receiving more money had also to perform a greater number of religious duties, as otherwise certain donations and bequests made in their favor which the government was interested in keeping alive would have been forfeited.

This was the state of things which existed in Cuba when, on the 16th of March, 1851, a solemn Concordat was concluded between the Holy See and the Crown of Spain, and the provision of that compact, subsequently ratified and affirmed by the Convention of August 25, 1859, were made applicable to Cuba and all the other dominions of Spain. All the seizures of property belonging to the Church, whether made under the crude name of "confiscation" or under the disguised ones of "commutation," "permutation," "nationalization," or something else, were openly condemned and repudiated. Whatever property of this kind was found in the hands of the government was ordered to be returned to the Church, or to the respective diocesans in her behalf, "at once and without delay." Indemnification, to be paid in registered bonds of the three per cent. consolidated debt of Spain, was to be made for the property which had been destroyed or sold or which for some other reasons could not be easily returned. Justice was made at last, and peace, so long disturbed in Spain between the Church and the government, was finally restored and reëstablished.

The provisions of the Concordat, when tried to be enforced in Cuba, were met by an obstacle which was not easy to surmount. Owing to certain reasons, the enumeration of which is not necessary, the government did not deem it advisable—perhaps it was impossible for it to do it—to pay the Cuban Church with those three per cent. registered bonds of the consolidated debt the value of the property which had been taken away from her and could not be returned without great inconvenience.

It was no doubt very difficult to vacate the Church and Convent of St. Francis of Havana and leave the Custom House and the Archives and the other offices established in those large and magnificent buildings entirely homeless. It was not an easy thing to dislodge the University, the Museum, the Public Library and other Government institutions, which had been accommodated with decent quarters in portions of other convents. It was also very difficult, if not at all impossible, for the government to command at that time, after the operations of the same kind made in Spain, such a number of bonds as were required to pay the Cuban Church the proper indemnity. Perhaps it was deemed better to leave Cuba and the Cuban people entirely unconnected with the Spanish consolidated debt. Be it as it may, the fact is that the government, while carrying into effect, in its spirit as well as in its letter, in the island of Cuba the provisions of the Concordat, thought it necessary to do so by means of certain orders of local application calculated to remove or obviate whatever difficulties might present themselves.

The first measure of this kind was the Royal Cédula, or ordinance, of September 30, 1852, relating to tithes. It was provided by it, (1) that the arrangements made or approved by the royal decree of September 9, 1842, above referred to should be maintained and continued, or, in other words, that the government should continue to collect and use the tithes revenue, but on condition to pay the Church certain stipulated amounts; (2) that out of the moneys derived from that source by the government or, if not sufficient, out of any other moneys in the Treasury of Cuba not otherwise appropriated, the salaries of $18,000 per year each should be paid to the Right Rev. Archbishop of Santiago de Cuba and to the Right Rev. Bishop of Havana, both Prelates to have besides, until some other final arrangements could be made, $1,000 the former and $4,000 the latter, to pay house rents; (3) that out of the same sources salaries, ranking from $4,500 to $2,000 a year, should be paid the Deans and other members of the respective Cathedral chapters; (4) that all laws and decrees abridging or interfering with the right of the respective Archbishop and Bishop to dispose by will or otherwise of their own property or levying upon those Prelates any kind of extra burden or taxation should be at once invalidated and repealed; (5) that the same system of classification of parishes as had been adopted in Spain, dividing them into three classes called respectively *de ingreso* (entrance or admission in the pastorate), *de ascenso* (promotion or elevation in rank) and *de término* (end or completion of the career), with salaries of $700, $1,200 and $2,000 a year, should be adopted in Cuba; (6) that in Cuba, the same as in Spain, the fees collected by the curates for baptisms, marriages, etc., should be divided into two parts, one of them to be used for what is called *la fábrica*, that is to say, repairs of the church building and other expenses of that kind, and the other to go to the curate himself, but to be imputed and charged to his salary account; (7) that the sums of $300, $400 and $700 a year should be paid to each church, according to its respective category, to attend with it to the expenses of divine worship; and finally (8) that some other arrangements to complete what was called the "putting of the secular branch of the Church on a firm and stable foundation," arrangements which the royal cédula minutely describes, should be carried at once into effect.

The second measure came out in the shape of another Royal Cédula or ordinance of the same date, and related especially to the Seminary of each Cathedral, to the Cathedrals themselves and to some matters of detail which had been omitted in the preceding enactment.

The third measure was also a Royal Cédula, bearing the same date, in which the ecclesiastical division of the island was carried into effect, the names of each parish, whether *de ingreso, de ascenso* or *de término*, in each diocese, being given in full.

The fourth measure, in the shape of another Royal Cédula or ordinance, dated November 26, 1852, referred to the religious orders, and after paying to them a great and well deserved tribute, and reiterating that under Article 38 of the Concordat all the property belonging to them held by the government and not sold *should be at once released and restored to them or to the respective diocesans in their behalf,* provided (Article 5) that, "in compliance with such a solemn promise," the Governor General of Cuba, "with the advice of the Superintendent General of the Royal Treasury and the proper intervention of the respective Diocesans, should proceed at once to form an inventory of all the "censos," houses, lands and other property, real, personal or mixed, belonging to the religious communities and not sold or disposed of," . . . and that "as soon as this inventory is made the formal obligation should be entered in writing by the Superintendent General of the Royal Treasury, in my Royal name, in favor of the Church as represented by the respective Archbishop or Bishop, to set aside the proceeds of the said property to satisfy the necessities of the Church and to attend, preferently to all other things, to the maintenance and support of the religious houses to which the Cédula refers." *Se extiènda **por el Superintendente** en mi Real nombre obligación formal á favor de la Iglesia y en su representación de los respectivos Diocesanos . . . de invertir sus productos en sus necesidades y con preferencia en la manutención y sostenimiento de los institutos religiosos a que se contrae la presente Cédula.*

These religious houses were those of the Paulists (the Spanish Paulists or clergymen of St. Vincent of Paul, clerigos de San Vicente de Paula) the Escolapios, the Jesuits and the Franciscans. The other orders which, in the shape of "Congregaciónes religiosas," had survived the "reform" were, of course, respected and allowed to continue their work without hindrance.

During the forty-seven years elapsed between the dates of these Royal Cédulas, which might be called the fundamental charter of the modern Church of Cuba, and the 1st of January, 1899, when General Brooke took up his official residence at the palace of the Governors General of Cuba, no substantial alteration was made to the provisions just described. Some orders were transferred from one convent to another, when in the opinion of the Diocesan such a transfer was necessary. The Augustinians, who were few in number, were, as it might be said, concentrated in the building belonging to their Third Order; and the Franciscans, who were more numerous and who, according to the Royal Cédula of November 26, 1852, were to be given preferent recognition, not as a single "congregación," but as a regular monastic order, were given the main convent of St. Augustin. Some other minor changes took place. But the principle was always maintained that the property of the Church which was held by the government was property of the Church, and that whatever money was paid to the Church by the government was money of the Church derived from property retained by the government in usufruct, and when practicable under inventory, the title on which had never been divested from the Church.

The present Governor of Cuba, Major General Leonardo Wood, when speaking about the provinces of Santiago de Cuba and Puerto Principe in his special report of October 5, 1899, above cited, explained the situation as follows:

"The property of the Catholic Church, as formerly established in Cuba, was held by the Spanish Government as a part of the property of the State, the administration of public worship being considered a part of the duty of the government in consideration of the surrender to the State of such ecclesiastical properties.

"The government charged itself with the payment of all the expenses of religion and public worship, including the salaries of the clergy. On the withdrawal of Spain from the island these payments, of course, ceased to be made.

"It is now claimed on behalf of the ecclesiastical authorities that the properties used for religious purposes should revert to the possession and ownership of the Church by reason of the failure of the Spanish Government to meet or to fulfill the obligations contracted when these properties passed into the possession of the State.

"On the other hand, it is claimed by some of the representative Cubans that the Church property may be regarded as any other public property, the Church having parted with all claims to ownership or use when the property was surrendered to the government.

"Pending a settlement of this question by competent authority, the ecclesiastical authorities remain in possession of the churches and worship is held in them, the expenses being defrayed by the voluntary contributions of the worshipers." With the exception of some slight inaccuracies, this presentation of the case is fair.

It is inaccurate to say, for instance, that the property of the Church held by the government in Cuba was held *as part of the property of the State*, because, as it has been shown by the Concordat and by the Royal Cédula of 1852, it was held as *property of the Church*, was managed and administered as such, under inventory, and by a special branch of the government organization, and was specially affected, preferently, if not exclusively, to the payment of the expenses of religion and worship.

It is also inaccurate to say or intimate that Spain ever failed to meet or to fulfill the obligations contracted when these properties passed into the possession of the State. The truth is that that failure is chargeable alone to the American authorities, which stopped at once the payments without stopping simultaneously the possession of the property and the enjoyment of the proceeds.

But the distinguished soldier and statesman upon whom the destinies of Cuba are now practically depending was fair enough to avoid taking sides with "the representative Cubans" to whom he alludes, and recognized without difficulty that an important question is involved in this matter and that that question has to be settled, if not settled arbitrarily, by competent authority.

It is unnecessary to say that the allegation of those "representative Cubans" that the Church parted with all claims to ownership or use of property when the government took possession of it has no foundation at all, either in fact or in law. In fact, because it is clear, as abundantly shown by the record, that the Church never made that parting, and that the government, after having repudiated and repealed and condemned all attempts to confiscate the Church property, ordered it to be returned to the Church. The State was not permitted to retain it, except when the restitution was attended with difficulties, and the retention was then to be merely in usufruct, and subject to the obligations which have been explained. In law, because it is well known, and nobody can doubt it, if versed in these matters, that the Church cannot part with the ownership of the property of churches and convents or of pious funds and endowments specially created for religious purposes.

It is to be expected that the Government of the United States will see without difficulty, that it is its plain duty to release and return to the Church, through the respective Archbishop and Bishop, every piece of property belonging to the Church in Cuba, which was transmitted to it by the Spanish Government, and to pay, furthermore, such indemnification as may be found to be proper for the use of that property since it fell into its hands.

It is also to be expected that the Government of the United States, being true to its word, will not allow any property rights or any rights of any other kind belonging to the Church in Cuba to be impaired, either by its own officials or by the Cuban authorities, on the pretext that the relinquishment of the Spanish sovereignty in Cuba has operated changes which would be in conflict with and in opposition to the provisions of Article VIII. of the Treaty of Peace: that it will practically *secure* the free exercise in the island of the Catholic religion; and that when the day comes, if ever, for the United States to leave Cuba to herself, it will impress efficiently upon the Cuban Government that the obligations contracted by the United States before the civilized world in regard to the religion and the Church of the island must be, to the credit of all the parties concerned, literally and strictly respected.

J. I. RODRIGUEZ.

Washington.

WAS ST. PAUL IN SPAIN?

IN connection with our recent war it is interesting to know, in general, something of the origin of Christianity in Spain; in particular, just how probably St. Paul carried his teachings to the homes of the silver miners and grape growers of that historic land. On what grounds do such church historians as Pearson, Hug, Olshausen,[1] Neander,[2] Fleury,[3] Darras,[4] Hergenroether,[5] Renan,[6] Bunsen,[7] Conybeare and Howson[8] base their belief that St. Paul made a Spanish journey, while Baur, Wieseler, Schenkel and Schaff either doubt or deny it altogether?[9]

It is our purpose briefly to state two explicit and as many implicit proofs, with the views of competent critics, about this subject. In St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (ch. xv., v. 24) it is said: "When I shall begin to take my journey into Spain, I hope that as I pass I shall see you and be brought on my way thither by you." Did he go?

Again, in the Acts (ch. xxviii., vs. 16 and 30), we read that St. Paul came to Rome. Bleek, commenting on this, says: "We may therefore regard it as certain that St. Paul really did labor in the parts referred to (*i. e.*, Spain), for the Acts were surely written some years after the Apostle's second year in Rome, and the way they end hints not of his martyrdom, which should have been mentioned, but rather of his liberation."[10]

So from the inspired writings, St. Paul, above all things a man of determination and untiring physical as well as mental energy, intended to go to Spain; and, moreover, there is no denial of his going. Such being the state of the question, is there no competent and trustworthy witness to fill out the unfinished accounts in the Epistle to the Romans and in the Acts of the Apostles?

I. St. Clement,[11] third Bishop of Rome after St. Peter, who wrote his Epistle to the Corinthians not later than the end of the first century, is such a character. Living at Rome, probably a disciple of St. Paul, and acquainted with St. Paul's projects, he writes that his master "preached the Gospel in the east and in the west . . . had instructed the whole world" [*i. e.*, Roman], and had gone to "the extremities of the West" (*τα τερμα της δυσεως*).[12]

---

[1] Schaff's "Apostolic Church," p. 398. [2] "General Church History," Vol. I., p. 116. [3] "Histoire de l'Eglise," liv. II., § 10. [4] "General Hist. of the Church," Vol. I., p. 47. [5] "Histoire de l'Eglise," Vol. II., p. 197, ed. 94. [6] "L'Anti-Christ," p. 106. [7] "Hippolytus," I., p. 27, second edition. [8] "St. Paul," p. 802, popular edition. [9] Schaff's "Apostolic Church," p. 398. [10] "Introduction to N. T.," Vol. II., p. 60. [11] Though some deny C. of Phil. iv., 3 is C. Romanus, yet all admit the epistle was written in the first century. [12] I. Epis. to Cor., ch. v.

If any commentary on these words be asked Lightfoot should stand first. "In the Epistle to the Romans (xv., 24) S. Paul had stated his intention of visiting Spain. From the language of Clement here it appears that this intention was fulfilled. . . . But it is incredible that a writer living in the metropolis and centre of power and civilization could speak of it as 'the extreme west,' and this at a time when many eminent Latin authors and statesmen were or had been natives of Spain, and when the commercial and passenger traffic with Gades was intimate and constant."[13]

Bunsen says: "It appears to me very arbitrary to deny a fact for which we have the explicit evidence of Paul's disciple and companion, Clemens."[14]

Conybeare and Howson, in their "Life and Epistles of St. Paul," say: "In a Roman author the 'extremity of the west' could mean nothing short of Spain."[15]

And Neander adds: "Since the Roman Bishop Clemens says that St. Paul went to the very boundaries of the west, we cannot imagine this expression to allude to Rome, and our thoughts naturally turn to Spain. Clement was probably himself the disciple of St. Paul, and this is a matter on which we can hardly suppose him to have been deceived!"[16]

Conybeare and Howson admit that: "Against this unanimous testimony of the primitive Church there is no external evidence whatever to oppose."[17]

Despite these fair and able critics, Schaff contends that: "As Clement wrote to the Corinthians he may, from their geographical standpoint, have called the Roman capital the end of the west."[18] But from the citations above it is clear that the burden of the criticism of St. Clement's τα τερμα της δυσεως is decidedly on the side of St. Paul's having gone to Spain.

II. A century and a half ago the learned Italian Muratori printed his "Antiquitates Italicæ," containing, amongst other things, a manuscript of the ninth century. In this old manuscript was imbedded a fragment of a manuscript written some time between the year 160[19] and 190.[20] In the thirty-ninth of its eighty-five lines it speaks of "Paul's setting out from the city [of Rome] for Spain." Schaff quibblingly says: "This is merely a conjecture, as the verb *omittit* has to be supplied."[21] But evidently the substantial sense is clearly something about the *fact* of Paul's setting out for Spain. So that this seems truly a second though less clinching explicit testimony in favor of Paul's going to Spain.

Every student of Church History highly values and dearly loves the "pater familias" of all Church historians—Eusebius of Cæsarea, by far the most learned man of his age, every inch an historian and a lover of the olden days and matters of fact. In the twenty-second chapter of the second book of his Church History we read: "Thus, after he had made his defense, it is said that the Apostle was sent again upon the ministry of preaching, and that upon coming to the same city a second time he suffered martyrdom."

---

[13] Corinthians ch. v., note 6. [14] "Hippolytus," second edition, Vol. I., p. 127. [15] Page 801. [16] Neander's "Hist. of First Three Centuries of Church," pp. 49-50. [17] "St. Paul," p. 802. [18] Schaff's "Gen. Ch. Hist.," I., p. 332. [19] Westcott. [20] Muratori. [21] Schaff's C. C., I. p. 333.

This apparent proof of Paul's freedom after his two years in Rome and, therefore, of his easy chance of fulfilling his purpose of going to Spain, is criticized rather severely by Neander: "The tradition in Eusebius is not sufficient evidence, because it was then too much the fashion to establish facts from incompetent presumptions, conclusions and suppositions, and so perhaps Romans xv., 24 may have given rise to this report."[22] But although Eusebius did write two hundred and fifty years after the event, and although his words are vague (λογος εχει), and although contrary to his custom —he quotes no authority, yet his testimony gains a consideration with many, and offers a third though indirect and less cogent proof of Paul's journey to Spain.

"The best proof of this concluding [missionary] work are the pastoral epistles.[23] It is now admitted by nearly all those who are competent to decide on such a question, first, that the historical facts mentioned in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus cannot be placed in any portion of St. Paul's life before or during his first imprisonment in Rome, and, secondly, that the style in which those epistles are written and the condition of the Church described in them forbid the supposition of such a date."[24] Moreover, it is now conceded that in the first Christian century there were many Jews in Spain, and consequently St. Paul would wish to reach them with his good news formerly told in the Areopagus of Greece.

That Gelasius says Paul was not able to go to Spain *for a certain time* we admit; but he is one witness, and a late one, against many like Athanasius, Cyril, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Theodoret and Jerome, who say he *did* go.

That Innocent I. is another who says that "None of the Apostles but Peter taught the faith in Spain and the west" we admit; but the common belief, even when Innocent wrote this, was in favor of Paul's having been in Spain. Or, again, Innocent may have forgotten or overlooked Paul, or used "Apostles" in the sense of the first and original *twelve*, excluding Paul.

That if Paul were in Spain we should hear of it in his works needs no refutation, for much of Paul's labors are undescribed; while we have nothing at all told us in Scripture of the late labors of many of the Apostles.

---

[22] "History of Christian Religion and Church During First Three Centuries," p. 49.
[23] Schaff's "Gen. Ch. Hist.," Vol. I., p. 333. [24] Conybeare and Howson, op. cit., p. 803.

That there is no Church of St. Paul in Spain claiming foundation by Paul has, if substantiated, some weight as an objection. However, even Schaff concedes: "These post-apostolic testimonies, taken together, make it very probable, but not historically certain, that Paul was released after the spring of 63."[25] And Conybeare and Howson say in conclusion that: "The evidence on this subject, though not copious, is yet conclusive as far as it goes, and it is all one way."[26] Therefore, it seems that in this much-mooted and still unsettled question the probability is that the great Apostle of the Gentiles really did not stop his missionary labors till he reached the border lands of the wild Atlantic, τα τερμα της δυσεως of the pre-Columbian world.

Louis O'Donovan.

Petersville, Md.

Scientific Chronicle.

TOTAL ECLIPSE OF THE SUN MAY 28, 1900.

The total eclipse of the sun, which will occur on May 28, is of more than usual interest to the people of the United States, because the shadow path of totality runs most conveniently across the East Gulf and Middle Atlantic States. The path of the eclipse enters the United States at New Orleans, La., and runs in a northeast direction, leaving the States at Norfolk, Va. Thus such cities as New Orleans, La., Mobile, Ala., Montgomery, Ala., Raleigh, N. C., and Norfolk, Va., besides very many small towns, lie well within the path of totality. Thousands of persons may thus view this eclipse, if the weather be favorable, without making long journeys to do so.

In the United States the eclipse occurs during the morning hours, beginning at New Orleans at about twenty minutes past 7, and ending at Norfolk about 9 o'clock. All along the line of the eclipse the totality, or the time that the sun is totally obscured, is of short duration. In a solar eclipse totality may last five or six minutes, but such eclipses are of rare occurrence. In the present case totality lasts from 1 minute 13 seconds to 1 minute 42 seconds. The shortest duration corresponds with the entrance of the shadow at New Orleans, and the duration increases as the shadow moves eastward until it reaches its maximum in the United States at Norfolk. As seconds are precious on such occasions, observers who wish to obtain all the data they can from this eclipse will locate their stations as far eastward as possible. To enable observers to locate their stations where the weather conditions will in all probability be most favorable, the United States Department of Agriculture has issued as a bulletin of the Weather Bureau, a pamphlet by Mr. Frank H. Bigelow, giving the results of observations made during the last three years at from sixty-six to eighty-eight stations along the path of the eclipse in the United States. The object of the observations was to determine the prevailing average cloudiness in the districts covered by the path of the eclipse. The observations were made at each station between 8 and 9 o'clock in the morning, the time at which the eclipse will occur.

---

[25] Schaff's op. cit., I. p. 333.

[26] Conybeare and Howson, op. cit., p. 800.

These observations were two-fold, first on the general state of the sky and secondly on the state of the sky near the sun. At first sight it might appear that the low altitude of the sun at the time of the eclipse would indicate an unfavorable position for observation on account of mist or clouds along the horizon. When, however, the results of the observations were summed up and reduced for comparison it was found that in the second case, the sky near the sun, the percentages for cloudiness ran smaller than in the case of the general condition of the sky. This shows that in the Southern States the position of the sun at the time of the eclipse is more likely to be clear at that hour than the rest of the sky. Another conclusion arrived at from the discussion of the observations of 1899 is that the percentages show a decrease of cloudiness from the Atlantic coast near Norfolk, Va., toward Georgia, and also from the Gulf coast at New Orelans, La., toward the same point. From which it is concluded that Eastern Alabama and Central Georgia, about south of Atlanta, is the most favorable region for avoiding the tendency to cloudiness. Here, then, is the best place to locate the eclipse stations as far as this consideration is concerned. The report of the Weather Bureau already referred to is most painstaking and will prove of great value to the number of scientists who are preparing to observe the coming eclipse.

A total solar eclipse gives an opportunity of making a number of interesting and important observations. The observation of the times of the four contacts of the sun and moon, which serve to correct the tables of their motions. Then there are telescopic and spectroscopic observations of the corona and prominences and the photographing of the same. In addition there will no doubt be a sharp lookout for intra-mercurial planets. To the ordinary observer so situated as to command a view of the distant western horizon the approach of the moon's shadow is a most interesting spectacle. It advances like a thunder-storm with surprising swiftness. The moon advances along its orbit at the rate of about 2,100 miles per hour. This would be the rate at which the shadow would travel if the earth did not rotate on its axis. The earth is rotating eastward in the same general direction as that in which the shadow is moving. At the equator the surface of the earth moves at the rate of about 1,040 miles per hour. This reduces the speed of the shadow to about 1,060 miles per hour. In higher latitudes, where the velocity of the earth's rotation is smaller, the speed of the shadow is higher. In the present case the velocity will be about 1,300 miles per hour.

Should the weather conditions prove favorable we may expect good results from the observations made during the coming solar eclipse.

DAVID E. HUGHES, F. R. S.

The death of David E. Hughes, which occurred on January 22 last, removes a well-known figure from the scientific field. A short notice of Professor Hughes will be of interest to our readers, since his first great work was brought out in America. He was of Welsh descent and was born in London on May 16, 1831. When he was seven years old his father emigrated to the United States and settled as a planter in Virginia. When the boy grew up he became a citizen of the United States. He never abandoned his citizenship, and this, according to a notice of his death in *Nature*, is probably the reason why the English Government never recognized his eminent scientific services. The boy early developed a talent for music, and at the age of 19 was appointed professor of music in the Presbyterian Academy, Bardstown, Ky. Shortly afterwards he was appointed to the chair of natural philosophy in the same institution.

This was a period of rapid telegraphic development, and Hughes became interested in the nascent art. At the age of 24 he invented his celebrated Roman type-printing telegraph, which was first patented in this country in 1855. In the hands of such men as Peter Cooper and Cyrus Field it soon went into practical use, passing ultimately into the control of the Western Union Telegraph Company. His instrument was based on synchronism, and each letter was struck by one current.

He went to England in 1857 to introduce his apparatus. The time was not favorable, as the telegraph was in the hands of private companies and their capital was locked up in promoting other patents. In 1860 his system was adopted in France, and he was made a Chevalier of the Legion of Honor. Similar honors were conferred on him in Italy, Russia, Austria, Turkey, Bavaria, Wurtemburg and Spain. The system was adopted in these countries as well as in England, Prussia and Switzerland.

For an interesting account of Professor Hughes' early days when he was engaged on his first great invention, the writer is indebted to Rev. Walter Hill, S. J. It is in the subjoined letter of Mr. J. W. Muir, vice president of the banking house of Wilson & Muir, Bardstown, Ky., to Father Hill:

"I knew Hughes well. He boarded in the same house I did. I was frequently in his room with him during his leisure hours, when he was engaged at his invention. He taught music on the harp at the Bardstown Presbyterian Academy. He was regarded as a brilliant performer on that instrument and a fine teacher. Hughes was a very diminutive man in his physical proportions, but of wonderful energy. He had in his room the works of an old brass clock, to which he attached a small wooden cylinder, into which with the aid of his penknife and a small chisel, he inserted ordinary printing type. This cylinder was made to revolve, and by means of keys worked by the fingers he would print whatever he wished on slips of paper passing under the type. His companion at this time was Mr. Hast, a German, who gave music lessons on the piano. The two boarded at the same house and ran their instruments late into the night, much to the discomfort of the other boarders. Hughes was then a poor young man, but said that although he was so small in physical build he would yet astonish the world and live in history. I met him afterwards on the streets of Louisville, and he told me that he had a medal from Napoleon III. as a reward for his printing telegraph."

The adoption of his instruments in every country in Europe brought him honor and wealth. Being a man of simple habits and of few wants, his expenditure was small, but his income great. According to published reports he has been most generous in endowing various scientific institutions and hospitals with large sums of money.

In 1879 Professor Hughes brought out the microphone. The same year he showed how to eliminate the effects of mutual induction from lateral wires by twisting the wires around each other in a metalic circuit. This was followed by the induction balance and a series of researches in magnetism and inductance.

Some of our Catholic papers have announced lately that Professor Hughes was a Catholic and a priest; that he taught music in St. Joseph's College, Bardstown, and that afterwards he was appointed to the chair of natural sciences in the same institution. All this is stated without giving a single authority by which the truth of the statements might be verified. The statement that he taught at St. Joseph's College, Bardstown, is not true. This is asserted on the authority of Rev. Walter Hill, S. J., who was stationed at St. Joseph's at the time young Hughes was at Bardstown. Father Hill writes: "The Mr. Hast mentioned in Mr. Muir's letter was a Catholic and came with his brother to the college frequently to play music with Father Miles and myself. Had Hughes been a Catholic he would undoubtedly have come to the college with his companion to meet the musical experts found there. This he never did to my knowledge."

Mr. Muir, whom we have already quoted, again writes: "I have no reason to believe that when Mr. Hughes resided in Bardstown he belonged to any denomination of Christians. He was a man of fine moral character and demeaned himself as a high gentleman." The funeral service over the remains was conducted according to the ritual of the Church of England.

Professor Hughes was not a mathematician, nor was he deeply versed in scientific literature. He jumped by intuition to facts which he was most ingenious in verifying by means of the most ordinary appliances. Pill boxes, nails, sealing wax, knitting needles, tumblers, old cans and cheap copper formed quite a sufficient outfit for him. His success in his chosen field is a bright example of what can be achieved by talent well and patiently directed. As he determined when a poor lad at Bardstown, he will live in the history of science.

THE CATALYTIC PROCESS FOR THE MANUFACTURE OF SULPHURIC ACID.

In the whole range of chemical manufacture the most important branch is the production of sulphuric acid. Sulphuric acid is as necessary for the chemical industries as iron for the mechanical. So great is the demand for this acid that it is claimed that the annual consumption of this acid is a good indication of the material prosperity of a country. A mere mention of a few of the uses of sulphuric acid will show that this claim is well founded. It is used in refining petroleum, and it is estimated that 90 per cent. of the acid manufactured in the United States is used for this purpose. It is consumed in large quantities in making acid phosphate of lime for fertilizing purposes. The storage battery business consumes yearly large quantities of it, while the drug and chemical trade demand a great amount of it. The nitroglycerin and nitrocellulose industries demand a good concentrated sulphuric acid. This short and very incomplete enumeration will suffice to give some idea of the extensive use of sulphuric acid.

The old process of manufacturing sulphuric acid is known as the "chamber process." It consists, first, in burning in a suitable furnace either crude sulphur or sulphide ores, such as iron pyrites, so as to form sulphurous anhydride, a gas made up of one atom of sulphur to two of oxygen. A large excess of air is mixed with this gas, and the mixture is fed in a constant stream into a chamber lined with lava or chemical brick, substances not acted upon by the acid. This chamber is filled with closely packed pieces of similar material or quartz. The mixture passes up through this packing and many impurities brought over from the furnace are mechanically removed and the mixture is cooled. At the top of this chamber or tower a supply of nitrous anhydride, a gas containing nitrogen and oxygen in the proportion of 2 to 3, is given the mixture and the chemical process begins. The nitrous anhydride gives some of its oxygen to the sulphurous anhydride, converting it into a mixture of sulphur and oxygen in the proportion of 1 to 3. Just as this action begins the gases are carried into the first of a series of large leaden chambers, into which jets of steam are blowing to keep up the action just begun. These chambers are kept as cool as possible, and in them the steam, which is a vapor containing hydrogen and oxygen in the proportion of 2 to 1, unites with the compound of sulphur just mentioned and gives a new compound made up of hydrogen, sulphur and oxygen in the proportion 2, 1 and 4. This compound is sulphuric acid, which forms as a mist in the chamber and condensing on the walls flows to the floor, whence it is drawn off. The air in the operation is taxed to keep up the supply of oxygen that replenishes the nitrous anhydride for the part it plays, which was already referred to. The operation is usually carried on in a series of three chambers, but the acid as it comes from these chambers is quite dilute and must be drawn off into lead and costly platinum pans, where the water is driven off and the acid obtained in its strong or concentrated condition.

The new process does away with the cumbersome lead chambers and also with nitrous fumes as oxygen carriers. This is done by the use of the catalytic power of platinum or ferric oxide or other substance that has that power. By catalysis is meant that peculiar influence by which certain substances, without undergoing any apparent change themselves, help to resolve other substances in contact with it into new compounds. This is often termed the action of presence. This reaction was known as far back as 1831, as appears from a British patent granted in that year to Phillips. It was, however, principally worked out by German chemists such as Dobereiner, Magnus, Wholer, Plattner, Clemens, Winkler, Messel and others. Its application, however, seems not to have extended beyond the preparation of Nordhausen fuming acid. Now, however, comes the news that the process has been applied to the manufacture of ordinary sulphuric acid, and that the price is so cheap that the old lead chambers are disappearing and that the new process is supplanting the old.

The keystone of the new process is the fact that sulphurous anhydride, or SO_2 gas, combines readily with oxygen to form sulphuric anhydride, or SO_3 gas, when the mixture is passed at the proper temperature over a contact substance such as platinum black. There is a drawback just here which had to be overcome in the new process. The combination of these two gases generates a great amount of heat, and the new gas is broken up into the two gases that form it at a temperature not much in excess of that at which it was formed.

The generation of heat by the union of gases in the presence of a contact substance is illustrated by a simple experiment. Light an ordinary Bunsen burner and heat a small spiral of platinum wire in it for a few seconds. Then turn off the gas. When the platinum is cool—and it takes only a few seconds—turn on the gas again, holding the cold platinum in the current of gas. The gas and the oxygen of the air meeting at the platinum combine and the heat of the combination is sufficient to raise the platinum to incandescence and ignite the gas. This is the same principle as that applied in the Dobereiner hydrogen lamp.

This excessive heat, in the first step in the manufacture of sulphuric acid, is removed from the contact substance and the apparatus by means of external cooling. The gases as they come from the furnace are first purified, washed and dried according to common methods and raised to the temperature at which the chemical action begins. The gas is then forced into the contact tube. This tube contains the contact mass, which consists of some inert substance which is coated with platinum in a finely divided state, distributed in thin layers resting on perforated plates arranged in layers one above the other in such a way that the gas is forced to pass through the contact mass. This part of the apparatus is kept cool by the circulation of a current of cool air or furnace gas. Liquid baths may also be used. The most economical way is to use the gases themselves, which while cooling the contact tube are raised to the proper temperature for the chemical action. This cooling action prevents the breaking up of the sulphuric anhydride formed by the union of the sulphurous anhydride and the oxygen in the presence of the contact substance. The cooling must be regulated, for too low a temperature would prevent the union of the two last mentioned gases. This is usually done by regulating the temperature or the velocity of the cooling gas. The sulphuric anhydride thus formed passes into a chamber, where it is absorbed by concentrated sulphuric acid, the fuming acid thus formed being afterwards diluted to the required strength.

The development of the new process to its present stage of commercial success seems to be due to the untiring efforts, during the last ten years, of the Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik Company of Germany. Their methods are covered by patents. Patents have also been granted in England to the Farbwerke vormals Meister, Lucius und Bruning, of Hoechst-am-Main. The Elberfelder Farben Fabriken Company after investigation have installed a plant for the new process. It is said that these three concerns are among the largest, the most wealthy and most progressive concerns in the world. This is an argument in favor of the new process. They would not in all probability adopt a method which was not a commercial success. It is reported that these three companies together employ about five hundred chemists on experimental work.

The interesting question at present is whether in this country the new process will supplant the old. It is admitted by all that for weak acids, up to say 63 per cent. of sulphuric acid, the chamber process is as cheap as the new process. When, however, strength and purity are required the catalytic process is by far the most economical. We cannot expect the new process to be introduced except by new firms who intend to install new plants. The old firms, especially as the price of acid is high, will be deterred by the cost of the new installation and the royalties that must be paid.

The use of oxygen in a more concentrated form than it is found in ordinary atmospheric air may still further improve the process. Here, then, we may find a new field for liquid air. The improvement in the manufacture of sulphuric acid is already a great advance, but the development that it may occasion in other branches can only be conjectured.

LAKE NICARAGUA.

While our lawmakers are discussing the importance of building the Nicaraguan Canal as a matter of national policy, scientists are interested in the matter from another standpoint, namely, the assumed inconstancy in the level of Lake Nicaragua. This lake is the source of the San Juan river, and is intended as the feeder of the proposed canal. The determination and regulation of its level is then of vital importance to the success of the canal.

The foundation on which the assumed inconstancy is based is the observed fluctuations of the level, together with the great variety in the figures given for the level in the surveys of different competent and trustworthy engineers. In 1781 the Spanish engineer Galisteo found the level of the lake to be 133.11 feet above low water on the Pacific side. From the same level Lieutenant Baily in 1838 measured 128 feet 3 inches to the level of the lake. Colonel Childs in 1851 determined the altitude above Pacific low tide to be 111 feet 5 inches. Commander Hull in 1873 gave for the altitude of the lake 102.28. Colonel Childs puts the fluctuation in level at not more than five feet. The Nicaragua Canal Board increase the range of variation to 14 feet, and this at not distant intervals. Other surveys show like fluctuations in the level of the lake and a growing tendency to maintain the lower levels.

Descriptions of the Estero Panaloya, the northwestern termination of the lake, suggest an actual lowering of the lake level. At the time of the Baily survey and in 1849, when Squier made his plan for a canal, the Estero was open to free navigation with from 5 to 15 feet of water in it. Colonel Ludlow in his report states that in the dry season at least the channel of the Estero is also dry. Changes in the height of the San Juan river also point to a varying supply of water from the lake, just what would be expected from fluctuations in its level. In 1850 Squier compared this river to the Hudson and the Connecticut, saying that for most of its course it was capable of being navigated by our largest river steamers. Of this same stream Collinson, an English engineer, says, in a report made to the Royal Geographical Society in 1867, that the water was so low that small stern-wheelers drawing only ten inches of water could hardly grope their way along it.

There seems to be a change of level of such amount that it must be attributed to something more than the ordinary changes in rainfall from year to year, although these are very great. The change in level was attested by Collinson, and in the report above referred to he suggests an explanation which may be the true one. He says it may be due to an increased draining of the lake due to a differential rise or tilting of the land surface, which would increase the gradients of the river, and thus creating a more rapid flow of water would reduce the level of the lake. Whether this be true or not, it is clear that the lake is situated in a volcanic region, where such changes in land elevation are known to occur, and this lends some probability to the explanation. It seems certain that the level of the lake is inconstant, and it is more readily believed that the level of the lake has dropped 15 to 20 feet in little more than half a century than to admit that the numerous surveys were inaccurate. This question is a vital one, and must be taken into consideration in the discussion of the feasibility of the canal.

THE CANALS OF NEW YORK.

Among valuable engineering documents the report of the committee on the canals of New York, lately presented to Governor Roosevelt, will long hold an important place. A good idea of it may be formed from the abstracts given in the *Engineering News* and in the *Engineering Record.* The conclusions reached are of interest to those who remember all that the magazines and the papers, both daily and scientific, published not long ago about building a ship canal through New York State so that ocean-going vessels might, on reaching New York, proceed at once to the Great Lakes and receive their cargo at once without the necessity of reshipment at the seaport, which the use of a barge at present necessitates.

The first point considered by the committee is one that concerns the very existence of the canal as a means of transport. If the railroads can ever transport grain, coal, lumber and such like freight at a rate lower than is possible by means of a canal, then the latter will surely be abandoned. This is a question into which the committee went, with the following result: The present rate of transportation for such freight across the ocean is half a mill per ton-mile. On the lakes, where the vessels are smaller and the waterway restricted at places so as frequently to cause congestion of traffic, the rate is slightly higher, amounting to 0.6 of a mill. The canal rates under present conditions, namely, size of the canal and of the locks and of the use of animal power, which is the only power employed at present on the Erie Canal, amount to 2 mills per ton-mile. The ocean traffic is the same, whether the freight be brought to the seaport by rail or by the present method. So the competition is between the railroads on the one side and the lakes and canal on the other. If the length of the waterway of the lakes was just equal to the length of the canal, the rate for transportation by water under the present system, from the figures given above, would be 1.3 mills per ton-mile. The lake route is, however, much longer, and hence the rate is much lower than that given. This practically means that if the railroads wish to supplant the canal they must come down to a rate of 1 mill per ton-mile. A general enquiry into present railway freight rates as well as special information obtained from the presidents of three of the main roads which handle such freight, show that there is no probability of a rate of 1 mill per ton-mile, but, on the contrary, there is every indication that the rates will be higher. Hence under present conditions, even the waterway can hold its own against the railroads.

But the prospect is still brighter for the waterway if the suggestions of the committee are followed. They are as follows: That all restrictions upon the capitalization of canal transportation be removed; that mechanical traction be introduced instead of the present animal power, and that the locks and lifts be operated by new and approved mechanical means. It is also suggested that a competent engineering staff have charge of all the works of the canal. With such changes, together with a feasible increase in the capacity of the canal, its locks and lifts, so as to accommodate barges of 1,000 tons cargo, the canal rate, according to the committee, could be reduced to ⅔ of a mill per ton-mile, thus securing it against all railroad competition.

The report also compares the advantages of a ship canal for seagoing vessels and a barge canal with reshipment at the seaport. The conclusion is in favor of the barge canal. While the former is a most attractive project, there are enormous difficulties in the construction of such a waterway, and the cost is almost prohibitive. Again, the character of the navigation on the sea, the canal and the lakes varies, and it is a question whether one vessel can economically be adapted to such varying conditions. The answer is in the negative. The cost of the ocean steamer is about $71 per net ton of carrying capacity; the lake steamer $36 per ton, while construction of equal capacity for canal traffic can be had for $7.31 per net ton. To use the higher priced vessel for the lower priced service would cost more than breaking bulk at each end of the canal. The conclusion of the report is in favor of an improved canal.

Denis T. O'Sullivan, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

Book Reviews.

VIA CRUCIS. A Romance of the Second Crusade. By *Francis Marion Crawford.* 12mo., pp. 396. Illustrated by Louis Loeb. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Mr. Crawford's story was announced a year before it came from the press, at the time when his "Roma Immortalis" had sprung into popular favor. It was expected to be a companion piece for the latter work, because the first announcement was vague. The reading public knew only that Mr. Crawford would write about one of the Crusades as he had written about Rome. With that unreasonable way of reasoning peculiar to the public it jumped to the conclusion that the newer work would be on the same lines as the older one. When it appeared it was seen to be altogether different. The book on Rome is made up of studies from its chronicles, historical and descriptive; the work on the Crusade is a historical romance. It deals with the second attempt to recover Palestine from the Musseulmans which was made by Louis VII. of France and Conrad III. of Germany between 1145 and 1150. This expedition was due to the zeal and energy of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, who figures in the story.

The hero is Gilbert Warde, a young Englishman of Norman ancestry, who after being robbed of his rightful inheritance and title through the treachery of his own mother, leaves England and attaches himself to the court of France and to the French army during the Crusade. In the meantime Gilbert's mother had become the wife of the slayer of her husband, whose lover she had been before, and Gilbert is in love with the daughter of his stepfather. This would have been complication enough, but the author really devotes little attention to the hero and heroine and their relations to each, but goes out of his way to bring Queen Eleanor, the wife of Louis VII., to the front. Throughout the story Gilbert is tempted and crossed by the Queen and her unholy love for him. We are told not once or twice only, but many times that she is the most beautiful woman in the world, but unfaithful to her husband. Her wickedness is constantly thrust forward until it becomes very annoying. It might have been passed with a single sentence. We think that Mr. Crawford has marred his story by dwelling on the picture of a queen who is unfaithful, and who despises her husband because he is a pious man, and who speaks of him contemptuously as a monk and not a king. There is no necessary connection between this unsavory chapter in history and a story of the Crusades.

It is to be regretted more because the story is in every other way so good. Mr. Crawford is in love with the subject, had evidently prepared very carefully for the work, and he brings to bear on it all that skill of the novelist which has distinguished him on so many other occasions. His descriptions of characters, scenes and incidents are all glowing with life and carry the reader away to distant times and lands in the most charming manner. While reading them we really seem to be part of the expedition. We see the gay banners, the bright uniforms and the flashing arms; we hear the blare of trumpets, the beat of horses and the shout of failure or triumph. We are about to place the book in the hands of our young men and maidens, when across its beautiful pages walks again and again the unfaithful Queen with a history that is not suited to the light.

The theme punishes Mr. Crawford for touching it so often. Towards the close of the story, when he wishes to tell us that she really left her lawful husband and married Henry Plantagenet, afterwards King Henry II. of England, he places in the mouth of Count Raymond, the Queen's uncle, whom she had consulted in regard to her divorce, these words: "The King, he said, was surely Eleanor's cousin and within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity, so that the marriage was null and void, and the Pope would be obliged against his will to adhere to the rule of the Church and pronounce it so. They were cousins in the seventh degree, he said, because the King was descended from Eleanor's great-great-great-great-grandfather, . . . and the seventh degree of consanguinity was still prohibited, and no dispensation had been given, or asked for."

As a divorce was afterwards granted, and both parties married again, the reader will probably conclude that Count Raymond was right, and that the Church approved of the whole transaction. Such was not the case, and this divorce has become such a *cause celèbre* that we think it advisable to furnish our readers with a concise statement of its merits. This can best be done in the words of Hefele, who treats the matter with his usual precision and accuracy in the fifth volume of his "Councils," page 530, second edition:

"Soon after the death of Suger, on the Tuesday before the Pascha Floridum (Palm Sunday) of the year 1152, a Synod at Beaugenci separated King Louis VII. from his consort Eleanora. We have seen above how scandalously she had misbehaved at Antioch during the second crusade. She is even reported to have carried on an amour there with a Turk. She maintained that the extreme continence of her husband gave her a right to compensation elsewhere; for, as she was wont to say, 'she had not married a king, but a monk.' Pope Eugene III. had indeed made an effort to reconcile the royal couple at Tivoli, upon their return from Palestine. He had forbidden them, in the severest terms, ever again to bring forward the plea of consanguinity as an impediment to the validity of their marriage; he had confirmed their union anew, and had inhibited their proposed divorce, upon any pretext whatsoever, under penalty of excommunication. All the more surprising, therefore, is the dissolution of this marriage pronounced by the Synod, in presence of the four Archbishops of Rouen, Rheims, Sens and Bordeaux, as well as of many other French prelates, precisely on the ground of consanguinity, sworn to by numerous witnesses. As soon as her marriage was declared invalid Eleanora espoused the young Prince Henry Plantagenet, later King Henry II. of England."

The incident is "pregnant with instruction." First, the Catholic Church, so far from sanctioning the divorce, had forbidden it, through her supreme authority, in the sternest and most uncompromising manner. As well might we make the Church responsible for the action of Cranmer and the other English prelates in the case of Henry VIII. Secondly, it emphasizes the immortal truth that only a Pope can curb the passions of princes, and that most wisely, at a later date, did the Roman Pontiffs reserve to their own tribunals the matrimonial complications of monarchs. Thirdly, it brands anew with the stigma of sycophancy the miscalled "Gallican liberties."

If we inquire wherefore the Popes did not proceed to extreme measures against the refractory pair and their abettors, there is a twofold explanation. First of all, since neither party to the divorce appealed to the Holy See, the matter did not come before the Papal Court officially. In the second place, the intrigues of Arnold of Brescia and the despotism of Barbarossa kept the Pontiffs fully employed, without permitting them to go out of their way to court further embarrassments. That they had not lost sight of the iniquitous proceedings at Beaugenci, they proved to demonstration when, in the next generation, Philip of France and John of England presumed to imitate the conduct of their respective parents.

WAS SAVONAROLA REALLY EXCOMMUNICATED? An Inquiry by *Rev. J. L. O'Neil, O. P.* Boston: Marlier, Callanan & Co.

The title chosen for his book does not clearly state the nature of the question which Father O'Neil undertakes to answer. There is no doubt about the *reality* of the censure issued by Pope Alexander

VI. against the Florentine friar; it is, in fact, given *in extenso* by our author on page 77. It was duly and solemnly published; was known throughout Christendom; was submitted to for a time by Savonarola until he mustered up courage to defy it. Father O'Neil's contention is that the said excommunication was *invalid*, and that consequently the friar was justified in contemning it. In his endeavor to establish these theses the author displays much erudition and casuistic skill; nevertheless, we fail to see that he has accomplished much in the way of vindicating his hero from the grave charge of disobedience to the Holy See. We are far from believing that he intends to hold up Savonarola as a safe model for men and women who have bound themselves by vows of religion. What would become of monastic discipline, if the commands of superiors, and especially of the Vicar of Christ, were subjected to all these refinings and hair-splittings?

The chivalrous attempt of the author to save the honor of Alexander VI. in the affair of Savonarola is a serious detriment to his argument. Certainly no such attempt was made by the friar when he at length overcame his scruples and launched out on the desperate course which brought him to the scaffold. The true explanation of his defiant conduct is, that, as time went on, he persuaded himself more and more that Alexander, having obtained the tiara by simony, was not a legitimate Pope. In this opinion (whether true or false we need not now determine) he did not by any means stand alone. Three years before eighteen Cardinals, with Rovere and Sforza at their head, had demanded the deposition of Alexander at the hands of the French King. This threat of deposition was so often repeated by all those who sought to intimidate the Pontiff that it became a serious menace to the unity and tranquillity of the Church. Alexander was marvelously indifferent to public opinion and showed little resentment when personally reviled. But when the friar presumed to write letters to the powers of Europe demanding a new Pope, and claiming to act by divine authority, the limit of endurance was certainly passed. It was the following letter that sealed the death warrant of Savonarola. We quote from Villari, vol. ii., p. 292:

"The moment of vengeance has arrived; the Lord commands me to reveal new secrets, and make manifest to the world the peril by which the bark of St. Peter is threatened, owing to your[1] long neglect. . . . Wherefore, the Lord is greatly angered, and hath long left the Church without a shepherd. . . . Now, I hereby testify, *in verbo Domini*, that this Alexander is no Pope. Nor can he be held as one; inasmuch as, leaving aside the mortal sin of simony, by which he hath purchased the Papal Chair, and daily selleth the benefices of the Church to the highest bidder, and likewise putting aside his other manifest vices, I declare that he is no Christian, and believes in no God," and so forth.

---

[1] **He is addressing the sovereigns of France, Spain, England, Germany and Hungary.**

In whatever light we choose to regard the writer of this bold challenge, we cannot deny that, from the standpoint of the assailed Pope, he was an audacious rebel, whose annihilation was of supreme importance.

THE EVE OF THE REFORMATION. Studies in the Religious Life and Thought of the English People in the Period Preceding the Rejection of the Roman Jurisdiction by Henry VIII. By *Francis Aidan Gasquet, D. D., O. S. B.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

A new publication by the learned Benedictine who has already enriched our literature with such standard works as "Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries," "Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer," and the "Old English Bible," is truly an event deserving to be chronicled throughout the entire English-speaking world. We lost no time, therefore, in purchasing a copy of his latest book, notwithstanding the almost prohibitory price of two dollars and eighty cents, at which it is offered by the Putnams to the American public. We deeply regret that these exorbitant figures will greatly restrict the sale of a book which ought to be found in every home and library.

Some years ago, when reviewing a volume of Janssen's History, we expressed the wish that some learned Englishman would do for England that which the German historian had so successfully accomplished for the Fatherland; that is, to delve among the mountain of historical documents, either recently brought to light or previously left neglected, in order to be able to give a true and unvarnished statement of the religious condition of the country at the outbreak of the Protestant Revolution. This is precisely what Father Gasquet has set about to do, with a diligence not unworthy of Janssen, and without burdening his pages with that apparatus of erudition and minuteness of detail which repels the ordinary reader of the German author. Taking up in separate chapters the various legends which form the mass of Protestant tradition regarding the religion of their Catholic forefathers, he proves by contemporary evidence that they are baseless and valueless. He first nails the lie that the attitude of English churchmen on the eve of the great religious changes was "one of uncompromising hostility to learning and letters;" whereas, "the chief ecclesiastics of the day, Wolsey, Warham, Fisher, Tunstall, Langton, Stokesley, Fox, Selling, Grocyn, Whitford, Linacre, Colet, Pace, William Latimer and Thomas Lupset, to name only the most distinguished, were not only ardent humanists, but thorough and practical churchmen" (p. 36). In the three succeeding chapters he discusses the attitude of the laity of England towards the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, towards the Holy See and towards their clergy; and he proves beyond the possibility of a doubt that, until the unfortunate question of divorce came to disturb the nation, the English laity were loyal and attached to their ecclesiastical superiors.

In this connection we may say that we have an intense dislike of the phrase "ecclesiastical system," which the author seems to have borrowed from Bishop Creighton, and uses occasionally as synonymous with the Catholic principles of faith and government. It smacks of the haphazardness and instability of Anglicanism, and is quite intelligible on the page of the Bishop of London. All the same, it grates on the Catholic ear; and we remember that the objectionable word "system," when employed in the *Acta* of a certain Council, was ordered to be corrected by the Holy See.

In his sixth chapter the author gives what we must designate as a roseate and optimistic account of that literary mountebank of Reformation period, Erasmus of Rotterdam. That Erasmus was not a Lutheran, Father Gasquet most superabundantly proves. But we were unaware that any one believes he was. The proper place of this wretched egotist is in the third Canto of Dante's "Inferno" among that worthless crew,

> A Dio spiacenti ed a' nemici sui.

Instead of wasting fifty-three valuable pages on him, it would have been better "to look and pass him by."

In chapter vii. it is demonstrated that Protestantism was not native to English soil, but was imported from Germany. The common impression that Lollardry survived to be merged into Lutheranism is shown to be utterly false; for the last relics of Wycliffism had long perished. The progress of modern error, it is proved, was slow and tardy. After an interesting chapter on "The Printed English Bible," the author refutes the oft-repeated calumny that the pre-Reformation clergy in England had neglected the duty of instructing the people in Christian doctrine and had left them in complete ignorance. After reading the provisions made for the careful instruction of the people, we are filled with amazement at the unnatural brutality of those Protestant writers and declaimers who for generations have gloried in the alleged degradation of their forefathers. What a powerful bond of union is the Catholic faith! Even those of us who drank in a hatred of English tyranny together with our mothers' milk, are nevertheless infinitely nearer in sympathy to the English of Catholic days than their own apostate children.

After two more chapters, in which the author describes the benign provisions made for the support of religion and charity, he ends with an interesting account of the popular devotion to pilgrimage and relics.

We have simply said enough to whet the appetite of our readers for this very important contribution to our English Catholic literature; for which we return sincerest thanks to the learned and diligent author.

Leaves from St. Augustine. By *Mary H. Allies.* Edited by T. W. Allies, K. C. S. G. Second edition revised and corrected. 12mo, pp. 483. London: Washburne & Co. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This book is a companion volume to "Leaves from St. John Chrysostom," by the same author. They both belong to the same family as the Characteristics of Manning, Wiseman and Newman. Indeed, the latter title seems to express more clearly the character of the book. This is indicated by a passage in the preface of the present volume, which says that the author wishes her readers to be able "to form some notion of the personal character, the doctrine, the faith, the hope, the charity of the man who ranks among the Fathers of the Church as St. Paul among the Apostles."

The work of compiling this volume was very great. The Edinburgh edition of St. Augustine's works consists of fifteen octavo volumes. The Oxford translation is even larger, but both together do not contain all that has been preserved. If the author had used these editions she would have lightened her labors a great deal; but she does not even refer to them. The work is entirely her own: choice of passages and translation.

She divides the book into four parts, headed respectively, "Personal and Philosophical," "Doctrine in Daily Life," "The Kingdom of Our Lord on Earth" and "Eternity." It will be seen at a glance that under these divisions a summary may be made of the great Doctor's writings. It was a great task, but it has been successfully done. Such books are very valuable. Bad books are generally short and attractive. It is so easy to deny facts in history, or to distort them. One word or a sentence is enough to throw doubt on some doctrine, whereas full treatises or whole volumes may be required to correct these errors. Thousands may learn the false lesson for the one who has time to learn the true. Comparatively few persons have the time and ability to read the works of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, or of their followers and pupils, like Wiseman and Newman and Manning. But in books like the one before us the task is made easy and pleasant. Only those who have used such books know how well they answer the needs of the ordinary student. It is best always to go to the original—the fountain head—but for the great majority that cannot do so, books like this one are very valuable and very useful.

BILDER AUS DER GESCHICHTE DER ALTCHRISTLICHEN KUNST UND LITURGIE IN ITALIEN. *Von Stephan Beissel, S. J.* Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, $2.50.

This book may be called a series of illustrated lectures on the relation of ancient Christian art in Italy to the divine worship. It is addressed more especially to priests and ecclesiastical students, although the educated laity may also derive great profit from the perusal of it. It is not a history of art for its own sake, but has the practical purpose of giving the reader a better understanding of the liturgy and ceremonies of Holy Church. It would be difficult to crowd so much valuable information into the compass of 328 pages as this veteran teacher has accomplished. The 200 illustrations which accompany the text make what might otherwise be of interest only to antiquarians pleasant and easy reading to any one who takes up the book. It will be of especial interest and instruction to those who contemplate a visit to Italy. We congratulate the firm of Herder upon the typographical excellence of the volume, and look forward eagerly to the companion volume on mediæval art which is promised by the author.

SOUVENIR OF LORETTO CENTENARY, 1799–1899. October 10, 1899. 8vo, pp. 405. Copiously illustrated. Cresson, Pa.: Swope Brothers, printers.

"This work is simply what its title indicates—a souvenir of the centenary of this parish, the oldest in Western Pennsylvania. It makes no pretence to originality, but is merely a compilation of papers, facts, names and dates, which show forth the progress made during the century just closed, and furnish valuable and interesting data for the future historian of the Church in this diocese."

In these modest words the rector of St. Michael's Church, Loretto, Pa., presents his valuable historical work to the public. The opening words of his preface, which we have quoted and which are apologetic in form, might be used boastfully. No stronger recommendation could be given to any book of history than to say that it is a true compilation of papers, facts, names and dates. It is desirable that these shall be linked together and set forth in such attractive form as to charm while instructing; but as history is very often distorted and made useless or harmful in order to make it charming, it is far better to limit it to the bare statement of facts.

Father Kittell brings to his work all the requirements for success. He is learned; he is a student of history; he has a rich field in Loretto, and he loves the work. The result is a very valuable contribution to the history of the Church in Pennsylvania. It will be best appreciated in the future, when a fuller history shall be written and the opportunity to gather facts here brought together shall have passed. Students of history would do well to secure copies of this work at once.

OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE CONFERENCES, 1897-1899. By *Joseph Rickaby, S. J.* 12mo., pp. 413. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

"On the 2d of April, 1895, the Holy See decided to tolerate the residence of Catholic laymen at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. A condition was appended that there should be established for their benefit regular courses of lectures or conferences by Catholic professors, in which philosophy, history and religion were to be treated with amplitude and solidity. An instruction, embodying this decision, was sent out by the Bishops of the Province of Westminster, August, 1896. All that has been found practicable hitherto has been to assemble the Catholic undergraduates on Sunday mornings by themselves in an oratory, where Mass is said and half an hour's conference addressed to them. These conferences (in the book before us) represent the author's share in the work. They are republished with some slight revision."

These conferences have been published before in separate form, but they are now brought together for the first time. They form a very useful collection for all persons, but especially for young men who are coming in daily contact with the world and its false maxims. They are an excellent antidote for the sneers and misrepresentations that do so much harm to religion and its true representative, the Roman Catholic Church. They should be read by our young men who are students of non-sectarian schools and universities, so-called, for there are no such institutions in fact. The very same dangers that confront Catholic students at Oxford and Cambridge exist in our secular schools, but in an exaggerated form. The prudence which moved the Holy Father to require the safeguards of these conferences for the more ancient institutions would advise them also for the more modern, if it were possible to introduce them. We hope, at least, that the publishers and agents of this and similar volumes will use every means in their power to bring them to the attention of Catholic students.

The present volume contains twenty-two conferences held at Oxford and twenty-three held at Cambridge. The subjects embrace philosophy, theology, history and liturgy. In them the learned author defends truth and combats error in that clear, straightforward style that is characteristic of him and that is irresistible.

New Footsteps in Well-Trodden Ways. By *Katherine E. Conway.* Boston: The Pilot Publishing Company.

The "pledge" which Miss Conway took "not to write a new book" on her recent trip to Europe, was one of those rash resolutions which one "sins in making, and would sin more grievously in keeping." We are pleased, therefore, that she good-naturedly "yielded to the solicitation of circumstance." Her notes of travel are just such as we might have expected from a pious Catholic lady of her culture, independence of thought, American wide-awakedness and journalistic experience. Her previous reading had well equipped her for a profitable trip to the European capitals. She knew with precision what she wished to see, and saw more in a few months than an ordinary tourist would have seen in years.

My New Curate. A Story Gathered from the Stray Leaves of an Old Diary. By the *Rev. P. A. Sheehan*, P. P. Doneraile (Diocese of Cloyne). 12mo., pp. 480. Illustrated. Boston: Marlier, Callanan & Co.

Most of our readers are, probably, familiar with this story in its serial form in the *American Ecclesiastical Review.* It was begun in that magazine very quietly, without any previous announcement or promise of its merits, and without the author's name. From the first it was seen to be the work of a master hand. The characters were true to nature; they were introduced naturally and developed gradually in the midst of the proper surroundings and as occasion demanded their presence. The scenes of action were so clearly described as to produce that atmospheric effect which artists try so hard to get without success. Each character taught a lesson, without at all giving offense or lessening the interest of the story, although novelists generally hold that this cannot be done. Altogether the story in the *Ecclesiastical Review* sprang into instant favor and attracted widespread attention. There was a general demand for it in book form, and it was sold as fast as it came from the press. Already the fifth edition is on the market.

It is very attractive in its new dress. It is excellently printed on good paper. The illustrations are generally disappointing. Not in workmanship, but in conception. This is particularly true of those which picture the parish priest and the curate. They are not the Daddy Dan and the Father Letheby whose acquaintance we made in the pages of the *Ecclesiastical.* The artist has surely failed to see through the eyes of the author. This may not strike the new reader so strongly as it does the old one, because the former has the assistance of the artist in forming his conceptions, but very rarely, indeed, does a portrait satisfy one who has seen the original or formed a mind picture of him from a good description.

"My New Curate" will last. It is a distinctive work without a rival. It is so well done that later comers of the same kind, and very likely they will appear, cannot displace it.

THE JESUIT RELATIONS AND ALLIED DOCUMENTS. Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France, 1610–1791. Vol. LX. Lower Canada, Illinois, Iroquois, Ottawas: 1675–1677. 8vo, pp. 323. Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers.

This great work is progressing steadily and rapidly. It was a big undertaking, and many had doubts about its completion; but the steady progress made up to the present time is a guarantee of ultimate success. The work is intensely interesting and immensely valuable. It was never published before in the originals with translations, and very likely it will never be published again. When we consider that the seven hundred and fifty copies which make up the whole edition will be scattered over the world, and allow for loss by accident and natural decay, we can easily understand the enormously increased value of the work in future years.

The same standard of excellence is followed in this volume that was followed in preceding volumes. We have the same simple, straightforward, truthful narration of facts with every detail, that is more interesting than fiction and more valuable than imagination. Each new volume is a new story, or series of stories, which have never been equaled, and the happy possessors of the work await each addition to it with great interest while they hope for its completion.

ORESTES A. BROWNSON'S MIDDLE LIFE. From 1845 to 1855. By *Henry L. Brownson.* 8vo, pp. 646. Detroit: H. L. Brownson.

This is the second volume of the "Life of Dr. Brownson." The first was called "Brownson's Early Life." The present volume begins with his entrance into the Catholic Church, as in the previous book the reader was brought down to that period. Every part of Dr. Brownson's life is interesting, but probably the period embraced in this volume is the most interesting of all. It shows the active mind, strong intellect and indomitable will at work for the first time without doubt or hesitation in the true Church of Christ. The time was most propitious. It was at a period when such a champion was needed to combat the senseless ravings of Know-Nothingism. Brownson was the man for the occasion, and right valiantly he gave battle.

The book is a valuable contribution to history, and when the succeeding volume has appeared, the work will be a necessity for all who would understand rightly the events of the years during which Brownson labored for the true and the good.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Die Heiligen Sacramente der Katholischen Kirche. Fuer die Seelsorger dogmatisch dargestellt von *Dr. Nikolaus Gihr.* Second volume treats of Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders and Matrimony. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, $2.35 net.

Vespers and Compline. A Soggarth's Sacred Verses. By *Rev. Matthew Russell, S. J.*, author of "Idyls of Killowen," etc. 12mo., pp. 155. Price, $1.00. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Meditations for Retreat. Taken from the Writings of St. Francis de Sales. Arranged by St. Jane Frances Frémiot de Chantal. 16mo., pp. 202. Price, 75 cents. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Des Apostels Paulus Brief an die Philipper. Ueberstetzt und erklaert von *Dr. theol. Karl Joseph Mueller*, Professor, Geistl. Rath in Breslau. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, $2.50 net.

Die Genesis nach dem Literalsinn erklaert. Von *Gottfried Hoberg*, Doctor der Philosophie, und der Theologie. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, $3.10 net.

The Story of the Divine Child. Told for Children in Pictures and in Words. By *Very Rev. Dean A. A. Lings.* 16mo., pp. 256. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The Blood of the Lamb. By *Kenelm Digby Best*, of the Oratory. 12mo.. pp. 180. Price, $1.00. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The Morrow of Life. Translated from the French of the Abbé Henry Bolo. 12mo., pp. 253. New York: Benziger Brothers.

St. Anthony of Padua and the Twentieth Century. By *Rev. Francis Dent.* 12mo., pp. 253. New York: P. J. Kennedy.

The Room of the Rose, and Other Stories. By *Sara Trainer Smith.* 12mo., pp. 266. Philadelphia: John Joseph McVey.

Chronicles of "The Little Sisters." By *Mary E. Mannix.* 12mo., pp. 378. Notre Dame, Ind.: *The Ave Maria.*

Over the Rocky Mountains to Alaska. By *Charles Warren Stoddard.* 12mo., pp. 168. St. Louis: B. Herder.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXV.—JULY, 1900—No. 99.

PENITENTIAL DISCIPLINE IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

AFTER the Eucharistic celebration in its various forms and developments nothing has occupied through Christian ages a more important place in the external life of the Church than the Discipline of Penance. To be reconciled to God and admitted afresh to the hope of heaven was, naturally, the greatest concern of sinners alive to their condition, while it was that of the Church to secure to them as fully and effectively as possible so essential a benefit. Her action in this regard is interesting to observe at every period; it is particularly so in the first ages of her existence, when her doctrines were being evolved and her discipline was still in course of formation. Hence the close attention with which writers of Church history and students of dogmatic theology are wont to examine the principles enunciated and the practices followed in these early times. Since the beginning of the seventeenth century large tomes have been devoted to describing and discussing them,[1] and the results which have been reached are briefly set forth in our manuals of Church

---

[1] We may mention among others Sirmundus, S. J., "Historia Pœnitentiæ Publicæ;" Petavius, "Animadvers. in S. Ephiphan.;" Dom Martene, "De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus," but above all the Oratorian Joan. Morinus, "Commentarius Historicus de Administratione Sacramenti Pœnitentiæ" (1682); Dom Chardon "Histoire des Sacraments," chiefly a summary, clear and interesting, of Morinus' great work, to be found in vol xxi. of Mignes' "Cursus Completus Theologiæ." Among recent writers we may mention Dr. Funk, professor of history in the University of Tubingen, especially in his article in the "Kirchenlexicon."

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1899, by Benjamin H. Whittaker, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

history and theology. But a consecutive study of the subject down to the present day remained to be carried out and it has been undertaken at length, not by a Catholic theologian or cleric, but by a non-Catholic and a layman.

I.

It is now nearly four years since Henry Charles Lea, LL. D., of Philadelphia, published in three large volumes "A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church." The work contains much more than its title suggests; in fact, it comprises a historical presentation of the whole penitential system which prevailed from the beginning down to the present day, with an attempt to describe its working and to determine its ultimate consequences. The names of "Auricular Confession" and "Indulgences" were doubtless selected for the title as being more likely to catch the public ear, although anything like popular success would seem to have been entirely absent from the mind of the writer. Such an end he might easily have reached with one-tenth of the materials accumulated in his volumes and of the labor bestowed upon them. But Dr. Lea is evidently above all things a scholar. He reads and he writes chiefly for his own satisfaction. He is deeply interested in the history of the Catholic Church, and loves to go back to the sources in order to study the nature and working of her institutions. Having satisfied himself as to their real character and value, he proceeds to impart to those who are interested in them the curious facts he has come across and the conclusions they have suggested to him; the whole with a multiplicity of quotations and an absence of rhetoric equally welcome to the student and uninviting to the general reader. It is in this way that, besides some earlier historical studies, he has given to the public in succession "A History of Religious Celibacy," "A History of the Inquisition" and, last of all, the history of penitential discipline with which we are presently concerned. The two former works awakened a certain amount of interest and reached a second edition. The last, appealing to a much more limited class of readers, seems to have attracted less notice. Few reviews, so far as we know, have discussed its contents; yet to our mind Dr. Lea's most recent work is by far the most valuable of the three. Not only is its subject the most important, but it must have cost the writer incomparably more labor and research.

The "History of Auricular Confession" is visibly the product of a scholarly mind working for years amid a rich and rare collection of theological books. One is amazed at the number of authorities to which the writer appeals at each step. Every page has its abundant footnotes of references and quotations. Fathers, Popes, Councils, historians, theologians are called up in evidence on each detail, and with an accuracy of quotation which the present writer has never found at fault. In short, by the wealth of his erudition as well as by the evident love of his work, Dr. Lea forcibly reminds one of those great Benedictine scholars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to whose untiring industry subsequent generations owe so much. Unhappily there have been wanting in him some of those qualities which enabled these learned men to give abiding value to their worth and weight to their judgment; in particular, special learning, thoroughness and an open mind.

Special work demands special preparatory training, and, first of all, a thorough knowledge of the sciences implied in the subject under consideration. A geologist, for example, needs to be familiar with the various forms of living nature. An astronomer requires a knowledge of physics and mathematics. No man who is not a lawyer will attempt to write a general history of criminal law; only a soldier will undertake to describe the gradual transformation of military tactics. In the same way, to write a history of the discipline of penance in the Catholic Church, it takes not only a scholar acquainted with the sources of Church history, but also a professional theologian, or at least one perfectly familiar with the doctrines of the Church which always underlie her discipline and can alone give a key to it. Short of this, the most learned of men, with all the facts at his fingers' ends, is sure to lose himself.

And this is just what happens to Dr. Lea in his "History of Auricular Confession." He knows the facts; he is not unacquainted with the doctrines of the Catholic Church, but he knows them only in an abstract, external, incomplete way. Points familiar to every enlightened Catholic escape him. He cites as peculiar to a writer what is admitted by all; he is surprised and shocked at what, properly understood, is but natural and simple. We are told of the great French historian, Thiers, that he succeeded in giving his wonderfully clear and vivid descriptions of battles and campaigns by constantly associating with military men. How often while reading Dr. Lea's history have we regretted, for his own sake and that of his readers, that instead of getting information on Catholic subjects from books only, he did not choose to consult occasionally some living authority. A few conversations with a Catholic theologian would have sufficed to preserve him from a number of mistaken conceptions which mislead his uninitiated readers and detract considerably from the value of his work. They would also have undoubtedly led him to treat his subject more thoroughly.

For a vast accumulation of quotations and facts does not suffice to give thoroughness to a work. It requires, besides, a close comparative study of them in order to determine their meaning as well as a clear statement and discussion of the position and proofs of those who hold opposite views. Dr. Lea, it is true, tells us in his preface that he has sought to write a history, not a polemical treatise. But in this he has attempted more, perhaps, than was possible in dealing with such a subject. Some definite construction had to be put on the evidence, taken as a whole, and in the one chosen by Dr. Lea he antagonizes from beginning to end the claims and beliefs of the Catholic Church. Yet nowhere can the reader find the latter fully and candidly stated, while the proofs upon which they rest are either conveniently ignored or treated with a freedom and ease unworthy of a serious writer.

Thus, for example, the power of the Church to forgive sins in the tribunal of penance is chiefly based on the words of the Risen Saviour: *Whose sins you forgive they shall be forgiven*, etc. (John xx., 22). What meaning does Dr. Lea attach to these words? How does he account for the special solemnity with which Christ chose to surround them? How can he explain the fact that all the churches, so independent of each other in these early times, so different and often so divided, yet all believed in appealing to the power of the keys in order to obtain the remission of sin, and that they have persevered in the practice down to the present day? He quotes the words of Christ, but does not stop to inquire what they may mean; he admits the facts, but he makes no serious attempt to account for them. Surely the free use of the term sacerdotalism is no sufficient explanation, and yet Dr. Lea supplies no other. If the power of the Church over sin shows itself faintly at an early date, it is "the beginning of sacerdotalism;" if, later on, it reveals itself more distinctly, it is "the growth of sacerdotalism;" if, finally, it becomes the undeniable belief and practice of the whole Christian world, it is "the triumph of sacerdotalism." And that is all.

The truth is that Mr. Lea, while loth to be unjust to the Catholic Church, and striving sometimes to be fair, yet lacks that openness of mind, still more that sympathy which we are told a historian needs to understand and to describe properly individuals or institutions. At no time, if we may judge by his previous writings, has he had love or leaning for the Catholic Church. All he could see in her was a human institution, born of a false conception of Christ's teachings, sustained chiefly by ambition, and flourishing at the expense of human ignorance and weakness. Entering in such a frame of mind on the study of the Church's penitential discipline, we must not be surprised that he misunderstood so completely its meaning and misinterpreted so many of its facts. Putting together his various statements, we are led to this conception: that Christ never gave the Church the power of forgiving sins; that such a power was not thought of at all in the beginning; that the discipline of penitence and reconciliation practised by the Church was purely external; that in these early times she merely exacted signs of sorrow and practices of atonement from the sinner, solemnly prayed for him, and finally, when she deemed him sufficiently repentant, readmitted him to communion. That was all. Only later on, with the growing influence of ecclesiastical authority, did the belief of a mysterious power over the guilty soul arise and spread, until it finally became one of the distinctive doctrines of the Catholic Church.

To substantiate this position no formal demonstration is attempted; but proofs are suggested right through the work, chiefly, as is natural, of a negative kind, the position of Dr. Lea being mainly a denial of the claims of Catholic theology. All the same he never fails to quote positive testimonies or facts which seem to run counter to Catholic belief. Yet we know that on the one hand silence is no evidence unless in circumstances in which a writer must have spoken had he known, and on the other hand, that his mind, when he does speak, should not be gathered from a stray sentence, ambiguous or, it may be, unaccompanied by limitations which the reader, especially if he be a contemporary, is supposed to supply. Such are the canons of intrepretation universally admitted, yet Dr. Lea shows a constant disregard for them. In the present paper there is no room for particulars; but if the reader wishes to see our historian's methods set forth in detail he need only turn to the able discussion of them by Rev. P. H. Casey, S. J. ("Notes on a History of Auricular Confession"—McVey, Philadelphia), in which the learned professor, though confining himself to the dissection of a single chapter, gives a key to the prevailing methods of the whole book and enables to judge of its argumentative value. There are times when one would be strongly tempted to question the good faith of the writer; but it is pleasanter to think that he is only prejudiced and unfriendly. After all, it happens to him only what happens to men of undoubted honesty when they start on a study, having made up their minds beforehand as to what it is to lead them to. They go along noticing all that makes for their beliefs, leading them unconsciously into what is vague or ambiguous, overlooking or putting the most unnatural construction upon what seems to contradict them. What else can they do, unless they are prepared to relinquish their original position, to which they may feel constrained to hold on? Theologians, anyhow, should be among the last to claim that such methods imply a lack of good faith.

In reality, the whole question, studied in its sources, is far less clear and satisfactory than in our manuals of theology. Few questions, indeed, in Christian antiquity are more confused and entangled than the doctrine and practice of penance. Nor shall we find anything strange in this if we consider the extreme complexity of a process in which God, the Church and the repentant sinner have all an important share, and, at the same time, the varying character of the discipline through many ages. To one or the other of these two causes may be assigned most of the obscurities and discrepancies, apparent or real, which we meet in the statement of fact or doctrine which came down to us on the subject from the first four or five centuries. Thus at one time we are told that the Church forgives sin, at another that God, being the offended one, alone forgives, or again that guilt is washed out by the tears of the sinner. We may add that the vocabulary remains long imperfect, the same term being employed to signify things not perhaps entirely unlike or having nothing in common, yet striking us chiefly by their differences. Thus such familiar and constantly recurring words as *Penance, Reconciliation, Communion, Confession, Forgiveness, Peace,* etc., have a variety of meanings unsuspected by the ordinary modern reader and not easily determined in many cases by the student. Amid all this nothing is easier than to lose oneself, or, if one is so minded, to find materials for building up the most opposite theories. Even Catholic theologians, with the clue of traditional doctrines to guide them, are far, as we shall see, from putting the same construction on many particulars, and in the points in which they are in agreement they find a striking contrast between the ancient methods and the familiar aspects of the institution as it is applied in our day.

A rapid sketch of the discipline, such as our space will allow, will not be out of place here, especially as it will allow us to show, as we proceed, the weakness of Dr. Lea's positions, and at the same time to throw some light on the historical difficulties that still cling to the subject.

II.

Already before the coming of Christ, indeed from the beginning of the world and through the whole history of the chosen people, God showed Himself "compassionate, merciful, ready to forgive," but always on condition of genuine repentance, shown principally by a change of life and by works of self-humiliation and atonement. Now it is remarkable that in the earliest references to the subject in the new dispensation nothing else is mentioned. St. Clement in his Epistle to the Corinthians (ch. vii. and viii.) brings together the promises of the Old Testament to encourage the sinner by the great fact that "from generation to generation the Lord has granted a place of repentance to all such as would be converted to Him." In the "Didache," or Doctrine of the Apostles, belonging, as many think, to the close of the first century, repentance is also referred to as the remedy of sin. All through the "Pastor" of Hermas (A. D. 150) nothing but repentance is spoken of, so that if we were entirely dependent on these early documents, we should be led to believe that no new methods or conditions of forgiveness had been introduced under the Gospel. Even fifty years later Tertullian, though dealing expressly with the subject in his short treatise, *De Pœnitentia*, gives little additional information. For him, too, repentance is almost everything. Already, he says, in baptism it is a necessary condition of forgiveness. But this sacrament for which it prepares should mark the end of a guilty life. Yet there are those who fall again; some into sins of deed, others into sins of thought or desire. Both need a remedy, and it is found once more, but only once, in penance or repentance. Tertullian mentions this "second plank" with reluctance, lest it become an encouragement to fresh sins. He describes the process as an acknowledgment of guilt made to God, like that of the prodigal son to his father, and represents the repentant sinner as wearing a penitential garb, fasting, praying, casting himself at the feet of priests and pious people to solicit their intercession. He exhorts the sinner to conquer his pride, and since shame has not kept him from sin, not to let shame keep him from acknowledging and expiating it. Neither should he be deterred by the hardships of the penitential life, for men are ready to face worse to secure temporal advantages, and no sacrifice is too great to escape the torments of hell.

The discourse of Tertullian is not a didactic treatise; it is an exhortation; therefore many particulars may have been omitted as not bearing on the object of the writer, or as sure to be supplied by his readers. Indeed, we have in it a clear suggestion of something more than what we might call the natural course of atonement. The process has to be gone through publicly, and it can be availed of but once, both which circumstances point to a positive discipline already established and enforced in the Church.

What that discipline was we learn more in detail from the ecclesiastical writers who follow next in order of date, Origen and St. Cyprian; after whom all the essential features of penance stand out with growing distinction, such as we find them in the Catholic Church at the present day.

At every step we are confronted with the conviction that private repentance, however deep and sincere, does not suffice to do away with grievous sin, even though secret; that forgiveness is secured only by acknowledging one's guilt to the Church, by submitting to her treatment, severe but salutary, and by receiving finally at her hands reconciliation and peace, of which the supreme and final pledge consisted in admission to the Eucharist. In a word, we have Confession, Satisfaction and Absolution; and all the testimonies collected by Dr. Lea cannot obscure this great fundamental fact.

But they bring out forcibly that other fact already felt in the schools of theology, that much obscurity still surrounds the particulars of the institution as practised in the early period of its history.

As regards its first element, some sort of confession seems to have been a common practice among the faithful from the very beginning. St. James, after referring to the anointing of the sick (v. 13), adds the recommendation: *Confess therefore your sins one to another, and pray one for another that you may be saved.*

St. John, too (I. John i., 9), speaks of confession, but although one would like to see in his words an allusion to the sacrament, it cannot be shown that he means anything more than an acknowledgment of one's guilt before God. The "Didache" (ch. lv.) is much more explicit. "In the church thou shalt confess thy transgressions and shall not come forward for thy prayer with an evil conscience." And again (ch. xiv.): "On the Lord's day do ye assemble and break bread and give thanks, after confessing your transgressions in order that your sacrifice may be pure." Here we see confession resorted to as a purifying process, but no mention being made of a penance imposed or priestly prayer of forgiveness uttered, we can hardly suppose that the practice possessed a sacramental character, and must only see in it a custom, similar to that of religious in chapter, and for the same purposes of purification and salutary self-abasement.

But when we come to Origen, St. Cyprian and those who follow, the case is clear. We are in presence of a necessary avowal, relieving the soul, as the removal of undigested food or corrupted matter relieves the body; to be made, furthermore, not to God only, but to those who preside in the Church (Orig. in Psalm xxxvii.). In his commentary on St. Luke xvii. Origen is still more explicit. "If we reveal our sins not only to God, but also to those that can cure them, they will be blotted out by Him who saith: *Whose sins ye forgive,* etc." And on Numbers x.: "They who feel their wounds go to the priest to be healed. . . . He becomes holy who appeals to the bishop for the remission of his sin."

Testimonies of a similar kind abound in the treatise of St. Cyprian, *De Lapsis,* in the two books *De Pœnitentia* of St. Ambrose and many other writings of the fourth century, all familiar to the student of theology. We will confine ourselves to recalling the sermon of St. Augustine (*serm.* 351), in which the whole process of recovery from sin as understood in his time is so clearly set forth that it cannot fail to interest the reader.

There are three kinds of penance, he says, one which prepares the soul for baptism, another which blots out our daily faults, a third to be practised by those who have fallen into sins that exclude from the kingdom of heaven. In regard to these last the sinner has to be severe to himself if he would secure indulgence from above. Let him, then, erect a tribunal in his own soul, listen to the accusing voice of conscience and, recognizing his guilt, pronounce against himself the strict but necessary sentence of exclusion from the Body and Blood of the Lord.

But this is only the beginning. "When the sinner," continues St. Augustine, "has thus administered to himself a severe yet beneficent correction, let him turn to those who hold in their hands the keys of the Church and let him receive from them the measure of his atonement, in which account must be taken not only of what is profitable to himself, but also of what is necessary for the edification of others, so that if they have been scandalized by his offenses, they may be edified by his public expiation."

III.

It will be noticed that during all these early ages only those who were conscious of having committed grievous faults thought of appealing to the keys of the Church. Confessions of devotion were unknown. Not only saints, like Ambrose or Augustine, but all those who lived up to the essentials of the Christian law went through life purifying themselves of their daily faults by prayer and good works, and renewing their strength by the frequent reception of the Eucharist, but never thought of appealing to the power of the keys. And these for a long time formed the great majority of the Christian community. Many were won to the faith or received baptism only after—sometimes long after reaching manhood, and they sought it only when they had resolved to lead a truly Christian life. Furthermore, their earnestness was tested by the discipline of the catechumenate, which was a sort of novitiate of the Christian profession. During that period of probation they learned to look back with horror on their past sins and to fashion themselves to the spirit and practices of the new life. When admitted at length, they were bound to avoid the occasions and occupations of life which most exposed to sin; they lived under the eyes of the clergy and of the brethren, ever ready to remind them of their obligations. In this way comparatively few fell into grievous sins. If guilty of a crime that entailed public penance, they were often slow to turn to the appointed remedy. Its severity deterred them, and so they put it off from year to year, as others put off the reception of baptism. Like baptism, public penance could be available but once, and this was an additional inducement for them to reserve it for the end. Meanwhile, unless excommunicated, they attended the celebration of the Holy Mysteries, but they abstained from communion. Some, however, yielding to human respect, feared not to approach with the rest of the faithful.[2] S. Pacian and St. Augustine refer to the fact, but declare themselves unable to prevent it, for lack of proof against those guilty of the sacrilege.

From all this it is easy to see how limited was the practice of confession in the early ages of the Church, and how natural that so little trace of it should be met in the rare and brief documents which have come down to us from the first and second centuries. There are those who would narrow it still more. In a remarkable essay suggested by Dr. Lea's work, a professor of the Catholic University of Paris, Dr. Boudinhon, proposes the view that, like many other particulars appertaining to the sacraments, our Lord may have left to the Church to determine what sins should be submitted to the power of the keys, and that as a fact for a long time only three kinds were thus submitted: idolatry, impurity and murder.[3]

It is perfectly true that the discipline of *public penance* was long confined to these three categories. On the other hand, it is difficult to discern any other form of penance during the first four centuries. Surely if secret sacramental penance was practised side by side with the other, it could not have been applied to the same sins, else the more rigorous discipline would have soon disappeared. But there is no question of it even in connection with less grievous sins, and hence the conjecture of the learned professor that it was but gradually and after a considerable time that these sins were submitted to the keys of the Church. But such a position can hardly be reconciled with the formal declaration of the Council of Trent (sess. xiv., Cap. v. and can. vii.) that confession of all mortal sins is a divine institution, and consequently independent of the power of the Church. At most it may be held that the law had not been everywhere thoroughly understood and practised from the beginning. Certainly the distinction between mortal and venial sins, while obvious in many cases, was far from clear in many more, especially to consciences that had been originally trained outside the influence of the Gospel. The language even of some of the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers sounds strange to our ears. Tertullian (De Pudicitia ix), though a rigorist, speaks with leniency of faults to which all are exposed, of sins of anger, striking, cursing, rash oaths, unfaithfulness to engagements, lying through shame, faults of the palate, of the ears, of the eyes. S. Pacian of Barcelona invites to public penance—the only one he seems to know—those guilty of any one of the three great crimes. "Other sins," he says, "are cured by the compensation of better works—niggardliness by liberality, slander by satisfaction, perverse ways by upright conduct," etc. ("Parœnesis ad Pœnit," ix.) Later on St. Cesarius of Arles in a sermon long attributed to St. Augustine and still printed in the appendix of his sermons (serm. 257) exhorts his hearers to do penance, not only for their grievous or capital sins, but also for those lesser faults, *minuta peccata,* which he thus describes:

---

[2] The common custom up to the fifth century, and in many places later, was that all present at the Holy Sacrifice received communion, unless positively unworthy. Those who failed to do so were naturally suspected of some grievous fault. [3] "Revue d'Hist. et. Litter Relig," July, 1897.

"Consider that even if you are exempt from more grievous sins, the lesser ones which you think nothing of are so numerous that if all were put together your good works would scarce suffice to compensate for them. Think of all you committed since you came to the use of reason by cursing, by swearing, by false oaths, by slander and idle talk, by hatred, by anger, by envy, by evil desires, by gluttony, by sloth, by impure thoughts, by unchaste looks, by listening to improper discourses, by disregard for the poor, for the traveler, for the prisoner, by failing to reconcile enemies, by neglecting to fast on fasting days, by talking in church and failing to heed the divine office," etc.[4]

---

[4] Cogitemus ex quo sapere cœpimus quid pro juramentis, quid pro perjuriis, quid pro maledictis, quid pro detractionibus, quid pro odio, quid pro ira, quid pro invidia, quid pro concupiscentia mala, quid pro gula, quid pro somnolentia, quid pro sordidis cogitationibus, quid pro concupiscentia oculorum, quid pro voluptuosa delectatione aurium, quid pro ex-

Here, as in the enumeration of Tertullian, sins mortal and venial are thrown in together, and we may well imagine that such a confusion was not rare in early times, with the result that many guilty of mortal sins failed through ignorance to submit them to the keys of the Church. But it is incredible that in spite of the warnings of the Gospel and of the formal declarations of St. Paul (to say nothing of the voice of conscience), all sins not included in the three categories would have been looked upon as venial, or that the divine law in regard to them could have been generally unknown or neglected for any considerable time. Surely the faithful whose consciences were burdened with what they considered grievous sins must have appealed to the Church for forgiveness. That such was the practice already in the time of Tertullian seems to follow from the fact that, writing as a Montanist (De Pudicitia) he denies the power of forgiveness in the Church only as regards the *peccata majora*, implying thereby that it was customary to submit others also to her authority.

This, too, may be gathered from the freedom with which new sins were submitted to public penance in the fourth century. (V. Morinus, l. v., c. 31). The impression which naturally arises from the facts is that all grievous sins were submitted to the bishops in the first instance, and that their concern was to determine which among them should be expiated by the established forms of public atonement. This again seems to be the mind of St. Augustine in his sermon 351, already referred to. A guilty conscience—"sins against the decalogue"—leads the sinner to abstain from communion and to apply to the Church for the spiritual medicine by which he may be healed. The priest decides whether or not he shall join the ranks of those who do public penance. But surely if the decision is in the negative, the penitent, though guilty of grievous faults, will not be simply dismissed. Other and gentler remedies will be applied to him—exercises corrective rather than penal. It is to these, doubtless, that St. Pacian and others refer when they speak of "opposite practices—better works" as the proper atonement for the less grievous and the lighter sins. Such penances, not being determined by custom or law, were left to the judgment not of the sinner himself, but of the bishop or priest to whom he had entrusted his conscience. They were doubtless accompanied by the

---

asperatione pauperum, quid pro eo quod aut tarde aut difficile Christum in carcere visitavimus, quod peregrinos negligentes suscepimus, quod secundum promissionem nostram in baptismo hospitibus pedes lavare negleximus, quod infirmos tardius visitavimus, quod discordes ad concordiam non toto et integro animo revocavimus, quod Ecclesia jejunante prandere voluimus, quod in ipsa Ecclesia stantes dum sanctæ lectiones legerentur, otiosis fabulis occupati sumus, quod aut psallendo aut orando aliquoties aliud quam opporteret cogitavimus, quod in conviviis non semper quæ sancta sed aliquoties quæ sunt luxuriosa locuti sumus.

ordinary prayers by which the other sinners were admitted to reconciliation, for at no time do we find special forms for secret absolution. It is strange, we must confess, that so important a form of discipline should remain so long without special mention and emerge distinctly to view only at the beginning of the fifth century; and we can attempt to account for it only by supposing that the solemn and striking discipline of public penance, with its strict rules and settled practices, completely overshadowed the other, which was sufficiently known to all and carried out entirely between the sinner and the chosen physician of his soul.[5]

The second act of the penitential process—*the penances enjoined and practised*—might now claim to be considered. But the subject, though complex, offers little real difficulty. It is found sufficiently explained in most of our modern Church histories, and there is little that calls for comment in what Dr. Lea has to say of it. It suggests indeed many important reflections and conveys more than one useful lesson; but our space is limited and we must pass on to the third and crowning act, *the reconciliation of the sinner through the keys of the Church.*

IV.

That a certain amount of ambiguity and obscurity surrounds the practice in early times cannot be denied; that the true values of the Church's forgiving power and action were but imperfectly understood by many, and that it took a long course of ages to make it clear to all is a fact which forces itself upon whoever goes over the original testimonies. But only one who closes his eyes to them can claim, as Dr. Lea does, that at any time the act of reconciliation extended by the Church to the penitent sinner meant only peace with her and not forgiveness from God. This is not questioned as regards the later ages; but it is from the first that we find Tertullian and the fathers assimilate the cleansing effects of the penitential rite on the soul to those of baptism. What does Tertullian Montanist reproach the Bishop of Rome with? That he undertakes to forgiven even such sins as adultery. What was the claim of the Novatians refuted by St. Ambrose? That the Church could forgive lesser but not the more grievous sins, which would be absurd on the face of it if applied merely to reconciliation with the Church herself. Why was St. Cyprian so much concerned that sinners should secure the benefit of reconciliation before they died? "Because," he tells us ("De Lapsis," 29), "it is only in the present that the remission made by the priest is of avail before God." Why should Pope Celestine I. regard as "impious cruelty" the denial of absolution to the dying sinner if its only effect was to reconcile him with a society to which he would soon cease to belong? Whence the eagerness of those sinners of whom St. Augustine writes, who, at the approach of the barbarians and the consequent peril of death, ardently sought to be reconciled, or at least to be admitted among the penitents? Why does he consider as heartless and unchristian the conduct of those priests who, instead of yielding to their entreaties, themselves sought safety in flight? All this points to something of supreme importance, peace, not merely with a Christian community itself in disruption, but with the society of the blessed and with God.[6]

---

[5] And yet St. Augustine, addressing the catechumens ("De Symbolo ad Catechum." *in fine*) formally declares that there are but three ways of obtaining forgiveness of sin—baptism, prayer and public penance. "Nolite illa committere pro quibus necesse est ut a Christi corpore separemini. Quod absit a vobis. Illi quos videtis agere pœnitentiam scelera com miserunt, aut adulteria aut aliqua facta immania. Inde agunt pœnitentiam. Nam si levia peccata eorum essent, ad hæc quotidiana oratio sufficeret. *Ergo tribus modis dimittuntur peccata in Ecclesia: in baptismate, in oratione, in humilitate majoris Pœnitentiæ.*"

Thus far there is no serious difficulty. Reconciliation granted by the Church always implied peace with God, provided, of course, the sinner by his dispositions was not unworthy of it. But we find other limitations in the exercise of this "power of the keys," as it is called, which are always a cause of surprise to those who come upon them for the first time, and which have given rise to much diversity of thought among modern writers.

Thus, 1. It would seem that for a time in various parts of the Church, and even in Rome, penance was positively denied to the three categories of great sinners—murderers, adulterers and apostates. The fact has been questioned as to Rome, yet various concurrent testimonies seem to substantiate it. It cannot be denied that the Council of Elvira, in Spain (vers. 305) refused the benefit of reconciliation, even at the hour of death, in a series of cases more or less comprised in the three above mentioned classes. 2. Another limitation was in regard to sinners who sought for reconciliation only when in danger of death. To such St. Cyprian refused to show indulgence, in which he was followed by the great Council of Arles (314), where it was decreed that apostates who had not sought penitence in health were to be debarred from it in sickness. 3. Perhaps the most striking restriction of all and assuredly the most universal was that which forbade sinners to be admitted to public penance more than once. "*Servis enim Dei,*" says Hermas, "*una pœnitentia.*" And Origen: "*In gravioribus criminibus semel tantum pœnitentiæ con-*

---

[6] See on this point F. Casey's "Notes," already referred to.

ceditur locus." S. Ambrose and St. Pacian show that the same law continued to prevail through the fourth century, and St. Augustine reëchoes it in the fifth when he tells us (Ep. 153) that even the lowest place in the church was denied to a relapsing penitent.

If we ask what gave rise to so rigid a discipline, the answer comes to us from the very writers who reveal its existence. To some the strong sayings of Our Lord (Matt. xii., 31) about certain sins being beyond forgiveness were a great source of perplexity, and the mysterious warning of St. John (I. John v., 16) and of S. Paul (Hebr. x., 26) added to the terror of the threat. Moved by these passages, Origen was led to believe that certain sins were beyond the Church's power; he even seemed to hold that only good priests could forgive the others. (De Oratione xxviii.) The Novatians eagerly grasped at the thought, but St. Ambrose (De Pœnit I., 10) is careful to explain the passages of Scripture, while the constant belief of Catholics set aside all limitations to the power of the Church.

Why then was forgiveness denied for a time to the more grievous sins? Because of the exalted opinion in which the Christian profession was held in those early times. Whoever, after having breathed the air of the Gospel through childhood and youth, or having been trained by the methods of the catechumenate to the spirit and practices of the Christian life and solemnly pledged himself to it, yet departed from it to the extent implied by these grosser crimes, was cast out as unworthy of the Christian name. Those, on the other hand, who sought to take refuge in penance only in face of death were supposed to be devoid of genuine sorrow. To admit them, besides, at the last hour, and necessarily on easy terms, would act, it was feared, as an inducement to defer their conversion to the end. Finally those who, having been admitted once to public penance and reconciliation, yielded again to their evil passions, gave rise to the suspicion that they had never been truly converted, or that they were trifling with God's justice and abusing His mercy. An additional reason for not readmitting them to reconciliation was that once reckoned among the penitents, the name and some of the burdens of the condition clung to them, like the character of baptism or confirmation, for the rest of their lives.

But this extreme rigor, however well meant and advisable, perhaps, when first enacted, proved ultimately unsuited to the requirements of the case and was gradually put aside. As early as the beginning of the third century Tertullian reproaches the Bishop of Rome with admitting adulterers to penance and reconciliation. Fifty years later the same indulgence is extended to apostates truly repentant, in Rome, in Africa, in Egypt. The Council of Nicæa (A. D. 325) reverses the stern decrees of Elvira and orders that the sick shall also be admitted to penance and forgiveness, with the protective clause, however, that if they return to health they shall perform the full measure of the atonement. The limitation of public penance to a single application was slower to yield. St. Augustine speaks of it as still in vigor in his time; yet already the Pope, St. Siricius (A. D. 385), had decided that even relapsed penitents might be admitted to the Holy Mysteries and to communion at the hour of death. The barrier thus weakened was finally swept away in the next century under the pressure of circumstances too long to describe here.

But it will be naturally asked what was the condition, in the eyes of the Church, of those to whom she refused her ministrations? What was supposed to become of those to whom penance was denied at a certain time through life and even at the hour of death, or of those penitents who after their reconciliation relapsed into one of the greater sins? Were they looked upon as irretrievably lost? By no means. Tertullian leaves them to God, from whom they may win that forgiveness which the Church cannot (according to him) or will not grant them. St. Cyprian, while declining to show mercy to those apostates who sought forgiveness only in time of sickness is not without hope that God may forgive them, and as a consequence he continues to extend to them his paternal solicitude.[7] In like manner St. Augustine, though declaring that there is no place in the Church for the relapsed, yet insists that they must not despair of the divine mercy; but that instead of giving themselves up in despair to the enjoyments of the flesh, they should strive by the fervor of their repentance to appease the wrath of God and win back His favor. (Ep. 54 ad Macedon.)

V.

As to the manner in which the sinner was reconciled or pardoned we know that for a long time it was believed by theologians that absolution being a judicial sentence could be administered validly only in the indicative or imperative form; but in presence of the fact that up to the thirteenth century all the known forms of absolution are only prayers and still continue to be so in the Oriental churches, it is now generally admitted that the deprecatory form was sufficient. These prayers, begging forgiveness for the sinner, were pronounced (sometimes the same, sometimes different) when the penance was imposed, several times while it lasted, and finally in the solemn reconciliation at its close. Hence a difference of opinion as to when sacramental absolution was really granted. Lack of space forbids us to discuss the question here, but we have no doubt that, as a rule, forgiveness of sin was granted only in the formal reconciliation at the end.

---

[7] Quos quidem separatos a nobis non dereliquimus, sed ipsos cohortati sumus et hortamur agere pœnitentiam si quomodo indulgentiam poteriut recipere ad eo qui potest præstare, ne si relicti a nobis fuerint, pejores efficiantur.

What is much more difficult to determine exactly is the sense which the ancients attached to the action of the Church in reconciling the sinner. Their language in that regard is often obscure, confused and sometimes contradictory; nor can we fairly expect it to be otherwise in so complex a subject. Catholic theology slowly elaborated has made all clear to us, but in the early ages the faithful and their teachers were left in many things to themselves. They knew that repentance had lost nothing of its power to secure forgiveness. They further believed that to be effective (with or without the action of the Church) it had to bear a certain proportion to the extent of the sinner's guilt, proportion which could only be guessed at, yet by which the granting or denial of absolution was determined. Fervor in the penitential exercises caused it to be hastened, lukewarmness to be deferred. The clergy of Rome in their letter to St. Cyprian speak of apostates who "by tears and groans show a truly repentant spirit;" yet because the proximity of death forbids them to go through the whole process of expiation, they are reconciled with fear and trembling, "God Himself knowing what He will do with such and what way He will examine the balance of His judgment." Right through the early ages this is the prevailing tone. To repentance, to sorrow and works of atonement is the justification of the sinner almost entirely ascribed. The early fathers, as we have seen, talk of repentance and nothing more. Tertullian ("De Pœnitentia") in describing it makes no mention of the action of the Church. Origen seems chiefly to rely on the sinner's sorrow and good works as a means of forgiveness. "*Et tu,*" says St. Ambrose, "*si vis veniam mereri, dilue lacrymis culpam tuam.*" In his books on Penance he indicates, it is true, the power of the Church, but at the same time he seems to place the hope of forgiveness principally in the sorrow and atonement of the sinner. And this is the prevailing note of the whole fourth and fifth centuries. The prayers of others and one's own, alms, austerities of various kinds, these are the means that seem to be almost entirely relied on. Of this we have a striking example in the "Vitæ Patrum; or, Lives of the Fathers of the Desert." They abound in stories of sinners who withdraw from the world to do penance, or of anchorites who having momentarily fallen from grace return repentant to their solitary life. Now what they all rely upon to obtain forgiveness is the austere discipline to which they voluntarily submit themselves. In his "Ladder of Heaven" St. John Climacus describes a monastery in which the penitents, imprisoned at their own wish, were ever inventing new contrivances for tormenting themselves, and thought only of adding to their sufferings. Their sighs and groans could be heard from afar, and when strangers came near them their only words would be: "Do you think God will ever forgive us?" Their only hope seems to be in their atonements and the prayers they begged for. There is no turning, so far as we can see, to the power of the keys. The fact is, in all these stories of sinners seeking to obtain forgiveness we find no mention of an appeal to bishop or priest. The penitent, moved by the grace of God or by the advice of some holy anchorite (not a priest), embraced the penitential life of the desert, and pardon reaches him suddenly from above, or slowly through the expiatory works; but not, so far as the narrative shows, through any priestly agency.

And yet, as far back as we can see distinctly into the past, the sinner had always to turn to the Church, and neither in life nor in death did he feel secure unless the Church had forgiven him. The two doctrines, "forgiveness through repentance" and "forgiveness through the power of the keys," were held simultaneously, but without any attempt to determine the part of each or to harmonize their action. That so obvious a question should have been so long neglected is strange indeed; but not more so than in the case of many other problems which had to wait for the active and penetrating minds of the schoolmen. We meet this one for the first time exposed at length in the *Decretum* of Gratian (A. D. 1115), causa xxxiii., 93 dist. 1, under this form: *"Utrum sola cordis contritione et secreta satisfactione absque oris confessione quisquis possit Deo satisfacere?"* and, strange to say, instead of a formal response in the negative the great canonist gives authorities, Scriptural and Patristic, on both sides, and concludes thus: *"Cui harum sententiarum citius adhærendum sit, lectoris judicio reservatur. Utraque enim fautores habet sapientes et religiosos viros."* In a word, he leaves it an open question, and an open question it remains for the next two hundred years, dividing the keenest minds and the highest authorities, not, indeed, as a practical problem, for the obligation of confession was not questioned, but as to what was the share of absolution in the remission of sin. The discussion is most interesting to follow in the theologians of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Petrus Lombardus (A. D. 1130) adopts in his "Sentences" the opinion of Cardinal Pullus: "*A peccatis solvit sacerdos, non utique quod peccata dimittat, sed quod dimissa (per contritionem) sacramento pandat;*" and adds: "*Nec ideo negamus sacerdotibus concessam fuisse potestatem dimittendi et retinendi peccata, idest, ostendendi homines esse ligatos vel solutos. . . . Ligant quoque dum satisfactionem confidentibus imponent; solvunt quum de ea aliquid dimittunt—et ad communionem admittunt.*" The great "Master," as he was called, drew after him the bulk of theologians, among others Albert the Great. His opinion, says Morinus (p. 505) variously expanded, prevailed in the schools for nearly a hundred years. Only one kind of contrition was thought of, and that, it was held, secured forgiveness before the reception of absolution. It was only gradually, slowly and amid much speculation that subsequently the opposite view took hold and finally triumphed.

If so much obscurity gathered around questions of such importance through a lengthened period of intelligent discussion, how much more must have prevailed before close consecutive thought had been given to the subject. A certain school of theologians instinctively proceed on the principle that all was perfectly understood and correctly practised in the Church from the beginning. They fight hard against anything that they cannot justify, and what is too well attested to be denied they strive to twist into conformity with the fuller and more accurate conceptions of a later period. But the facts are often too strong for them, and hence the ever growing number of theologians who, with intentions equally pure, but with more intellectual honesty, accommodate their theories to the facts instead of twisting the facts in order to make them fit into preconceived theories. Thus they realize that while certain fundamental doctrines, such as the Incarnation, the Redemption, the Real Presence, stand out in their general lines as boldly and as distinctly from the first as at any subsequent period, their developments, logical and practical, were the work of ages; that the full meaning, measure and application of the Gospel institutions were understood in many particulars long after they were established; that, consequently, instead of taking it for granted that all in the early Church was just as we find it in our time, we have to study in detail each doctrine, each institution, such as the episcopate, the Papal supremacy, the sacraments, and ascertain by direct examination how far any given writer, or church, or age thought as we think or acted according to the principles which guide us at the present day.

Studied thus Christian antiquity gives us all the constitutive elements of the sacrament of penance, contrition, confession, satisfaction, absolution, but has no definite theory as to the share of each in the reconciliation of the sinner. We may well suppose that there were those in early times who, like the theologians of the twelfth century, ascribed to the contrition of the sinner the forgiveness of his sin, and who saw little more in absolution than reconciliation with the Church. We can understand how, for disciplinary purposes, those who held that view denied absolution to the relapsed, and how the growth of the opposite opinion led to a contrary practice.

We see how the problem of modern theologians—at what time and in what form forgiveness was imparted to the sinner—did not even occur to many, while such as assigned forgiveness to the power of the keys did not necessarily ask themselves which of the prayers said over the penitents produced the sacramental effect any more than they inquired which of the many unctions applied to the sick by a priest or by several priests, as in the Greek rite, acted sacramentally upon them. They performed the complex ceremony, believed in its mysterious efficacy and left the rest to God and to the curious inquiries of later generations. In nothing, perhaps, is the ancient discipline so unlike ours as in the amount of sorrow and expiation required of the repentant sinner. But this is because the Church aimed at effecting a radical change and a renovation so thorough in the sinner that his perseverance might be looked upon as morally certain, whereas we, doubtless for good reasons, content ourselves with a sorrow and a resolve to amend which, though weak and often ineffective, are for the time being honest and sincere.

We now return to the "History of Auricular Confession," which led us into the foregoing reflections. They correspond only to the earlier portion of Dr. Lea's work, for he pursues the subject down to the present day. All in it is new to him, and all interesting. To us its later stages are better known, some quite familiar, and we prefer to look at things as they were at the beginning. Yet the sequel of Dr. Lea's book is suggestive and not undeserving a critical discussion; but such a thing in dealing with the present work is no easy task. If what is objectionable were confined to a few positions or statements it could be handled without any special difficulty.

But in the present case it extends all over the book. Almost at every page there are facts misinterpreted, passages misunderstood, proofs weak or sophistical, suggestions unfounded, so that nothing short of a continuous abundant gloss would suffice to redress all that is faulty. As we have said, there is no close discussion, no definite position on most points. The truth is, Dr. Lea is an admirable compiler, but not a historian. He is sometimes overpowered by the abundance of his materials, and handles them or drops them like one who fails to see their value, or knows not how to dispose of them. He evidently delights in demolishing, but shows no taste to build. The constructive power is wanting. Hence, notwithstanding our wish to welcome a work on a great theological subject upon which so much labor has been spent, and, even though out of harmony on some points with Catholic belief, to recommend it to our readers, yet we find it difficult to do so. For any one unacquainted with the subject, the book, though full of information, is absolutely misleading. For others better equipped, it is confusing and perplexing. Yet at least for the latter it is truly suggestive. It calls attention to a vast number of interesting facts and testimonies generally unknown or unnoticed. It opens up many questions and leads to investigate them. It compels the student to go back to the sources and get their meaning at first hand. It brings home to him, finally, the value of the work of Catholic ages on the original data of faith and practice, and supplies the proof that to yield solid theological wealth, even so rich a mine as the early Christian Ages needs to be worked by Catholic hands.

J. HOGAN.

St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Mass.

RITUAL IN THE REIGN OF MAXIMIN.

I AM about to describe and discuss a work which has excited much attention among liturgical writers: "Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, nunc primum edidit, Latine reddidiet et illustravit Ignatius Ephraem II. Rahmani, Patriarcha Antiochenus Syrorum. Moguntiæ, Sumptibus Francisci Kircheim, 1899." The book purports to be an addition to the Gospels, a discourse of our Saviour to His Apostles after His resurrection, containing first a prediction of Antichrist; secondly, a minute ritual supposed to be there and then prescribed by Christ Himself. The work is an unmistakable forgery. The prediction is worthless, but the details of ritual are of great value. Embodying as they do many known fragments of ancient liturgy, they are evidently no mere inventions of the writer. He could not have expected to impose a new system of rites on the Church. He must have set down what he saw being done before his eyes, possibly with some little amplification of his own. Mgr. Rahmani, Catholic Patriarch of Antioch of the Syriac Rite, discovered the work as one portion of a Syriac manuscript, preserved at Mossul on the Tigris, dated A. D. 1654. He has published the Syriac text with a Latin translation. It has never been published before in its entirety. Fragments of it, however, appear in a Paris manuscript of the eighth century, published by Lagarde. The work is extant in another Syriac manuscript in the library of the Propaganda at Rome, dated A. D. 1578. A fourteenth century Arabic manuscript in the same library, purporting to be a translation from a Coptic manuscript of the tenth century, exhibits the same work. In the British Museum are two manuscripts of an Ethiopian version of the same. From the Mossul and the Roman manuscripts we learn that the work was translated into Syriac from the Greek in the year 687 A. D. This makes Greek the original language, so far back as we can trace the work. The title, in which the work is attributed to "Clement the Roman, disciple of Peter," is simply part of the forgery. The "Testamentum" covers much the same ground as the "Apostolic Constitutions," edited in the Coptic with an English translation by Tattam in 1848, and the "Canons of Hippolytus," of which a Latin translation from the Arabic was published by Mgr. de Haneberg in 1870. Mgr. Rahmani argues that the "Apostolic Constitutions" are founded upon this "Testamentum" which he publishes, being a second edition abridged and adapted to the discipline of a somewhat later age. The so-called "Canons of Hippolytus" he shows to be a clumsy forgery, the work of some clumsy compiler of a still later date. Yet a third work, called the "Eighth Book of Apostolic Constitutions," he considers to be derived from the "Apostolic Constitutions" above mentioned, otherwise called the "Ecclesiastical Canons," that is to say, from the second edition of the "Testamentum," put forward, he thinks, some time in the third century. The "Testamentum" itself he assigns to the second century ("Prolegomena," p. 48). Thus, if Mgr. Rahmani is right, the "Testamentum D. N. Jesu Christi" appeared some time between 100 and 200 A. D. A second edition, the "Ecclesiastical Canons," and a third edition, the "Eighth Book of Apostolic Constitutions," appeared between 200 and 300 A. D. He inclines to think that the "Testamentum" first saw the light in Syria, to which country what I have called the second and third editions of the "Testamentum" also belong. Certain indications seem to me to refer the work to the third rather than to the second century. Still it is most valuable as exhibiting apocryphal gospel, to be sure, but actual ritual, the ritual under which the sacraments were conferred which nourished the martyrs to victory.

The apocryphal prophecy of Antichrist and his times (supposed, of course, to be close at hand) which the inventor places in the mouth of our Lord after His resurrection betrays its apocryphal origin by the ineptitudes into which, after a fair beginning, it speedily descends. Antichrist is to have a head like a flame of fire, his right eye bloodshot, his left eye blue, with two pupils; his eyelashes white, his lower lip large, his right thigh shrunken, his feet broad, his middle finger flattened out and oblong. Portents to proceed his coming are the birth of children with white hair and the faces of old men, who shall foretell the end of the world and then beg immediately to be killed, dragons born of women, infant souls without bodies, quadruped infants, and the like trash. Of this nothing can be made. But another part of the prophecy affords some clue to the age of the composer. Apocryphal prophecy represents contemporary history. We read: "There shall be princes lovers of money, enemies of truth, slayers of their brethren, . . . kinsmen indeed of one another, but not in mutual concord, every one longing to destroy his partner's life. Through their armies shall be great distresses, flights and shedding of blood. But there shall arise in the west a king of foreign stock, a prince of extreme guile, godless, a murderer, a deceiver, covetous of gold, most crafty, wicked, an enemy and persecutor of the faithful." The second century had no such sad experiences, filled as great part of it was with the peaceful reign of the Antonines. But the years of the third century (212-235) exactly verify the pretended prophecy. Severus, dying in 211, left his empire to his two sons, Geta and Caracalla. In 212 Geta was murdered by Caracalla. This represents "princes, slayers of their brethren." Caracalla himself and the three succeeding emperors, Macrinus, Heliogabalus and Alexander Severus, all met with violent deaths. Heliogabalus in particular merits all the abuse which the prohetic author pours upon the princes of his time. In 235 "a king of foreign stock," the Thracian peasant Maximin, intruded himself upon the throne of the Cæsars—Maximin, the well-known "enemy and persecutor of the faithful," as the acts of St. Catherine of Alexandria and other martyrs attest. There were also to be "unrighteous pastors," who were to cause much trouble in the Church. Syria and Asia Minor were to be the scene of signal calamities. This may point to the Montanist and Cataphrygian heretics, who, as the name of the latter shows, were conspicuous in Asia Minor. "Unrighteous pastors" figure more in the history of the third than of the second century. Hence I think that Mgr. Rahmani has antedated the "Testamentum," and that it really belongs to the first half of the third century, not to the second.

From prophecy we pass to the main element, the only valuable element of the "Testamentum," the liturgical directions which are attributed to Christ Himself. First the sacred edifices are described on a scale quite inconsistent with catacombs, presenting the Church as living in the light of publicity, and by no means wanting for money. Such publicity, less possible at Rome under the immediate ken of the Emperor, was not denied to the Church in remoter parts of the empire in the second and third centuries. The details given remind us of a Cathedral, with palace, Cathedral close and canons' houses; or to recur to a fourth century precedent, to the erections of St. Basil at Cæsarea.[1] I enumerate the various buildings according to the names given. It would not be easy to draw an architectural plan of the whole. The church has three entrances. To the east is the altar and the Bishop's throne, raised three steps. The altar is curtained off. To the right and left (south and north side) of the altar are two porticoes, one for men and one for women. There is a catechumen's chapel, also a *diaconicon* where offerings are made for the Holy Table. The *diaconicon* is a hall, surrounded by a portico. Within or beyond this hall is a baptistry. Near the *diaconicon* is the treasury. There is also a registry, where their names are taken down who have made offerings for the altar, or for whom offerings have been made, that they may be prayed for in the holy sacrifice. There is a Bishop's house, a house of widows, houses of priests and deacons and a guest house.

The Bishop is elected by the whole people. All the neighboring Bishops meet and impose hands upon him, with a prayer, short and somewhat vague, still used in the Syrian pontifical; after which one Bishop alone, deputed by the rest, imposes his hands, reciting the consecration prayer, a long prayer still in use in the consecration of Bishops of the Coptic and the Syrian rite. The prayer contains these words, sufficiently significant of the powers of a Bishop:

---

[1] See "Saint Basile," par Paul Allard (Lecoffre, Paris.)

"Father, who knowest the hearts of all, grant to this thy servant, whom thou hast chosen to the episcopate, that he may feed thy holy flock, and exercise the functions of the high priesthood without reproach, ministering to thee night and day. May thy face appear to him, and render him worthy of offering to thee diligently and with all fear the oblations of thy holy Church. Impart to him that he may have thy spirit, strong in power to loosen all bonds, as thou didst grant it to thy apostles."

The first book of the "Testamentum" may be thus analysed: The sacred buildings, the Bishop and the ritual concerning him, especially the rite of the Eucharistic oblation, the presbyters and their ritual, deacons and their ritual, canonical widows and their ritual. The second book treats principally of catechumens, of baptism and of the Office for Easter Eve.

The Bishop is to fast six days a week for the three weeks succeeding his consecration and three days every week for the rest of his life. This latter fast the presbyters also are to observe. He is to abstain perpetually from flesh meat, not, however, as though such food were blameworthy in itself. "Wine he is never to taste, except only the chalice of the oblation." On this curious subject we shall have more to say. The like abstinence was incumbent also on the presbyters. One would wish to know from other historical evidence how far our author here was merely theorizing, and how far he is setting down what he actually saw put in practice.

The holy sacrifice is to be offered only on Saturday or Sunday and "on the fast day." From Tertullian (*de jejun.* ii., 14) we learn that Wednesdays and Fridays every week were fast days; this, however, our author does not say. The sacrifice is offered by the Bishop, with the presbyters standing around him. When the Bishop is indisposed one of the presbyters offers it in his stead. This extends the power of offering sacrifice to the second order of priesthood. Ordinarily, however, the presbyters do not exercise this power. There is no clear trace of their celebrating along with the Bishop. They impose their hands with him upon the bread to be consecrated, but the words of consecration, so far as we learn from the "Testamentum," are spoken by the Bishop alone. The essential rite of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, at which only the baptized were allowed to assist, is thus described:

The deacon makes this proclamation: "Lift your hearts to heaven. If any one has hatred against his neighbor, let him be reconciled. If any one is conscious of incredulity, let him confess. If any one has a mind estranged from the commandments, let him depart. If any has fallen into sin, let him not hide himself (*i. e.*, hide his sin); it is wicked to hide himself. If any one labors under a sick mind, let him not approach. If any be polluted, if any not firm, let him give place. If any one be estranged from the precepts of Jesus, let him depart. If any one despises the prophets, let him leave the company; let him keep himself from the anger of the Only-begotten. Let us not despise the cross; let us fly from the threats of our Lord. We have the Father of lights seeing with the Son, and the angels visitors. Look to yourselves, that you keep not hatred against your neighbors. Look that none remain in anger; God sees. Lift up your hearts to offer unto salvation of life and holiness. By the wisdom of God let us receive the grace that is given us."

"Then the Bishop confessing and giving thanks is to say in a loud and solemn voice." What follows is the preface, with the responses preceding it:

"'Our Lord be with you.' Let the people answer: 'And with thy spirit.' Let the Bishop say: 'Lift up your hearts.' Let the people say: 'We have unto the Lord.' Let the Bishop say: 'Let us confess [*i. e.*, give praise] to the Lord.' Let all the people say: 'It is meet and just.' Let the Bishop cry: 'Holy things by the holy.' Let all the people cry together: 'In heaven and on earth unceasingly.'"

The preface ensuing is quite unlike anything in our Missals. It is joined on to the Canon without any *Sanctus* intervening. The Canon is a continuous prayer to the Father, to the Son, and again to the Father, continuing thus: "Through thine Only-begotten Son, who was crucified for our sins, Thou, O Lord, hast sent into a virgin's womb thy Word, the Son of thy mind and Son of thy existence, through whom thou didst make all things, whereas in him thou wast well pleased; who, when he was conceived and made flesh, appeared as thy Son, born of the Holy Ghost and of a Virgin; who, fulfilling thy will and making ready a holy people, stretched out his hands to suffering that he might deliver them that have hoped in Thee from suffering and the corruption of death; who, when he was given over to his voluntary passion to raise them that were fallen, etc.—taking bread, gave to his disciples, saying: 'Take, eat, this is my body that is broken for you unto remission of sins. As often as you shall do this, you shall enact my resurrection.' [Curious variant from I. Cor. xi., 26.] In like manner the chalice of wine that he mixed, he gave unto a figure of the blood that was shed for us."

The "Ecclesiastical Canons," taken to be another edition of the "Testamentum," here read: "In like manner the chalice of wine that he mixed, saying: 'This is my blood that is shed for you.'" Ancient scribes had odd ways, and we cannot tell whether the writer of the parent manuscript of our MSS. of the "Testamentum" curtailed the form of consecration of the chalice out of reverence, or because it was so well known, as even now to many priests the words of consecration printed in the missal or on the altar card are practically useless there. What follows is called the *anamnesis,* or *recollection,* still easily recognizable in our rite:

"Mindful, therefore, of thy death and resurrection, we offer thee bread and cup, giving thanks to thee, who alone art God forever and our Saviour, because thou hast made us worthy to stand before thee and fulfil the ministry of priesthood unto thee. Wherefore we give thee thanks, we thy servants, O Lord." The last sentence is repeated by the people. It will be noticed that the *anamnesis* is addressed to the Son; that he whose death and resurrection is commemorated is distinctly styled God, and that in what we may take to be at any rate an ante-Nicene liturgy. The bearing of the pre-consecration prayer against the heresy of Nestorius is also observable.

The prayer continues: "Eternal Trinity [the term *Trinity* is as old as the second century], Lord Jesus Christ, Lord Father, Lord Holy Ghost." St. Ignatius of Antioch in his epistle to the Magnesians puts the three Persons in the same order, "in the Son and in the Father and in the Spirit," probably because through the Son we have access to the Father. Also St. Paul (II. Cor. xiii., 13): "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the charity of God, and the communication of the Holy Spirit." Corresponding to the *epiklesis* (invocation), which in the Latin Church now stands in the form, "Bid these gifts to be carried by the hands of thy holy angel to thy altar on high," we find here: "Bring this drink and this food of thy holiness, make them be to us not unto judgment, nor unto disgrace or unto perdition, but unto the healing and strength of our spirit." This primitive *epiklesis,* unlike that in use among the Greeks, could never be taken for a consecration prayer. The prayer goes on with a double *memento* for the living and for the dead. The former is principally made up of these words: "Sustain unto the end those who are in the enjoyment of graces of revelations, confirm them who enjoy the grace of healing, strengthen them who have the power of tongues, direct them who labor in the word of doctrine." For the explanation of this passage we must turn to

St. Paul, I. Cor. xii., xiii., xiv., on which St. Chrysostom writes as follows: "This passage is very obscure, owing to our ignorance and inexperience of things that happened when St. Paul wrote [and continued to happen when the author of this 'Testamentum' wrote], but do not happen now [A. D. 396]. In those days after baptism one immediately spoke in strange tongues; many also prophesied; some worked miracles. . . . They received the Holy Spirit in the instant of their baptism; but they could not see the Spirit, as He is invisible, and therefore the miraculous grace gave them a sensible proof of his operation. Thus at once one there was speaking the language of the Persians, another that of the Romans, another that of the Indians, and so of the rest. This was a sensible proof to those outside the faith that the Spirit was in the person of the speaker. They also raised the dead, chased out devils and did other wonders." St. Irenæus (martyred A. D. 202) testifies to permanence of these miraculous gifts in the Church in his time (Iren. ii., 32). How long before the time of St. John Chrysostom they came to an end I am unable to say. They are frequently mentioned in this "Testamentum," and persons who enjoyed them were assigned a place of honor in the Church, immediately after the clergy. This fact argues the early date of the "Testamentum," though it does not necessarily place it in the second century.

The *memento* for the dead is brief: "Remember them who have fallen asleep in the faith, and give us inheritance with thy saints." Elsewhere, in the bidding-prayer recited by the deacon, we have: "For the dead, who have passed away from the Church, let us entreat that the Lord may give them a place of rest." Elsewhere it is directed that in a certain case the goods of the deceased be distributed to the poor "in aid of his soul."

There is no mention of the Lord's Prayer in this liturgy. The bishop concludes: "Let the name of the Lord be blessed forever." People, "Amen." Priest, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord, blessed be the name of his glory." People, "Amen, Amen."

Then follows the Communion. The Holy Eucharist is distributed in both kinds by the deacon, as in St. Justin's days (Apol. i., 186). Mgr. Rahmani quotes Tertullian as saying: "Nor do we receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist from the hands of others than of the officiating (priests)." The custom seems to have been for the deacon to take round the chalice only, as we gather from the Acts of St. Lawrence. Hence Mgr. Rahmani argues that the *Testamentum* is prior to Tertullian, not a very cogent inference, for customs vary not according to time, but according to place, and a custom may have lingered in Syria after it had been abolished in Africa. The deacon placed the Holy Communion in the receiver's hand, saying: "The body of Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, unto healing of body and soul." Before receiving, the communicant said this prayer: "Holy, holy, holy, ineffable Trinity, grant me to receive this body unto life, not unto condemnation. Grant me to produce fruits pleasing to thee, that pleasing thee I may live in thee, fulfilling thy precepts, and with confidence may invoke thee, Father, while I implore upon me thy kingdom and thy will: hallowed be thy name, O Lord, in me, because thou art strong and glorious, and to thee be glory forever. Amen." The first part of the Lord's Prayer may be detected in the conclusion of this prayer. The rubric directs: "After all have received, let them pray, praising and giving thanks for the receiving." The bishop recites a prayer, answering to the post communion, and the rite is done. There is no mention of any blessing.

Though Mass was only said three or four times in the week, and only on these occasions was there any gathering of the people in the church, yet we have the direction: "Let the faithful man be ever solicitous, before he takes (any other) food, to be partaker of the Eucharist, that he may be rendered incapable of hurt." The explanation is pretty clear that the people took the Blessed Sacrament with them to their own homes. There is other evidence for this in the Acts of the Martyrs. The practice may be alluded to in the "Testamentum," bk. II., n. 13: "Let him that is a friend or kinsman of a master of profane things not permit that person to offer praise with him, nor eat with him on any ground of kindred or propriety, lest perchance he give to the wolf the things that are ineffable and take to himself damnation." As the faithful were obliged to come to the church to receive and, we suppose, to carry home the Blessed Eucharist, if they were sick for any length of time it had to be taken to them, to presbyters by a presbyter, to other men by a deacon, to women by a deaconess (ib. n. 20). There is ground to conjecture that while it was the custom to reserve the Blessed Eucharist under both kinds, what the laity took to their homes and what was taken to them when sick was the species of bread alone. The grounds for this conjecture are these two rubrics: (1.) It is said of the bishops (b. I., n. 22): "Let him on no account taste wine, except only the chalice of oblation. This let him use both when he is sick and when he is well. For it is good that this be for priests alone." But where the liturgy is performed in the church, the direction is for all to receive of the chalice, the clergy first and then the laity. (2.) Of the presbyter it is said (b. I., n. 31): "Let him fast, and if it do him good to take wine from the chalice, let it suffice him to take as much as he judges to be good for him, lest he take to his harm that drink which is for health." It may be said that the reference is to what we call the "altar wine," or the wine intended for use in the Holy Sacrifice before consecration. But altar wine is not kept in the chalice; and in those days, apparently, the wine as well as the bread for the Eucharist was the offering of the faithful expressly for that purpose, and could not lawfully be used except for consecration. Hence we may conjecture three things: (1) that the Holy Eucharist was reserved under both kinds: (2) that the chalice, so reserved, was for the communion of priests alone: (3) that when the laity communicated of the reserved Eucharist, they received only under the species of bread. I say advisedly "conjecture;" for the evidence of the "Testamentum" is too slight and vague to build any certainty upon in these points. Such conjectures as have suggested themselves to me I leave, with much diffidence as to their value, to the judgment of the erudite antiquarian.

The rite of ordaining a presbyter was simple, taking no more time than it would now take to ordain an acolyte. The whole body of priests bring up the candidate for priest's orders, and the bishop imposes his hand upon his head, the presbyters touching him and holding him the while, and the bishop says the ordination prayer. In it occur the words, "give him the spirit of presbyterate (*presbyteratus*, eldership) that groweth not old;" and also, "while he glorifies, blesses, exalts, gives thanks and raises the doxology at all times, day and night, to thy holy name." There is no mention of the power of sacrifice, except so far as these words may be taken to imply it. But there is evidence that the words were so taken; for we read elsewhere (b. I., n. 38): "Let the ordination of the deacon be done in this wise: the bishop alone imposes his hand upon him, for he is not ordained to the priesthood (*non enim ad sacerdotium ordinatur*), but to the ministry of serving the bishop and the Church." The conclusion is evident that, unlike the deacon, the presbyter was ordained to the priesthood. This is further conveyed by the rubric in the liturgy above referred to, that when the bishop was indisposed, he was "not to offer, but a presbyter is to offer." The *presbyteratus* therefore mentioned in the ordination formula involves sacrificial powers. In other words, the *presbyteratus* is a participation in the *sacerdotium*.

In b. I., n. 39, of the "Testamentum" we read the following extraordinary directions: "Whoever gives testimony and acknowledgment in bonds, in prison and in torments for the name of God, for this let not the hand be imposed on him for diaconate, nor again for presbyterate; for he has the honor of clergy, having been protected by God's hand through the confession (of faith). But if he is ordained bishop, he is worthy also of the imposition of the hand. If he is a confessor, but yet has not been called to judgment before the powers, nor afflicted with bonds, but has only confessed the faith, let him be accounted worthy of the imposition of the hand; for he receives [is a fit subject for?] the prayer of clergy [the ordination formula?] Let not [the bishop], however, repeat all the words and pray over him, but when the pastor goes on further, he receives the effect [of ordination]."[2] This obscure utterance perhaps expresses the private opinion of the author rather than the ecclesiastical practice of his age. I do not believe that anywhere confession of the faith was accepted as equivalent to ordination, or an unordained confessor of the faith allowed to minister as a priest. All that the passage means may be simply this, that any one who has confessed the faith and borne torments for his confession deserves as much consideration as a deacon or a priest, and without any ordination should sit high up among the clergy, a precedence that might be readily granted to such a hero and champion of Christ. The passage at any rate shows that at the time the Church was still under persecution, a fact, however, which falls in with the third century quite as well as with the second, and remained a fact up to the time of Constantine, A. D. 312. The traces of persecution are imprinted in several parts of the "Testamentum." Thus in the deacon's bidding-prayer: "For them who suffer persecution let us entreat that the Lord may give them patience and knowledge and perfect their labor. . . . For them who have lapsed [from the faith under torments] let us entreat that the Lord may not remember their ignorances and may withhold from them His threats." The deacon is "diligently to take note who come into the church, to discern whether they be lambs or rather wolves, . . . lest it happen that a spy come in and the liberty of the Church be assailed." The mention of the spy recalls the precautions necessary to be taken by English Catholics three centuries ago. And again (b. II., n. 5): "If any, being still a catechumen, is apprehended for My name and condemned to torments, and runs hastily to receive baptism, let not the pastor hesitate, but confer baptism upon him. But if he be put to a violent death before receiving baptism, let there be no perplexity about him; for he is justified as having been baptized in his own blood."

---

[2] Suscipit enim cleri orationem. Non omnia tamen vocabula repetat oretque super ipsum; sed cum pastor ulterius progreditur ille effectum suscipit.

Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Eucharist, Holy Order and apparently Extreme Unction (there is a blessing of the *oleum infirmorum* by the bishop) are all in the "Testamentum." There is no clear evidence of the practice of confession. All mention of public penance is conspicuously absent, and that though we are told all about the catechumens and the arrangement of various classes of people in the Church. This omission Mgr. Rahmani takes to show that the "Testamentum" is certainly prior to the middle of the third century, and I think the argument a good one. I quote his words: "At the time of the author of the 'Testament' the penitents do not yet appear constituted a special class, nor is any proclamation made by the deacon to dismiss them, nor is there any trace throughout the entire book of any rite of reconciling them. Now, Gregory of Neocæsarea (233-270) mentions in his canonical epistle an *order of penitents* standing outside the door; and in the 'Teaching of the Apostles,' which is referred to at least the middle of the third century, it is distinctly prescribed that the penitents be restored by imposition of the hands of the bishop along with prayer." Another indication of early date is the continued prohibition to taste of anything strangled or offered to idols (b. II., n. 17; Cf. Acts xv., 20). Also the fact that the fast of Lent is limited to the last two days, Good Friday and Easter Eve. Lent is called "the forty days of Easter." During those days the people are to frequent the church continually, but there is no mention of their being fast-days (b. II., n. 8). On Good Friday and Easter Eve the fast was absolute, so that no food or drink was taken at all till the reception of the Paschal Communion after midnight (Cf., b. II., nn. 6, 20). Justin (d. 165 A. D.) Irenæus (d. 202), Tertullian (d. 240), mention this two days' fast as the custom of their time.

The "discipline of the secret" appears in full force in the "Testamentum." The Church hid her doctrines from the pagan world, and revealed them only gradually to the catechumens. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body was not revealed till after baptism. "Let no man hear a word of the resurrection before he has received baptism; for this is the new ordinance, having a new name, which none knoweth but him that receiveth" (b. II., n. 10; Cf. Apoc. II., 17). Before the Holy Sacrifice two instructions were given, one to the catechumens, to whom were read lessons from the prophets and the apostolic writings. Then the catechumens were dismissed, and the baptized alone heard what is called the *Mystagogia,* "That they may offer with fear when they have recognized of what mystery they are made partakers," and again, "that the faithful may know to whom they are about to approach and who is their God and Father," and again, "that they may know of what they become partakers in the holy mysteries, and whose memory they celebrate by the Eucharist." The *Mystagogia* is an exposition, in decidedly Oriental language, of the Incarnation and the Redemption—an exposition thoroughly Catholic and orthodox. It contains these words: "He it is . . . who rose from the dead. He is not Man only, but also at the same time He is God. . . . His body, when it is broken, becomes our salvation, and His blood our spirit, life and sanctification. . . . He, then, who has been made Man is the Son of God, Lord. . . . This is the cross in which we glory that we may be glorified, whereby the perfect faithful who take it up sever themselves from all that is sensible or visible, as from a thing that does not really exist.[3] O ye who are reckoned strong, hence draw ye your strength, make deaf your visible ears, make blind your exterior eyes that you may know the will of Christ and the whole mystery of your deliverance."

It is interesting to note that the hours of the Divine Office were already fixed and office was regularly said at those hours, though in a form differing from the present chiefly in this, that it was not so exclusively composed of psalms and admitted more prayers of private and uninspired authorship. The Bishop is directed to pray in the church "at the first hour of the night, at midnight and at the first streak of dawn;" also "in the morning, at the third, sixth and ninth hour, at the twelfth hour [sunset] and at lamp-lighting" (b. I., n. 22). "The presbyter is to offer praise and thanksgiving in the same way as the Bishop" (b. I., n. 31). "They that are chaste" are to omit none of the above hours of prayer. The class of persons so designated will be considered presently. For ordinary laymen these directions are given: "The people are always to take care to pray at early dawn, as soon as they have risen from bed and have washed their hands. . . . Let all take care to pray at the third hour [9 A. M.] with grief and distress, either in the church, or, if they cannot go to church, at home: for that is the hour at which the Only-begotten was crucified. [This confirms the reading *hora tertia* in Mark xv., 25.] Likewise let there be prayer with sorrow at the sixth hour. . . . At the ninth hour also let prayer be prolonged, . . . for then life was laid open to the faithful, and blood and water flowed from the side of our Lord. At evening, as it is the beginning of the following day and presents an image of the resurrection, there is cause for praise. At midnight let them rise, praising and extolling God for the resurrection. At dawn let them praise with psalmody, since after his resurrection he (Christ) praised the Father, they (the apostles) singing psalms." (b. II., n. 24.)

---

[3] This is not idealism, but a recognition of the truth that sensible things, compared with divine things, are as nothing.

On days on which the Holy Sacrifice was offered, that is, on Saturdays and Sundays, and on the fast day, which may have been Wednesday, or Friday, or both (Cf. Tertullian, de jejun. II., 14), a liturgical service was held called "the praise at dawn," four pages of prayers recited by the Bishop and responded to by the people, besides "four psalms and canticles," which were sung by "small boys, two maidens [curious precedent of antiquity for a "mixed choir"],[4] three deacons, three priests." When this was over the lector read the lessons, "a presbyter or deacon is to read the Gospel," then the Bishop or a presbyter delivered a sermon, the catechumens were then dismissed, the homily called *mystagogia* was read to the faithful, and the Holy Sacrifice was offered according to the rite above described. The canticles sung were the canticle of Moses (Exod. xv.), and probably Psalm lxxi. *(Deus judicium tuum)*, with the canticle either of Isaias xii. or of Habacuc iii. Also a short form of "daily praise" is given, to be said by the presbyters in church "each at the time to him prescribed." Also we read that "at midnight the assembly of the priests apart and the more perfect among the people are to offer praise: for at that hour our Lord rising celebrated His Father with praise,"—where note the phrase "our Lord" put, as the whole "Testamentum" is, in the mouth of Christ Himself.

In the above account we easily recognize the canonical hours—matins at midnight, lauds at peep of dawn, prime at sunrise, then tierce, sext, none, at their several hours, Vespers "at the twelfth hour," 6 P. M., or sunset, and compline "at lamp-lighting time." Most prominent and liturgically complete of all these canonical hours is decidedly lauds. Whoever will look at the oldest hymns in the Breviary, those of the Sunday and ferial offices, can have no doubt that lauds originally stood apart from matins, and were recited at peep of day: see the phrases *præco diei jam sonat, aurora lucem provehit, ales diei nuntius, lux intrat, albescit polus, lux ecce surgit aurea, ortus refulget lucifer, aurora jam spargit polum.* On the other hand, prime is said, *jam lucis orto sidere, i. e.*, at sunrise.

---

[4] *Duo virgines*, however, in the language of the "Testamentum" is ambiguous, and might mean two of the men vowed to celibacy, of whom more presently.

The interposition of the Christmas midnight Mass between matins and lauds tells the same story. At the time of the "Testamentum" Vespers show no special development; this again is a mark of antiquity.

The deacon is "the eye of the church." He is the man of business; he is the district visitor, looking after the poor, receiving guests, burying dead bodies (especially those cast up from the sea; there are several indications that the "Testamentum" was written for a seaside place); "he is not to worry the bishop *(episcopum non disturbet)*, but tell him everything on Sundays only." People who come late to service, he is to keep outside, lest the tumult made in introducing them be a distraction to those who pray" (b. I., n. 36). When at last the late comer is admitted, the deacon proclaims: "Let us pray for the brother who has come late, that the Lord will give him diligence." Thus, it is remarked, "diligence is increased, and the bond of charity is strengthened, and the negligent or slothful party is corrected." Can this be the origin of our petition in the litany "for our absent brethren?"

The "Testamentum" (b. I., nn. 40-43) well illustrates I. Tim. v. 3-10. "Widows with precedence," as they were called, form a special order, we might almost say of clergy. They are blessed by the bishop with a special prayer at the entrance of the sanctuary. They receive Holy Communion among the clergy, immediately after the deacons, before the lectors and sub-deacons.[5] At Mass they stand within the veil of the sanctuary, behind the presbyters who are on the bishop's left, as the deacons stand behind the presbyters on the bishop's right. They say office in the church, a few together or privately. Prayers are set down for their use at matins and lauds. They instruct catechumens, correct delinquents of their own sex, assist at the baptism of women and anoint them with holy oil. They are a distinct body from the deaconesses in the "Testamentum," and superior to them. Can it be that the singular honor paid to these widows in the early Church is a vestige of that paid by the first Christians to the Blessed Mother of Jesus after the Ascension of her Son?

"Let her be constituted a widow," says the "Testamentum," "who has long remained without a husband, and who having had many offers of marriage has nevertheless for the sake of the faith preferred to remain single. . . . Let her be proved, if she has brought up her children in holiness, if she has not taught them worldly wisdom, if she has formed them in the love of the holy law and of the Church, if she has loved and honored pilgrims, if she has been assiduous in prayer, . . . if she be fit to bear the yoke . . . loving simplicity, possessing nothing in this world, but constantly taking up and bearing about with her the cross, which is the undoing of all evil; night and day persevering about the altar, doing her work with cheerfulness and without display. . . . Let her look up the deaconesses. . . . If she has any property, let her give it over to the poor and the faithful. If she has none, she is to receive aid from the Church. . . . Let her not trouble about her children, but give them over to the Church, that living in the house of God they may become fit for the ministry of priesthood."

---

[5] In the "Testamentum" the lector ranks above the sub-deacon.

In this state of professed widowhood we discern some anticipation of religious life. Such anticipation was not confined to the aged nor to the female sex. We read (b. II., n. 8): "If any man (coming to baptism) wishes to vow chastity to God, let him be baptized before the others by the bishop." We find a whole section (b. I., n. 46) entitled, "Of celibates, men and women." It opens thus: "A celibate, male or female, is not appointed by man, nor ordained, but he himself of his own will separates himself, taking the name of celibate. Nor is the hand imposed upon him unto celibacy, since this state is the effect of his own will. These celibates must be bound to mortify their bodies, without prejudice to health; they must attend steadily every day to fastings and prayers with weeping and mourning, expecting their departure from the flesh at any time, and daily taking themselves for persons about to die." They were not ranked among the clergy, but had a certain precedence in receiving Holy Communion, and were to be held in honor by all.

On this subject, as also on the practice of almsgiving amounting to a partial community of goods in the early Church, further light is thrown by the following directions: "If any of the faithful, man or woman, departs this life, leaving children, let their goods be given to the Church, that the Church may be guardian of the children, and out of their possessions the poor also may be aided, that so God may grant the children grace, and rest to the parents who have left them behind. Let not him who has no children possess more goods (than he needs), but out of his possessions let him make ample distribution to the poor and to them in prison, reserving to himself such portion as is congruous and sufficient. If any one has children, and desires to retire to vow a single life, let him distribute all his goods to the poor and retire to lead the life of an ascete and dwell at the church, persevering in prayers and thanksgiving" (b. II., n. 15).

The only mention of penitents is in these two passages: "If any one persists in his fault or misconduct, let the deacon report him to the bishop, and let him be put apart for seven days, and then called, that he be not carried away (by temptation). If when he comes he is found to be still obstinate in his sin, let him be cut off till he is truly penitent and returns to himself and begs for readmission" (b. I., n. 34). "Let the deacon catechise them that are doing penance and lead them to the presbyters or the bishop, that they may be instructed and imbued with knowledge" (b. I., n. 37).

The following direction on matrimony leads up to the later recognized impediment of *disparitas cultus:* "Let no obstacle be thrown in the way of him who wishes to be joined in matrimony. . . . But let him contract marriage with a faithful Christian woman of a Christian family, who may keep her husband in the faith. The bishop is to give direction and take care" (b. II., n. 1).

Discretion is to be exercised in admitting candidates for baptism. Slaves are not to be admitted without the assent of their master being asked. If the master is a Christian, and refuses the slave a character, he is not admitted. If the master is a pagan and can show that the slave asks baptism out of hatred to his master, he is not admitted: otherwise he is admitted. Evil livers, priests of idols, makers and caretakers of idols, gladiators and all manner of professionals engaged in the arena or race course, also soldiers and magistrates, are shut out from baptism, unless they give up their occupation. These exclusions point to a time when idolatrous worship was bound up with service in the army or on the bench. "A schoolmaster in profane science," which seems to mean a teacher of classical literature, is recommended to give up his charge, but may continue in it if he has no other means of subsistence (b. II., n. 2). Signs of demoniac possession are expected to occur in some cases under the exorcisms that precede baptism. "Let them be exorcised from the day that they are chosen (for baptism); they are to be baptized at Easter time. As that time approaches, let the bishop take them apart, one by one, and exorcise them, that he may be convinced that they are one and all clean. For if it happens that any one of them is not clean or is possessed by an impure spirit, the witness of the impure spirit itself will convict him. Whoever is found debarred by such an impediment is to retire apart and be reprehended and rebuked for not having faithfully heard the word of precept and admonition, seeing that the evil and alien spirit has kept his abode in him" (b. II., n. 6).

On Easter Eve the *baptizandi* kneel before the bishop, who stretches his hand over them and pronounces a long prayer of exorcism, where we note these beautiful words: "Man by thy hands was formed out of earth; but since he has come to believe in thee he is earth no more." The rubric adds: "If while the bishop is pronouncing the exorcism any one becomes agitated and suddenly gets up and weeps, or cries out, or foams at the mouth, or gnashes his teeth, or assumes an impudent stare, or too much lifts himself up, or, carried away by sudden impulse, makes off, let any such be hidden away by the deacons, that there be no brawling while the bishop speaks. Let such a person be exorcised by the priests until he is cleansed, and then let him be baptized" (b. II., n. 7).

The practice of infant baptism at this early epoch is gathered from the following rubric: "All children who can make answer for themselves at baptism are to answer, repeating the words after the priest; but if they cannot answer, let their parents answer for them, or some friend of theirs."

Two kinds of oil are used at baptism, having been blessed by the bishop. The one is called "the oil of exorcism," answering to our "oil of catechumens;" the other is the "oil of thanksgiving." The person to be baptized turns to the west (the region of darkness) and says: "I renounce thee, Satan, and all thy worship, thy pomps, thy desires, all thy works." The bishop then anoints him with the "oil of exorcism," saying: "I anoint thee with this oil for thy deliverance from every wicked and impure spirit and thy deliverance from all evil." Then the neophyte turns to the east (the land of light) and says: "I submit myself to thee, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, before whom all nature trembles and is afraid; grant that I may fulfil all the judgments of thy good pleasure without stain." Then the bishop hands him over to the presbyter who is to baptize him. Accompanied by a deacon, the neophyte steps into the waters, which must be "clean and running" (b. II., n. 8), apparently of a brook running through the baptistry [we remember how the Cistercian monasteries of old were always by a stream]. The presbyter puts his hand on the neophyte, now standing in the water, and asks him: "Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty?" The neophyte replies, and the priest immerses his head for the first time. No formula of baptismal words is given, whence, however, it does not follow that none was used; the words may have been omitted as too obvious; compare the previous omission of the words of consecration of the chalice. On the other hand, from there being no mention of the blessing of the baptismal water, we have some ground to conjecture that the blessing of the font, so prominent in our Holy Saturday service, is a later development. The priest asks again: "Dost thou believe also in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who came from the Father, who from the beginning is with the Father, who was born of the Virgin Mary through the Holy Ghost, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, died, rose again the third day, coming back to life from the dead, ascended into heaven, sits at the right hand of the Father, and is to come to judge the living and the dead?" The neophyte answers: "I believe," and the presbyter immerses his head for the second time. Then he asks: "Dost thou believe also in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church?" The reply "I believe" is followed by the third immersion. As soon as the newly baptized comes out of the water the presbyter anoints him with the "oil of thanksgiving," saying: "I anoint thee with oil in the name of Jesus Christ." This corresponds to the unction with chrism in our baptism. The above interrogations manifestly contain the Apostles' Creed, still said by us on the way to the baptismal font. Why the article on the resurrection of the body is omitted has already been made clear. Due decency in the baptism of women was secured by the attendance of the canonical widows above described.

As soon as the baptisms are over the newly baptized are gathered together in the church and the bishop administers the sacrament of confirmation with a rite strikingly like that still in use in the Latin Church. The bishop stretches out his hand over them and says a prayer called the "invocation of the Holy Ghost." Then he pours oil (doubtless the "oil of thanksgiving") and lays his hand on the head of each, saying: "With this unction I anoint thee in God Almighty, in Christ Jesus and in the Holy Ghost, that thou mayest be a laborer having perfect faith, and a vessel pleasing to Him." And signing him [with the cross] on the forehead he gives him peace, saying: "The God of the humble be with thee," the person signed replying, "And with thy spirit."

Then the newly baptized and confirmed pray with the whole assembly of the faithful. The Holy Sacrifice is offered and all receive Communion. "The bread is offered," Christ is made to say, "in sign of My body, and the chalice is mingled with wine and water to signify blood and the water of baptism, that the inner man, who is spiritual, may deserve to receive similar gifts to those which the body receives," an exact description of what our catechism calls a sacrament, "an outward sign of inward grace." We may observe that the species of bread after consecration is a "sign" of Christ's body, not, however, an empty sign, when the body is really there.

If any conjecture of mine as to the date of the "Testamentum" be worth recording, after careful consideration of its contents I should still refer it to the first half of the third century. I have already shown some cause for fixing it within the reign of Maximin, A. D. 235-238, the age of St. Catherine of Alexandria, a little before the persecutions of Decius and Valerian and the martyrdom of St. Lawrence. The spirit of prayer and simple devotedness of God's service which it breathes, and which can only be appreciated by continuous perusal, tells of an age when Christianity meant martyrdom close at hand. The "Testamentum" may have gathered additions from the hands of subsequent transcribers, putting in the ritual practices of their own days; but such simplicity still marks it, and so many well-known practices of later times are conspicuously absent, that I think Mgr. Rahmani right in taking the "Testamentum" to represent, if not second century, at least early third century ritual, later additions being more apparent in such revisions of the "Testamentum" as the "Ecclesiastical Canons" and the "Apostolic Constitutions."

One thing the "Testamentum certainly is not, it is not Protestant; and one characteristic it strongly displays, it is redolent of sacerdotalism.

JOSEPH RICKABY, S. J.

London.

RISE OF THE CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS—DE LA SALLE.

"IN order to understand thoroughly," says Ravelet,[1] "the mission of St. de la Salle, it is necessary to know what the education of the people was at the period when he founded his Institute. A brief sketch of its history will not, therefore, be out of place here. This will enable us to see what the Church had done before his time, what yet remained to be done, and thus we shall understand, at a glance, the facilities and the obstacles which the ancient institutions brought to the new foundations."

The origin of the first Christian schools can be traced back to the cradle of Christianity. St. Paul, writing to his disciple, Timothy, says: "Attend to thyself and to doctrine; be earnest in them.[2] And the things, which thou hast heard from me, before many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, *who shall be fit to teach others also.*"[3] There is no mistaking these words. The great Apostle of the Gentiles was convinced of the need of a zealous and learned band of teachers which would aid him in the work of evangelization.

---

[1] "Vie du St. J.-B. de la Salle," c. ii., p. 13. [2] I. Tim. c. iv., 16. [3] II. Tim. c. ii., 2.

"In carrying the bright flame of Christian truth into the dense darkness of paganism, the Church exercised a right and accomplished a duty. This right and duty were founded upon the words of the Divine Master: *Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*"[4]

Christian instruction was, in the beginning, traditional. The neophytes received oral instructions. These were given in the Catecombs of Rome. The traveler who visits the Catecombs of St. Agnes will find there two rooms, having for their only ornament a chair for the catechist and benches for the catechumens. To-day that light sheds its lustre throughout the universe, and is not, as of old, confined within the narrow chambers of a catecomb. The poor, the ignorant and the little are called to enjoy its benefits; no man is excluded.

St. John the Evangelist opens a Christian school at Ephesus and forms excellent disciples. St. Polycarp, one of his disciples, founds a school at Smyrna. St. Mark establishes the school of Alexandria. The school became famous for the truly great Christian scholars and philosophers it produced.

Schools were also founded at Cesarea, Antioch, Constantinople, Nicomedia and other places. "The constant practice of the Syrian nation is never to have a church or monastery without having a school attached, nor a school without a monastery or church."[5]

In the shades of the first churches erected in the West, we beheld nestled sacred asylums destined by the Bishops for the two-fold object of fostering science and virtue in the future generations. Hence we find that the first Bishops who converted and civilized France established schools in their episcopal palaces and parishes. "The church and schools were inseparable for the people."[6] For Catholicism was the most efficient promoter of the popular development of the human intellect.[7] And "wherever a church was built we might be almost certain of finding also there a school."[8]

St. Hilarius, Bishop of Arles, a contemporary of Pope Leo I., lived with his clergy and clerics, forming with them a kind of seminary.[9] It was in this school that St. Cesarius, one of his successors, gave his celebrated grammar lessons. Thus we have St. Remigius at Rheims, St. Germanus at Paris and St. Hilary at Poitiers, devoting themselves to teaching.[10]

---

[4] Cardinal de Bonechose, *Le Semaine Religieuse*, 27 Juili, 1872, Rouen. [5] Assemani, Bibl orient., t. IV., c. 1. [6] David, Gregory VII., p. 216. [7] Auguste Comte, Cours de Philosophie Positive, t. V., p. 258. [8] Ed. Schmit, L'Instruction Primaire à la Campagne, p. 6. [9] Vie de St. Hilaire; Œuvres de Saint Léon, t. II., p. 121.

The monastic schools also did good work in the cause of the education of youth. In the sixth century lay persons were admitted to these schools.[11] Hence it is that we find the monastery divided into two schools: the *cloistral*, for children who afterward embraced the religious life, and the *canonical*, for the education of children who embraced neither the ecclesiastical nor the religious state. For ecclesiastics these schools became real seminaries.[12]

The powerful influence and energetic action exercised by the great Charlemagne over all the schools of his vast empire are too well known to be commented upon in this brief sketch. Unfortunately for France, his successors did not display that enlightened zeal and keen appreciation for knowledge and virtue which rendered his reign so remarkable in the annals of the history of true progress and science.

While admitting that the schools were sadly neglected, we must beware of falling into the other extreme of presuming that, during this period, they were entirely deserted. "When speaking of the dark ages, it is very essential to distinguish carefully the epochs, and not apply to every century comprised in this long period the unfavorable and severe criticism which is applicable only to some."[13] We may add that the same careful distinction holds good in relation to the provinces. Some of them, less distracted by civil dissensions than others, happily preserved the academic traditions of the first apostles of Gaul. Again, they were favored in a twofold manner, *i. e.*, by reason of the number of schools and the great merit of their professors. While in other provinces many people openly declared themselves more or less averse to the impetus given to the schools by the Bishops, the King and the Parliament of Paris.[14]

From the eleventh to the fourteenth century there were three principal causes which contributed to the resuming of the interrupted work of Charlemagne: 1. The Councils; 2. The extraordinary renown of certain schools; and 3. The wonderful multiplication of religious communities. To be admitted to these communities it was necessary to have acquired a certain degree of knowledge.

In the fourteenth century the fearful ravages which punished or tried men in those remote days like the plague of 1348 necessarily closed a number of schools. Indeed, "few teachers could be found who would then be willing to teach the elements of grammar at home or in the village school."[15]

---

[10] Théry, Histoire de l'Education en France. [11] Théry, ibid. [12] Auguste Teiner, t. I., p. 143. [13] R. de Beaurepaire, t. I., pp. 13, 51. [14] A. Babeau, L'École de Village pendant la Révolution, p. 4.

"The ravages of war, the terrible scourges of plague and famine that devastated whole peoples were as disastrous to the progress of education as they were to that of life and civilization. The school being sustained by local enterprise, varied with the fluctuations of local energy."[16]

There were, however, at this period, two men, Gerard Groot and Gerson, who labored with a vim and an energy in behalf of elementary schools. They tried to give the children attending such schools good, religious and zealous teachers.

Gerard (1340-1384), born at Deventer, Holland, made his studies in Paris. He was considered competent at eighteen to profess philosophy and theology at Cologne. Here he acquired fame because of his knowledge and eloquence and gained for himself the title of Groot or great. After he was ordained priest he was instrumental in converting many souls by his eloquence. Many flocked around him and became his disciples. Thus did he found the Clerks and the Brethren of the Common Life. He employed them according to their special aptitudes, either in copying manuscripts or in manual labor, or in teaching elementary schools, established for poor children. Gerard intended to adopt the Rules of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine, but death intervened. Floret, a true disciple, completed the religious work of his master.

Gerard Groot occupied his brethren chiefly in copying. He collected for this purpose the most correct and authentic manuscripts of the Bible and of the Fathers. These transcriptions were greatly admired and much sought after both for the beauty of their characters and correctness of text. The convents multiplied, especially in Flanders. Their manuscripts were highly appreciated at Rome and at the University of Louvain. But while thus engaged, the elementary schools under their control were by degrees abandoned.[17]

Gerson (1363-1429), the celebrated chancellor of the University of Paris, retired to the Convent of St. Paul, Lyons, and there devoted a portion of his time to the instruction of poor children. To teach the elements of knowledge to poor children was looked upon as degrading and unbecoming a man of learning and position.

---

[15] Guibert de Nogent, Coll. des Mém. sur l'Histoire de France, par Guizot, t. IX., p. 356.

[16] Brother Azarias, Essays Educational, p, 193.

[17] Thomas à Kempis was a member of the Brethren of the Common Life. He was regarded as one of the best skilled caligraphists of his time. His copy of the Bible, which took fifteen years to transcribe, is a real masterpiece. Another beautiful manuscript was the great work, the "Imitation of Christ." After the Bible, this little volume is the most extensively read work ever penned by man. It is a monument of Christian philosophy and piety. It is translated into every living language.

Gerson was indifferent to the praises of men. He was equally regardless of their contempt. To teach the first principles of Christian doctrine was his greatest desire. He was particularly careful to have his pupils attend Mass. He understood the value of a thorough Christian training. The children who appeared especially bright were also initiated in the elements of Latin. In his great humility and sense of unworthiness he taught the children to say: "O my God, my Creator, have mercy on Thy poor servant, John Gerson."

In his treatise "De parvulis trahendis ad Christum" we read these apt words: "Let the teacher remember his youth; let him preserve his pupils from evil by true devotedness. Let him be little with them; but let him always maintain his superiority by reason of his experience and knowledge."

Thus we find that at this epoch throughout France primary instruction was by no means neglected. Schools were to be found almost everywhere, for Gerson advises Bishops to inquire "if every parish has a school, and how the children are taught, and to open a school, if there be not one already."[18] Delisle tells us that "many documents superabundantly establish how rural schools were multiplied in the thirteenth century and in Normandy the following centuries."[19]

Again, "the organization of episcopal and monastic schools of the Middle Ages did not come to us from abroad already systematized. The faith of teachers, pupils and schedule of studies depended absolutely upon the will and judgment of the rector and Bishop. No universal rules existed or were in force to govern and regulate the course. Instruction varied in each diocese and even in the same school."[20] This undoubtedly resulted in much loss of time and in wrangling among professors.

Hence we may introduce the pertinent criticism of Hugh of St. Victor's: "When grammar is their subject, they discuss the nature of syllogisms; when treating of dialectics, they will occupy themselves with the inflection of words."[21] But on the other hand Hugh's master hand "has sketched for us a beautiful picture of student life in this monastery (St. Victor's). It is too valuable to leave unquoted:[22]

"Great is the multitude and various are the ages that I behold—boys, youths, young men and old men. *Various also are the studies.*

---

[18] Tractatus de visitatione prælatorum et curatorum, t. II., ed. 1560, Antwerp. [19] Étude sur la Condition des Classes Agricoles en Normandy, p. 176. [20] M. de Resbecq, Histoire de l'Enseignement Primaire avant 1879, etc., p. 73. [21] Quoted by Brother Azarias, Essays Educational, p. 34. [22] Ibid.

Some exercise their uncultured tongues in pronouncing our letters and in producing sounds that are new. Others learn by listening at first to the inflections of words, their composition and derivation; afterwards they repeat them to one another, and by repetition engrave them on their memory. Others work upon tablets covered with wax. Others trace upon membranes with a skilled hand diverse figures in diverse colors. Others, with a more ardent zeal, seem occupied with the most serious studies. They dispute among themselves, and each endeavors by a thousand plots and artifices to ensnare the other. I see some who are making computation. Others with instruments clearly trace the course and position of stars and the movements of the heavens. Others treat of the nature of plants, the constitution of man and the quality and virtue of all things."

In all the ancient little schools taught by ecclesiastics, religious and clerics Latin was found on the schedule of studies. If it was not taught it was because the teacher did not know it; but the defect was soon made good by substituting a more learned teacher.

Moreover, the reading of Latin was taught by all teachers. We may say that frequently the children were not taught to read in any other language. "Those who did not enter the religious life returned to the world when they were competent to read and interpret the Psalter and the Gospels. This was, indeed, little enough; but the requirements of civil life did not demand much knowledge."[23]

This course is unquestionably very limited. But we have other authorities who include "logic, the principles of versification, liturgic chant, the Old and the New Testament, theology, sometimes canon law, and later on Aristotle."[24] With such a curriculum the youth of the cloistral school had decidedly a fair education.

Some writers claim for Martin Luther the honor of having introduced primary schools. This is evidently an error, resulting not only from the confounding of terms, but also from ignorance of the facts. Luther "had not even a conception of primary teaching."[25] "It is true," says Ravelet,[26] "that Luther addressed a letter, in 1524, to all the Councillors of the German States urging them to found Christian schools, and fourteen years later, in 1538, he published 'Directions to Inspectors,' an essay on the general system of popular education. But these documents appeared several centuries later than the urgent decrees of the Council of Lateran. What Luther tried to do in Germany the provincial councils of France had succeeded in doing some years before in our provinces, and with more wisdom and precision." When we compare facts we learn that Luther speaks only after the councils. This is also true of the Gymnasium. An imperfect copy of the Catholic universities and the Jesuit colleges. The most celebrated Protestant pedagogue, Pestalozzi, lived a century after Saint de la Salle had matured and perfected his scheme of education, and which completely revolutionized the whole system of popular education.

---

[23] L. Maitre, Les Écoles Épiscopales et Monastiques, p. 254. [24] Brother Azarias, Essays Educational, p. 24. [25] Paul Rousselot, Pédagogie à l'usage de l'Enseignement Primaire, p. 35. [26] Vie du St. J.-B. de la Salle, p. 33.

Since the Reformation the State has obtained the control of secular education. Prior to this the Church held that exclusive privilege. The State never interfered. It aided and encouraged by erecting schools and universities and then endowed them. But the education of the masses was the duty and privilege of the Church. She was jealous of her right and duty. Consequently when Luther wants to establish schools all over Germany he writes to the German nobles: "It devolves upon you to take a hand in this work; for if we entrust the care of it to the parents, we shall perish a hundred times before the thing is done. I pray you, therefore, not to reject my advice, but to take to heart and to take in hand the salvation, happiness and the prosperity of Germany."[27]

"The direct and immediate effect of the Reformation," continues Ravelet, "was above all the ruin of a great number of schools. It swept over France like a pestilence, and everywhere gave rise to fearful strife. The school could not continue where the Church had been thrown down and burnt to the ground."

Besides, Luther insisted upon having Latin taught in the little schools. Consequently we cannot agree with those ardent writers who claim for him the distinguished honor of establishing the primary schools. Truly history does not sustain them. The Catholic clergy had already forestalled Luther in his efforts at popular education. Hence the monastic schools also supported a number of clerics who were destined for the profession of teaching.[28]

"The schoolmaster in the Middle Ages," says Brother Azarias,[29] "we may infer, was, up to the fifteenth century, generally a young ecclesiastic or cleric who dwelled with the pastor, helped him to sing the divine offices, aided him in many ways and generally acted as sacristan."

M. Mireur informs us that a teacher was frequently selected by the City Council upon the advice of fathers of families, without having any other guarantee of his character.[30] If several candidates presented themselves, the most competent was appointed. His ability was determined by a public examination. This was, however, only legally requisite when there was question of confiding to him a large school.[31]

---

[27] Quoted by Ravelet, p. 34. [28] R. de Beaurepaire, t. I., p. 28. [29] Essays Educational, p. 181. Cf. also Ravelet, pp. 26, 27 and 28. [30] Documents sur L'Enseignement Primaire en Provence, p. 2.

Professional education in the hands of such schoolmasters was worthless. The material condition of the school fluctuated with the locality. Only some schoolmasters established themselves permanently in a commune or in a parish. They were men of virtue, and hence were worthy of the honors they received. But there were others to be found, and in great numbers, who were like rolling stones and hired themselves out to municipalities for a limited time.

There was, however, despite this deplorable inconsistency, one point upon which all schoolmasters were a unit, and that was to give their modest teaching a positive Christian character. In general their behavior was in accord with their teaching. St. Fulbert preferred to see the professor's chair vacant than behold it occupied by one unworthy of that honor. "I do not wish," he writes to Ifildegaire of Poitiers, "to send you a co-laborer for your school if he be not of mature judgment and of great moral purity." Stephen de Tournay expressed himself, in 1197, in similar terms: "The teacher should be of tried virtue and learned, and if he need an assistant he should be characterized by the same qualities."[32]

The object sought in all the schools was essentially religious. Hence the reason why the founders usually annexed them to the parish church. "Charlemagne was assiduously attentive to two objects: 1. The formation of good and learned priests. 2. The dissemination of the Christian faith among his subjects."[33] Throughout the Middle Ages the schools preserved their religious character. Hence we may justly apply the words of Joubert to the teachers of that period: "What we regret in the ancient education is its moral character."[34]

The low ebb of morality that prevailed in the sixteenth century had decidedly a baneful influence upon the little schools. And, if we add thereto the religious dissensions, we need not wonder at the widespread evil of ignorance and crime. But the Church was on the alert. She detected the evil, suggested the remedy, furnished the means of applying it effectively and insisted upon the strict observance of her decrees.

"The Council of Trent was the signal for a new development in public instruction. It commenced by reforming religious teaching."[35] The Council did not stop with formulating and promulgating explicit decrees concerning the education of ecclesiastics. It took the further step by prescribing that "in every church there be appointed an ecclesiastic to teach grammar gratuitously to clerical students and poor scholars." And why? "That they may be competent to study theology if God should call them to the ministry of the Church." It also legislates for the payment of those teachers and regulates how they should be treated.[36]

---

[31] M. Boniface, Suite d'Arrêts notables du Parlement de Provence, t. I., p. 354. [32] L. Maître, p. 187. [33] Ibid, p. 4. [34] Pensées, t. II., p. 258, Edition, 1862. [35] Ravelet, p. 36.

Consequently "nearly all the provincial councils and diocesan synods of the sixteenth century, before and after the Council of Trent, deal with the school question and decree that there be a school in every parish. In places too poor to maintain one an ecclesiastic or competent cleric is to be entrusted with the instruction of children."[37]

Therefore, "to understand all that the Church has done for popular instruction, to see how she has laid the first foundation of the present legislation, it is necessary to peruse attentively the synodal decrees of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries."[38]

We already noted that the first reform instituted by the Council of Trent was connected with the clergy and their education.[39] God raised up for that purpose several zealous and enlightened apostles, who took an active part in this reformation by establishing seminaries. It was in these nurseries of faith and piety that ecclesiastics were renewed in the spirit of sacrifice, prayer and study. They were likewise inspired with a zeal and love for their priestly duties.

Hence we need not wonder to find ecclesiastics occupied solely with the instruction of the children of the poor. Then, again, we see a work springing up in Italy, France and Austria forcibly reminding us of the ancient catechists of Ephesus, Alexandria and Jerusalem and opposing, under the familiar form of the sublime and divine teachings of the Gospel, the absurd doctrines of paganism. At Milan, Italy, St. Charles Borromeo and Mark Sadis establish the association of the Priests of Christian Doctrine, whose principal end and aim are to teach religion to the children and laboring classes. St. Ignatius Loyola inaugurated his generalship of the Society of Jesus by teaching the Christian doctrine several hours after his election in a church of Rome. Hence the disciples of the inspired St. Ignatius look upon the teaching of religion to children as one of their principal obligations.

"The spirit of teaching catechism, which diffused itself over the entire Church,"[40] had a beneficial effect upon France by stirring up pious and heroic souls to devote themselves to the instruction of the people. For pastors had sadly neglected this important duty of their sacred ministry.[41] It devolved, therefore, upon schoolmasters to accomplish it. But many of them looked upon the teaching of Christian doctrine with a species of contempt. Indeed, there was a time when no man of any pretensions to learning would deign to break the bread of life to the little ones. The fear of derision and human respect proved the stumbling blocks. The schoolmaster preferred his own honor to the honor and glory of God. He no longer rejoiced in being considered worthy to suffer contempt for Christ's sake.

---

[36] IV. Session, c. I., June 17, 1546. [37] Ravelet, p. 37. [38] Ibid, p. 39 et passim. [39] Gallia Christiania, t. VIII., p. 1041. [40] Vie de César de Bus, quoted in the Life of M. J.-B. de la Salle, 1733, p. 150.

But César de Bus (1544-1607) and the Priests of the Christian Doctrine acted as a powerful lever against the prevailing spirit of religious indifference. The impetus imparted by these zealous and devoted men at Cavaillon made itself felt. It leaped the narrow limits of the diocese and like a consuming flame throughout Comtat-Venaissin, Provence, and Languedoc,[42] and by degrees extended to other provinces.[43] The chief feature of César de Bus' method was the teaching of Christian doctrine by discussion.[44]

And yet these men of God, when contemplating the end proposed, were soon convinced of their insufficiency. The field was large; the laborers few. Again, the missions they gave were limited by time and locality. They could assemble the children but once or twice a week, and the instructions fell naturally upon unprepared soil. Hence the instruction was soon forgotten, because it was not comprehended.

When we come to examine the admirable work accomplished by a Vincent de Paul (1576-1660), a Bérulle (1575-1629), a Bourdoise (1590-1655), an Olier (1608-1657) and a Eudes (1601-1680), we must candidly acknowledge that much was still left undone toward the regeneration of society. The Bishops, however, availed themselves of reforms instituted by great men. They applied to them for clergy who were deeply penetrated with a sense of their duties. They also sought for ecclesiastics or clerics to take charge of their little schools. For these modest institutions had been either destroyed or discredited owing to the ravages of civil strifes or to the lack of proper vigilance and control or to poverty and want of teachers.

In the little schools Christian doctrine was not universally taught;

---

[41] The Rev. F. Bridgett, C. SS. R., Life and Times of B. Cardinal Fisher. Read the sad picture presented in England under Henry VIII. Bishops and priests were indifferent to the duties of their sacred calling. The people were ignorant of the essentials of religion. The same was true for Italy. Cf. Vaughan's Life and Times of Thomas of Aquin. Cf. also Janssen's History of the German People. [42] Annales de L'Institut, t. I., Introduction, p. xviii. [43] Ravelet, p. 85. [44] Ibid, p. 86.

but the children were generally educated in a Christian manner. The poor children, however, were often either neglected or ill-treated by teachers who did not possess the requisite qualities of their profession. The complaints tendered by men of rank and position were truly lamentable. M. de Lantages lamented that no person could be found in the rural districts of Velay to instruct and educate the children.[45] In 1669 Charles Démia found that the great number of the teachers of Lyons "were ignorant not only of the methods of good reading and writing, but also of the principles of religion. Several of them were heretics and impious men. Nay, more, he met even some who were professed libertines. Hence the youth confided to their care were in evident danger of being lost."[46]

Paris was no better off in this respect than Lyons. The precentor, Claude Joly, was accused of having tolerated "junkshop men, keepers of low restaurants, tavern-keepers, masons, wigmakers, fiddlers, puppet-show men, etc.," as schoolmasters in Paris.[47] These complaints, however, did not affect all the little schools. The only schools that suffered were the schools destined for the poor children. "It is true," says Charles Démia, "that the children of the better class receive moral instructions at home and from the schoolmasters, paid by the parents, or else in the colleges from the regents who are remunerated by the city. But the poor have no means whatsoever to educate their children. And the consequence is that they remain ignorant of their duties. This is obvious. The parents have to struggle for existence, and hence neglect to teach their children how to live well. Moreover, having been wretchedly educated themselves, they cannot give what they do not possess. Hence we observe with deep sorrow that the education of the poor children is entirely neglected."[48]

The most effective remedy against this crying evil was already applied. It was to educate the clergy, *i. e.*, to oblige them to pursue their professional education, to regulate and govern their behavior in the classroom and to indicate and define their relations with the parents. However, the precentor and pastors had adopted no uniform course regulating the extent of their academic jurisdiction. Hence resulted incessant quarrels and vexatious lawsuits.[49] The precentor claimed the exclusive right to give teachers letters of recommendation, to deliver and revoke their certificates of teaching. He also insisted upon the privilege to appoint teachers to charity schools, and even to the schools confided to religious communities and laymen.[50] But the pastors vigorously protested against this undue assumption of authority and strenuously defended the exception made in favor of their charity schools by the Bishops. This ruling of the Bishops was sustained by Parliament.[51] From this we observe the little schools which were dependent upon the precentor, the charity schools which were erected and controlled by the pastors only and the schools of the writing masters in which writing only was taught. Each kind of school was jealous of its rights and privileges. Now should the writing masters attempt to teach reading, or the charity schools admit pupils of the wealthier class, then the directors of the little schools, with the precentor, would have much to do about nothing.

---

[45] Vie, p. 93. [46] Vie de M. Démia, p. 81. Cf. Ravelet, pp. 73, 4 and 5. [47] Factotum attributed to Pourchat. [48] Vie de M. Démia, p. 487. [49] Vie du St. J.-B. de la Salle, par Frère Lucard; Introduction, pp. liii. et liv.

Prior to the seventeenth century the government never interfered with the elementary schools. If it should happen to interpose the purpose was not to obtain control, but rather to ensure the teacher's salary, to erect new schools or to sanction the efforts of the clergy in this important affair. Such was the tenor of the royal decree of 1598, of the letter of Louis XIII. to the Bishop of Poitiers (1640) and of the declarations of Louis XIV. in 1685 and 1698.[52] The supervision of the moral government and instructions of teachers was left to the Bishops, who generally appointed an ecclesiastic eminently qualified for the office.

"The supervision," says Ravelet,[53] "was very strict. It extended to the teachers and the books. The teachers were warned not to teach the children of 'books of fables, of romance, or silly or improper stories,' and above all to avoid such as contained corrupt doctrine and teaching tainted by heresy. . . . But, indeed, we know the use and the possession of bad books were forbidden to everybody, even to private individuals. The children were supplied, as to-day, with primers containing letters, separate and in syllables, the usual prayers and the commandments of God. The cross shone on the first page.[54] . . ." The districts, fathers of families and private individuals continued to enjoy the privilege of founding schools and appointing teachers. But once accepted and appointed, the teachers had to be guaranteed payment, and their only personal duty consisted in the formality of obtaining the ecclesiastical authorization to teach.[55]

"The Church did not forget that in order to induce children to frequent the schools, it was necessary to let the expense of schooling fall as lightly as possible on the families of the poor.

---

[50] Claude Jolly, Traité Historique des Écoles Épiscopales, Preface. See also the interesting account by Ravelet, pp. 28 et passim. [51] Arrêt du Parlement; Mém. du Clergé, t. I., p. 999. [52] Cf. Ravelet, pp. 49, 50 and 51. [53] Vie du St. J.-B. de la Salle, p. 54 et passim. [54] Brother Azarias, Essays Educational, pp. 185-194. [55] Ravelet, p. 52.

"Free instruction has consequently always been one of the principal pre-occupations of the Church, not that illusory freedom which consists in making everybody, rich and poor, pay for the education of the children, whatever be the fortune of the parents; but really free education, that which rests upon the charitable foundations, and not on *concealed taxes*. Therefore does the Church encourage to the utmost the endowment of schools."[56]

If the Church encouraged the material aid to the schools, she was specially solicitous about the religious foundation. Hence when it was question of establishing a congregation or pious association, having for object the instruction of youth, the Church, in her generosity, showered upon the founder and his congregation many and great blessings and allowed them rare spiritual privileges.

With the thorough reformation of the clergy effected, it was, therefore, not surprising to see ecclesiastics of rare merit and ability devoted to the interests of the little schools, *i. e.*, to the education of the poor. Many attempts were made to found seminaries for teachers who would be well trained and disciplined and fully imbued with the spirit of their calling. Moreover, "the Council of Trent renovated the spirit of Christendom, and faith, purified and regulated by discipline, produced a superabundance of vocations." Nothing can exceed the fecundity of those congregations in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, especially those devoted to teaching. Among the first, therefore, who took the initiative in this sublime mission was Blessed Peter Fourier (1565-1640).

Having completed a brilliant course of classical studies at Pont-à-Mousson, Peter Fourier opened, in 1585, an elementary school at Mirecourt. We can appreciate his pedagogical aptitude from the declaration of one of his pupils. "If at my death," he says, "I find, as I hope, grace before God, I shall attribute that happiness to the fact that I was educated in my youth by the Blessed Peter Fourier."

After his ordination he entered the Congregation of the Canons Regular. He was afterward one of its reformers. He was made pastor of Mattaincourt, a much neglected parish. It was long left in disorder. "This worthy pastor was firmly convinced that neither the reformation of his modest parish, nor even that of the Church and society, could be solid and lasting unless it were effected through the Christian education of the tenderest youth, to which he devoted himself from the moment of his arrival at Mattaincourt. This work constituted the principal object of his zeal. But what grieved him most was to see children excluded from the school because of their poverty and, again, because he met only mercenaries who were generally either incompetent or indifferent to disseminate the spirit of religion and Christian piety among their pupils."[57]

---

[56] Ravelet, p. 52. To-day we hear much about free education. This is unjustly claimed as one of the lasting benefits of the Reformation. The various Councils of the Church have positive legislation on this interesting subject. Let the candid reader study their decrees and he will be convinced that to the Church alone is due this precious boon of a free education. Her charity schools were free schools. The teacher was prohibited from exacting payment of the pupils. He was liable to dismissal for violating this rule. The councils are proofs positive and definitive. Cf. Ravelet, p. 57 et passim. This question merits careful study on the part of every student of history.

Hence, to overcome this obstacle, he formed the project of building two free schools, the one for boys and the other for girls. His aim was to facilitate the instruction of the poorest children. Alone he could not accomplish his object. He associated with himself, therefore, three or four men whom he carefully trained to be teachers. But the four young men soon abandoned him. "The work was reserved for another no less worthy."[58] And, "God reserved the success of this work for another holy priest who would prove more than a mere imitator."[59]

St. Joseph Calasanctius (1556-1648) conceived a grander and more practical plan than that devised by the zealous priest of Mattaincourt. He accordingly went to Rome, in 1592, at the beginning of the Pontificate of Clement VIII., and remained there till his death. He was the founder of the Regular Clerks of the *Scuole Pie*, or Pious Schools. They are, on that account, called *Piarists.* "The object of this congregation is to teach children reading, writing, ciphering, book-keeping and business transactions, the humanities, classics, mathematics, philosophy and theology. They extended to Spain, Austria and Poland."[60] In one of his letters, dated June 16, 1646, this holy founder declared that despite his ninety years the teaching of Greek to little children was a cheerful task.[61]

The Pious Schools were established at Rome in November, 1597. The Pope authorized Joseph Calasanctius to open colleges, direct seminaries and establish universities. The new congregation differed from the Society of Jesus only in this, that its members were connected with elementary grammar schools and were devoted exclusively to teaching.[62] "They did not spread, however, as much as was hoped, and, above all, they did not continue specially restricted to primary education. Their schools developed into colleges whose curriculum to-day extends from the elements of reading and writing to the higher branches of instruction."[63]

---

[57] Rohrbacher, Histoire universelle de l'Église, t. XIII., p. 137. [58] Brother Azarias, Essays Educational, p. 213. [59] Rohrbacher, t. XIII., p. 137. [60] Ibid, p. 74. [61] Vie de Saint Joseph Calasanz, p. 405. [62] Everardo Micheli, Storia della Pédagogia Italiana, p. 152. [63] A. Ravelet, Vie du Saint J.-B. de la Salle, p. 85.

There were other similar essays, attempted at Lyons and Paris; the one at Lyons by the Rev. Charles Démia, and the one at Paris by the Rev. Nicholas Barré.

Charles Démia (1636-1689) was born at Bourg.[64] After he was ordained he went to Lyons. Here he was welcomed by Abbé Heurtevent, a Sulpician, who had established, in 1659, the Seminary of St. Irenæus. The contemporaneous writers were not flattering in their accounts of the spiritual and social condition of the Diocese of Lyons.[65] The celebrated orator, Massillon, in the funeral oration delivered over Villeroi de Neuville, exclaimed: "Alas! all the splendor of the city of Sion is obscured! . . . The faithful one who, during his life remained in profound forgetfulness of our holy mysteries and the law of God, dies peacefully;" for he was deceived through the ignorance of those who should have enlightened him. To oppose this depravity, therefore, the Archbishop, Camille de Villeroi, had founded or favored several important works; but "the little schools had not yet obtained his coöperation, being unmindful of the fact that society would be regenerated through the school."

Charles Démia was not slow in perceiving that the children of the laboring class lived in great depravity and ignorance. To apply a remedy to this crying evil he formed catechism classes and thus improved the behavior of the children.

On December 30, 1671, the Provost of the Merchants received many complaints, and was requested to listen, in behalf of humanity, to the earnest pleadings of the zealous priest and to give the necessary aid. Being at last touched at the sight of so much misery and vice, the Provost and City Council forthwith voted an annual sum of two hundred francs to found a school where the children should be taught reading, writing and the Christian doctrine. The following year three other schools were opened in the parishes of St. Nizier, St. Michael and St. Paul. In 1672 there were schools where children were received gratis.

But to complete his noble work and to make it lasting, it was essential for Charles Démia to associate with himself co-laborers who would assist him in carrying out his plans. He was fortunate to find among the clergy some very distinguished men who were willing to devote themselves to the regeneration of society. He was not, however, so successful with laymen. He saw, nevertheless, the absolute necessity to have complete authority over the teachers. Accordingly, he obtained from Louis XIV. a decree, June 7, 1674, ordaining all teachers subject to the regulations formulated by the Archbishop. Furthermore, it ordered every school closed within six months, if the teacher failed to legalize his position. Charles Démia looked upon thte formation of teachers as a personal duty and responsibility. He established, therefore, a seminary at his own expense for the training of teachers. He gave them rules and advice. The seminary was successively known as the *Community of Teachers, Little Seminary of Teachers,* and, lastly, as *St. Charles Seminary.*

---

[64] Cf. L. Niepce, Histoire des Établissement d'Instruction dans le Départment du Rhône.
[65] Ibid.

The rules of this seminary were based upon those of St. Irenæus. To the superior were associated two professors—one for dogmatic and the other for moral theology. There were also twelve teachers, each having an assistant; they were all ecclesiastics. They left the seminary at an appointed time to teach school in the various quarters of the city. In establishing his seminary, Charles Démia had in view several objects: 1. To form competent teachers and good preceptors; 2, to prepare virtuous clergy for country parishes; 3, to enable worthy young men who had a vocation to the ecclesiastical state to complete their studies gratis.

Independent of the seminary, Charles Démia organized also a school-board, composed of a director and twenty-two rectors. This organization was approved by the Archbishop February 6, 1679. Among the special functions of the school-board was the direction and government of the schools and the administration of St. Charles Seminary.

The Congregation of the Sisters of St. Charles owes its existence to the zeal of Charles Démia, and its object was the education of girls and the care of the sick. This community is still flourishing. The seminary became, however, a common seminary like any other. The work of the Brethren of St. Charles did not survive their founder.

"The Rev. Charles Démia," says Ravelet, "had the intuition of the *mutual system of education;* at least he appealed to the good will of the older pupils, and established among them dignitaries who aided the teacher."[66]

Let us now see what was accomplished at Paris. Here we meet the enlightened founder of the Congregation of the Sisters of the Child Jesus, the Rev. Nicholas Barré (1605?-1683). This flourishing congregation had two distinct branches—that of Rouen and of Paris. The former received the name of Sisters of Providence, and the latter the name of Sisters of St. Maur. Madame de Maintenon at St. Cyr, Paris; Charles Démia at Lyons, and the Abbé Roland (1642-1678) at Rheims adopted the rules and regulations of Nicholas Barré and requested him to send them several Sisters to aid in the organization of a work analogous to his own.

---

[66] Ravelet, p. 86.

But the tentative of the man of God in favor of teachers was ephemeral. He assembled in 1678 the teachers of Paris, gave them a regulation and endeavored to form them into a community. "The young men, however, thought more of themselves than their holy vocation. They looked upon it in the light of a useful calling, and so lost the grace to remain faithful to it. At the end of a few months they dispersed and their schools were closed."[67]

He was among the first to recognize St. de la Salle as the instrument destined by Providence to fill up, at last, in part, the immense gap left in the elementary instruction of the poor for lack of good teachers. He went even so far as to urge De la Salle to reside in Paris, where his disciples could divide the labors of the schools of St. Sulpice with the Sisters of St. Maur. A like counsel would not have been given to the founder of the Brothers of the Christian Schools, if the project of an association of the teachers of Paris had proved a success.[68]

But among the precursors of De la Salle, the ecclesiastic who evidenced the greatest zeal in the cause of Christian Schools was the Rev. Adrian Bourdoise (1590-1655). He was unquestionably one of the most devoted promoters of the little schools and charity schools. Experience taught him that perhaps the most effective element for the recruitment of the clergy was to be found in the wise and intelligent management of these schools.

"The little schools," he loved to repeat, "are the seminary of seminaries. But to render them useful to the family and religion, teachers should be formed who would labor like apostles and not like hirelings, looking upon the office of teacher as a miserable trade taken up to get their bread. . . . The best teachers, the greatest, the most esteemed, would not be too good for the avocation. Because the parish schools are poor and taught by poor men, people imagine they are of no account. And yet it is the only means of destroying vice and instilling virtue. I defy all mankind to find a better means. The school is the novitiate of Christianity."[69]

---

[67] Ravelet, p. 90. [68] M. Hermant attributes the founding of the Child Jesus to Nicholas Barré. This is an error. The religious habit he gives to them belongs to the Brothers of the Christian Schools. The disciples of De la Salle sometimes received this name, because the institute, as is proved by the Bull of Approbation of Benedict XIII., was placed under the special patronage of the Child Jesus. Simon de Domcourt, in his Histoire de l'Église de Saint-Sulpice, 1774, mentions the Brothers of the Christian Schools, called of the Child Jesus. [69] Vie de M. Bourdoise, MS., p. 985, 1203. Bibliothèque Marazine. Adrian Bourdoise de-

Adrian Bourdoise opened a free school at Liancourt which attracted considerable attention. While success crowned his efforts in the school, he was completely baffled in the attempt to establish a seminary for teachers. His ambition was to emulate the famous Seminary of St. Nicholas du Chardonet for the education of clerics. However, in view of the happy results which he obtained conjointly with Vincent de Paul and John Olier for the formation and improvement of the clergy, Adrian Bourdoise believed firmly that Providence would not long delay in giving to the little schools an apostle who would elevate them and give them a strongly defined Christian character.

Fully imbued with this thought, Adrian Bourdoise formed, in 1649, an association of prayer among his friends to implore heaven to hasten the advent of the much desired Apostle of Youth. "I believe that if St. Paul and St. Denis," he said, "were to come back to France now, they would undertake the important work of forming teachers in preference to any other work." Adrian Bourdoise possessed the happy facility of imparting his own enthusiasm to others. The association had already seventy members on its rolls. He placed it under the protection of St. Joseph.

"As the clergy are very negligent," writes Adrian Bourdoise, "in the instruction of children, God, who protects His Church, intends perhaps to remedy this defect by some extraordinary means and to raise up teachers who will conscientiously acquit themselves of our derelict duty. It is doubtless for this end that God gives to so many persons the spirit of prayer."[70]

There were already at this period many congregations of religious schoolmistresses. But as is evident from the writings of Adrian Bourdoise and contemporaneous records, no similar institutions, having for special object the formation of schoolmasters, either for the charity schools or the little schools, had been successfully established and operated. We have seen that all attempts to establish them proved complete failures. The antiquated individual method of teaching was scrupulously adhered to in the elementary schools. The reading of Latin was the foundation of the course. The precentor insisted upon the study of the Latin grammar, logic and rhetoric; while "in many localities," writes Mgr. Armand, Bishop of Angers, "the schools were hardly of any avail toward the salvation of the children, for the schoolmasters and school-

---

manded three things from his teachers and clerics, namely—vocation, knowledge and love. "The last," he said, "depends upon the disposition of our heart. It is the rarest quality to be found." He took for his device the two initial letters S. F., signifying *scire* and *facere*.

[70] Vie, MS., p. 896.

mistresses were content with the mere teaching of the reading of Latin."[71]

There was, however, a more serious abuse. The Church is the teacher of morals as well as of doctrine. We all know the frailty of human nature. Hence any one having experience will applaud the wisdom of the various councils and synods of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Indeed, we may also examine the prudent restrictions explicitly expressed in the councils prior, during and after the Middle Ages concerning the necessity of separate schools for boys and girls. And despite the strict laws and formal prohibitions, there still existed some mixed schools. "Although every one acknowledges," says Mgr. Hardouin de Péréfixe, Archbishop of Paris, "the utility and even the necessity of these formal prohibitions, we are daily apprised of their infringement in several localities, and which would have resulted in a manner decidedly prejudicial to the education of the children if we had not intervened anew by our authority."[72] Consequently, the Archbishop revived the ordinances of his predecessors touching this point and prohibited any infringement thereupon by schoolmasters and schoolmistresses under pain of excommunication *ipso facto.*

Toward the close of the seventeenth century this abuse had not yet been entirely corrected. The country schools at this period were generally known as mercenary schools. This was due to the fact that pecuniary interests necessitated "ordinarily the receiving of children of both sexes; it was rare, therefore, to meet with hirelings who dreaded this combination."[73] The King and Parliament of Paris enacted, however, upon this important subject-matter some explicit statutes and prohibitions.[74]

But the little schools, destined for the education of poor children, were deserted and held in contempt. There was a deep feeling on all sides of some existing evil. The schools continued to be deserted for lack of teachers who could take away the odium attached to them. Parents had no confidence in such schools. Therefore the great necessity of providing teachers above reproach and thus restore their good name and confidence. The success of the schools would then be assured and would eventually do away with mixed schools. The teaching sisterhoods increased and their schools multiplied. The girls had, therefore, no longer any need to frequent schools intended for boys. Hence by degrees the mixed schools even in the more densely populated parts of the city were of the past. This was an excellent remedy and it worked admirably.

---

[71] Ordonnance Synodale de 1668. Statuts Synodaux du Diocèse d'Angers, p. 768, 1680. Also cf. l'Abbé Alain, L'Instruction Primaire en France avant la Revolution, etc., p. 109. "The Abbé Alain has made a specialty," says Brother Azarias, "of the history of education prior to the Revolution of 1789 in France." Essays Educational, p. 171.

[72] Ordonnance du 10 Mai, 1666; Cf. R. de Beaurepaire, t. I., p. 72; A. de Charmasse, p. 140.

[73] Vie de M. J.-B. de la Salle, p. 50, 1731.

[74] Mém. nouveaux du Clergé, t. I., p. 1056 et passim.

There were, moreover, many children of every condition of life to whom the study of the classics would be practically useless. No one had as yet conceived the scheme of establishing a special course, having the vernacular as the basis of study, and arranged with a view to the new intellectual wants born of the invention of printing and the progress of industry and commerce. The demarcation between elementary and secondary teaching was nowhere definitively settled. Consequently a change of teachers not unfrequently implied a like change in the schedule of studies.

In studying the peculiarities of educational programmes of the period, we are not a little surprised at the lack of special schools where the pupil could take eclectic studies consonant with his future career. Hence even the children of some noble families were condemned to take the most elementary course, because they declined to follow the classical or because the father refused them the privilege to prevent them from embracing the ecclesiastical state or from taking up the profession of the law. In such cases the profession of arms was considered more honorable to the interest of the family. To-day we find special courses in every college or university curriculum. This educational reform was successfully introduced by St. de la Salle.

Men who had given any serious thought to the important question of the education of children concluded that seminaries for the training of teachers like those which had been established for the education of the clergy was the only possible solution to be reached. It was, therefore, essentially necessary to found a teaching congregation of select and worthy men, having for object: 1, The recruitment and education of men to fit them to take charge of large schools; 2, the establishing of seminaries for its teachers and the training of secular teachers. Is it not thus that congregations proceed to act when entrusted with the administration of ecclesiastical seminaries? They naturally form members for their own society and diocesan clergy for parochial duty. Under such conditions it would be easy to establish pertinent relations between the lay teachers and their forming masters so as to maintain in their schools unity of organization, method and aim. The teaching of the Christian doctrine would then constitute the groundwork of their schedule of studies, and thus all would labor for the welfare of society "through the

Christian and secular instruction of youth, the principal end and aim of their institute."[75]

From the beginning of the eighteenth century the government, the hierarchy and clergy, the public officials and the parents were unanimous in attesting that the work of St. de la Salle realized all and more that the most enlightened and far-seeing men had contemplated. Nor were those interested in the instruction of the masses disappointed, for De la Salle corresponded to all the hopes and aspirations they had founded upon the eminent merit of this great apostle of youth. The foundation of the Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools is dated from 1679.[76] But few years sufficed these patrons and promoters of education to warrant them in considering De la Salle the instrument of Providence granted in answer to the many and fervent prayers that daily ascended to the throne of mercy and love. De la Salle, too was the one destined to provide for their free schools such teachers as they in their piety and patriotism could have reasonably desired.

It is, therefore, "in the midst of this general movement in favor of popular education that De la Salle founded the Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools at the opportune moment of which the Church possesses the secret. The new institute set out with this thought that *teaching is less a career or instrument of fortune than that it is the most elevated expression of the spirit of sacrifice and devotedness;* and the Church has proved that by proposing the founder of this admirable congregation to the public veneration, she honors those who give their heart as the equal of those who shed their blood."[77]

But "never did the time," says Lemontey, "appear more unfavorable to the founding of a new religious institute." And yet, after enumerating the principal facts which demonstrate the corruption of morals and the consequent weakening of faith, he adds: "It was in the very midst of the symptoms of public indifference to religion that the Congregation of the Brothers of the Christian Schools is established. Struck with the neglect in which the children of the poor were left, with all the evil consequent thereupon, M. de la Salle conceived the bold idea of presenting these young savages to society by opening free schools where they would receive the first rudiments of secular and religious instruction. . . . He endeavored to accomplish the greatest possible good at the least possible expense. And we doubt very much whether his plagiarists and imitators in many States of the American confederation have attained to a better solution of this difficult problem than did this pious priest."[78]

---

[75] Règles du Gouvernement de Frères des Écoles Chrétiennes, p. 12, 1714. [76] Annales de l'Institut des Frères, t. I., Introduction. [77] A. de Charmasse, l'Instruction Primaire dans l'Ancien Diocèse d'Autun, p. 41.

"The reign of truth is never peaceful. Heresy in a thousand forms is perpetually attacking her and trying to usurp her place. Just then, under the name of Jansenism, it was troubling the Church and was to go disturbing her for a whole century. At the same time Gallicanism, of older date and equally dangerous influence, continued its ravages, ensnaring Louis XIV., through his pride, and fascinating even the genius of Bossuet. The very year in which De la Salle was born, 1651, Dupuy published the new edition of his 'Preuves des Libertés de L'Eglise Gallicane.'

"Such was the period in the midst of which De la Salle was born into the world. He was also to be *the inventor of a system of teaching.* He was to receive doctrine in trust. He was to preserve it intact, to assimilate it by prayer and meditation and to distribute it around, and to find innumerable disciples who would go on distributing it after him. In this universal education, dispensed with such prodigality, there was, nevertheless, one class, the humblest and most numerous, that was neglected and left without masters. These were the little boys of the lower classes. It was to them that De la Salle was sent."[79]

C. M. GRAHAM.

Tennessee.

A SUMMER IN SICILY.

MOST travelers testify to the potency of drinking the *Aqua Virgo* at the Trevi fountain in Rome to produce an irresistible yearning to return to the Eternal City, and the breathing of the air of Sicily seems to be possessed of the same mysterious power upon him who has once imbibed its fragrance; few can ever leave that fair island without finding themselves influenced by a warm desire to revisit its shores, drawn by a strangely powerful affection for a land whose recollections come back to the mind like some pleasant dream of the night.

To those who seek to make their travels a store of fruitful provender whereon the mind may feed in the afterglow of life, there are few places which provide so rich a feast for the memory. All true travel must be accompanied by a greater or less degree of bodily discomfort, but in the retrospect only the mental impressions endure, and our thought then will transport our unjostled bodies over the scenes of the past without fatigue or worry. Sicily does not demand any unusual share of this fatigue such as is commonly supposed to be necessary for a visit there, since the railway now makes all places that are of supreme interest easily accessible. At Palermo there exists every luxury of life and inducement to make it a winter and spring residence, and at other places there are to be found hotels which are at least sufficient for the traveler's needs. The brigand, that valued assistant to the newspaper correspondent, seems to have retreated before the advance of the parallel lines of peaceful steel, and is more likely to be met with in the neighborhood of Naples than here. Moreover, as far as we could learn in a recent visit, it is not the passing visitor that is the object of attention to the Sicilian highwayman, for there exists no band of these men, and the traveler has come and gone before any trusty number can be collected or any concerted action determined upon; but it is their own local people, such as the factor going from place to place collecting the rents, that is the real desire of their eyes.

---

[78] Histoire de la Régence et de la Minorité de Louis XV., t. II., p. 287. [79] Armand Ravelet, Vie du J.-B. de la Salle, pp. 96 et 97.

In the combination of its varied history, its relics of ancient art and beauty of nature and climate Sicily affords a charm so great that Egypt occurs to the mind as its sole competitor, and even that fails in respect to the physical aspects. Yet Sicily is not uniformly beautiful; those who only know its fascinating and lovely eastern coast must not think that they will find it repeated. The mountains that girdle the greater part of the island from below the western Eryx circle round along the northern coast and turn again down the eastern to Ætna and give the land its picturesque aspect of configuration, for they leave but a small extent of level ground unbroken by spurs from the main ridge in the centre, and no spot is out of sight of these sheltering highlands. The honeycombed limestone and lava that prevail in their composition are the very materials to render a country not simply fruitful, but luxuriant, and to furnish it with varied outline and romantic spots, while from almost every point of view Ætna itself is visible and is a source of awe and wonder as well as of grandeur in the landscape. Above all the gorgeous sun irradiates mountain and valley, making them to "laugh and sing" in the language of the eastern Psalmist, flooding the panorama with every tint of azure and golden light from morn till eve, and defying all attempts to find a nomenclature of color that will convey any idea of its varying splendor. The air is fragrant with the odors from citron and jessamine, fiery globes of pomegranate light up the thickets, orchards of orange and lemon with leaves of glossy green, gray oliveyards, vineyards of graceful native vine and purpling grape, to which the town of Marsala has given its name, the sombre carot, the soaring aloe, hedges of yucca and prickly pear, flowers and shrubs creeping down to the very shores or hanging in festoons and masses from the broken cliffs; in short, everything that can charm the eye and enparadise the senses is to be found lavished by Mother Nature about this bright island. The configuration of the steep and rugged coastline is equally lovely. The Bay of Palermo, with its guardian mountains like fortresses to protect its entrance, and the Bay of Catania, shadowed by lordly Ætna seated on his snowy throne, these are familiar from repute; but the whole coast is fretted by broad forelands of warmly glowing hills whose rocky barriers broken into outlying crags form deep recesses which echo to the whish of the sunny sea; masses of black lava rock, set amid a creamy surf, diversify the line of shore, while a rich flora occupies every nook and cranny and responds with glowing color to the opaline iridescence of the waters. But it is not only the senses of sight and smell that are captivated, for every spot teems with historic memories, appealing to our historic sense and intellectual capacity, deepening the enjoyment, so that one goes back again and again to the lavish bounty of the physical and mental delights of the island, as Cardinal Newman once said, like "as one smells again and again at a sweet flower."

No one who has read the great literatures of Greece or of Rome can coast the shores of Sicily or tread its strands without being thrilled with the evidences that remain of peoples that have "gathered" here and then "gone by together." Its Cyclops and giants of earlier fable were perhaps but the more prosaic workers in iron and stone, just as the Lotophagi of Læstrygones were the farmers and herdsmen of its prehistoric times; but they are scarcely less shadowy to us than the Sican Sicel of Elymian, whom modern historians identify with the island's earliest inhabitants. Each of these latter has at least left some recognizable evidence of his presence. It is true that of the Celtic Sican, Latin Sicel and possibly Trojan Elymian not a fragment of writing or coinage is known to us, yet of the Sican tongue we can shrewdly guess from the place-names that exist. Of Sicel there is known a short but efficient vocabulary; but of Elymian only a grammatical case-ending! The subterranean cities and built towns of the Sican and Sicel have not yet received the patient study they require and deserve, but still they are to be seen. Fancy would wish to accept the presence of Troy's fugitives at least at the foot of Eryx, where Virgil tells of the death of Anchises and of the funeral games then celebrated. Here the island of the boat race lies in the offing. There the goddess mother of Æneas still seems to look benignantly on the children that play around the site of her temple and the pyre of her earthly lover, for they are still remarkable in the island for their beauty, and here alone in Western Christendom the women go veiled in compassion for man's frailty at the sight of their loveliness. But out of the sea-mist sweeping over the ocean of time and enveloping these earlier races we may descry other mysterious visitors to the island coming from the foot of Libanus and popularly called Phœnicians or in Holy Writ Canaanites. At first we can but vaguely trace the presence of these shadowy voyagers as they land here and there; but gradually they emerge into the light of history under the name of Carthage. Their own name, viz., that by which they called themselves, remains unknown to us. Sidonians, Tyrians we call these subjects of King Hiram; but those are only place-names. Who were they? will be a constantly recurring thought at many a spot. Those who have traveled up the Nile's flood will try and connect them with that wondrous picture on the walls of Dayr-el-Bahari in the plain of Thebes and think of them as coming from the "Holy Land of Phunt"—now said to be Somali-land—and find another confirmation of the general accuracy of Herodotus (vii., 89), who says they came from the Erythræan Sea. The Hebrew knew them as the Canaanites, *i. e.*, the Lowlanders, from their choosing the seashores and low plains in preference to the hills. The Greek named them Phœnicians from the encircling palm groves about their great cities of Tyre, Sidon and Arvad, which the inhabitants adopted as their emblem. The Roman corrupted this into Phœni and had to struggle for life with their more vigorous daughter Carthage in the Punic wars. But still their own name is a mystery to us. We may trace the sites of their factories, marts, temples and camps around these coasts and see their battlefields close by. Here they came to win the fair pearl of the great sea, at first as gentle wooers, spreading at her feet the luxury and wealth of the East and endeavoring to gain the favor of her glance by the richness of their purples, the delicacy of their tissues and the beauty of the embroideries for which Homer celebrates the daughters of Sidon. Their descendants became less courteous and patient suitors, and adopting more violent methods tried by force to obtain her and to wrest her for themselves. Think for a moment as you stand gazing over some scene where once they have been that here came men of probably the same speech as Joshua and of David, the sweet singer of Israel, for although the Ægyptian was a "strange language" to the Israelite of the tongue of Chaldea, "one thou knowest not," we never find that said of the speech of Canaan. The Carthaginian names of Hannibal and Asdrubal that will be on your lips seem to confirm this, for we need only change the ending that tells of their patron deity Baal to that of the mystic Jah to see in those titles the familiar Hananiah and Azariah. These lovers of the low, sea-bordered lands came here from the foot of Libanus as they did to the old Irish and Cornish coasts, bringing with them those gods that had for worshipers the errant Solomon as well as the great Hannibal. Here they reared their temples to Baal and lighting their fires to Moloch made their children to pass through its purifying flames, a custom still recalled in the innocent mirth of the Beltein or Baal fires of midsummer in Ireland and many other places. Side by side with Baal arose the temple of the cruel Ashtoreth, with the scenes of lewdness that marked out "the abomination of the Sidonians," and here they gave the "fruit of their body for the sin of their soul." On some hilltop we find the Greeks, with their merry, graceful, "flashing-throned, immortal Aphrodite," born of the sparkling foam, supplanting the Phœnician Astarte with her passionate, insatiable hunger, and this again succeeded by the coarser Venus of the Romans, and in these successive dedications we may see the varying ideals of succeeding races in their conception of perfect womanhood before Christianity taught of her who was "Sweet Mother, Sweet Maid."

But if the Tyrian merchant were an unwelcomed petitioner for the love of the fair Sicilia, this cannot be said of the ancient Greek, for he surely won her heart. Subsequently rival nations, rival creeds, rival races, with rival systems of life, contested for a share in that love, for Roman, Vandal, Goth, Arab, Norman, French, Spanish were all aspirants and evinced their admiration of her beauty, and Arab and Norman were certainly regarded by her in no unkindly fashion, but the Greek alone possessed her. He made this his new world in the height of his civilization and culture, and his influence remains not only in the habits of the people, but in those evidences of his art which are among the most precious relics of Greek sculpture in Europe at this day. The Eastern coast literally teams with Greek memories, and it is this part of the island which is said by those who know both countries to be the portion that most reproduces the varied coast of old Hellas. This is the typical Sicily of Theocritus and the poets, with its mountains and islands, mysteries of ravine and cliff, its grottoes wherein dwell the Nereids, Cyclops-haunted caverns, inland woods and vineyards. Taormina, "la splendidissima," with the New Naxos at its foot, the home of the first settlers, and Syracuse, "la fidele," their last home, and one of the most magnificent cities in the old world, both lie along this coast. Towering above everything and dominating this entire side of the island rises mighty Ætna, within whose cauldron of fire is enclosed Enceladus or Typhœus, rebels against the King of heaven. Along its fertile slopes the goatherd still plays his pipes and his goats "run after the cytizus" (Theoc. x.). Silvery threads of rippling waters make music with the song of the cicada and the sweet melody of the pine woods; in the peasant's home the love charm and song of Simætha (Idyll ii.) may be heard, while on some purple hillside, fragrant of thyme and wild flowers, basks in the sun the old fisherman Œpis as he watches for the approach of the shoals of the tunny fish. So complete was the Hellenisation of the island that between the times of Thucydides and Cicero the native tongues had become extinct and Greek leavened the whole; nor did Latin, Arabic or French ever supplant it, but it continued through all subsequent changes until it gave way to Italian in mediæval days.

With the exception of Athens, nowhere, even in Greece itself, are such fine remains of that country's art to be seen as are found at Girgenti, Segesta, Selinunte and Syracuse. Some of the most magnificent temples that the Grecian architect ever produced still exist here, and a dominant desire in the mind of every intelligent visitor to the island is to see those that stand erect. To estimate the grandeur that marked two that are now lying like swaths of corn laid prostrate before the scythe of some giant reaper, a comparison may be made if the reader be acquainted with the lovely temple of Neptune at Pæstum, the ancient Poseidonia (about B. C. 550), which measures 190 feet long by 84 feet broad; or the matchless Parthenon at Athens (finished B. C. 438), which is 229 feet by 101 feet. These figures are entirely dwarfed by the measurements of one at Girgenti (the ancient Æragas and Latin Agrigentum), which was not only the largest in that city, but the largest that was ever attempted, unless it be that of Diana of Ephesus, for it was 363 feet long, including its steps, by 182 feet in width. Again, of still greater length and little less area was the shrine they were constructing to Apollo at Selinus, which was 371 feet long and about 177 feet in breadth; but this was left unfinished, and one of those incidents which seem to bridge all intervening time may be seen there (such as occurs in the quarries of Baalbec in Syria or Assouan in Egypt), where the drums of the pillars remain awaiting the return of the ghostly workmen who were suddenly driven from their toil by the incursion of the Carthaginians in B. C. 409. Such daring magnificence shows the height of wealth and culture to which the Sicilian Greek had attained and may well excite our admiration and wonder.

But although the larger number of the existing remains of Greek art lie overthrown, yet there are three temples standing erect, while others are embodied in churches. These three are fairly perfect for work of such antiquity. Uncared for as they have been through centuries and only regarded with the eye of the spoiler or the adapter, they have survived the shock of earthquakes, the mordent tooth of the scirocco and, worse still, the lust of the utilitarian. Most of us want to see for ourselves what a Greek temple really looked like, and thus form our own conception apart from pictures and engravings, and here is our opportunity. It is a lack of school teaching that we have never set before our eyes as we read the model of a temple, theatre, bath-house, forum or dwelling place of Greek or Roman life. Pictures do not convey the reality, and the result is that we usually expect to see things in a very different condition. Nor are we wont to be familiar with the various parts and their uses, and this, added to the first sense of disappointment at their state of decay, often renders a visit to their remains unsatisfactory. It would be a good thing if no one were allowed to take the higher classical forms in our schools or become teachers at our universities in classical subjects unless he had traveled in the countries where Greek and Roman works are to be seen. A few months' study of these to a man already well read in their history is a duplication of all he knows, and brings a life and reality into his teachings that saves time and brightens the labor of the pupil.

All the temples in Sicily are in the style called Doric, from being perfected in the Doric cities of Greece, those first art schools of Europe. It was not confined to that tribe, but was common to all the tribes of Greece in Europe, just as Ionic was common to all the Asiatic Greeks. Like the Norman style in England, it is marked by its simplicity, solidity and impressiveness, and was governed by strict rule, simple proportion and pure harmony. The temples are placed upon a stylobate or platform of three or four steps, and from it rise the columns without other base, with tapering, fluted sides. These shafts usually have twenty flutes and a height corresponding to five times their diameter. The form these edifices most frequently take in Sicily is described architecturally as hexastyle peripteral, that is, they have six columns in front and back and a varying number down the sides. The interior was built up by solid walls into an oblong quadrangle called the cella, divided into naos and pronaos, answering to sanctuary and choir in a Norman church. They all stand orientated after the custom of Greek fanes. The impression of firmness and solidity is very powerfully conveyed in this Doric order of architecture by making the entablature, as all the portion above the pillars is termed, intentionally heavier than was needful, and also by placing the columns near together and rapidly tapering. The frieze was ornamented with groups of sculpture, the rough surface of the stone of pillars, etc., was made smooth with a thin layer of fine plaster or stucco, and color would be used everywhere. Within the now desolate cella would stand some costly statue of the deity there honored, in bronze or marble, the work of some skilled artist, emblems of the god and statuettes of heroes or gods connected with him would be placed around, rich hangings covered the walls on festal days and sacred herbs strewed the ground. Every spot within the cella would be full of decoration and color, valuable votive offerings would adorn the walls, here the arms and bucklers of a conquered foe, there the prow of a ship in thanksgiving for escape from the waves, tripods of incense, altars and furniture for priestly use, vessels of gold and silver, all these we must bring back to our mind's eye as we tread these courts and repeople these shrines.

But the study of these temples would take up a greater portion of our space than we now propose to give it, and we return to a review of the eastern coast of Sicily as that most sought by the traveler in search of natural beauty and because physically and historically it is the most interesting. It is hard to compare lovely scenery and probably unfair to do so, but most persons will register in their memories the journey from Messina to Syracuse as perhaps the most singularly attractive and beautiful of any in Europe. Every form of graceful outline and every shade of magic coloring may be seen along that coast. The stupendous masses of mountains that overshadow it are broken into varying outline, never lumpish and heavy, but with peak and crest radiant in sunlight, while rift and fissure are deep in shadow. Their valleys, coming down to the sea, have their sides clothed in luxuriant vegetation, pleasant streams wander down them from bracken covered woodlands, orchards of orange, lemon, pomegranate, fig and vine occupy every available spot, and where possible tilth and lea succeed dene and dingle. The oaks and pines of Theocritus are now rare, yet they still exist on the slopes of Ætna, but as a rule the mountains of Sicily are as bare as those of Hellas. The olive and the vine brought to the island by the Greek are gradually creeping up their sides by extended cultivation; the orange of the Saracen visitors is being more widely planted each year, but the palm that they also introduced is seldom seen, and more rarely still their cotton and sugar. The Spaniard during his possession gave the fair island the aloe and prickly pear, which he brought to it from his new world colonies, and they are continually met with. Since the time of Proserpine Sicily has been the home of flowers, and her mother Demeter rendered it the granary of Italy, and to-day it looks as fair and blessed with their gifts as when the virgin goddess gathered her violets in Enna's perfumed woods or when in union with Artemis and Athene she wove a floral robe for almighty Zeus upon his throne of Ætna.

The towns along this coast—Messina, Taormina, Catania and Syracuse—are each worthy of a visit. The last mentioned demands more than a casual one, for it was the most important city of the Greeks in the island and the most magnificent of its time in Europe. The remains of its ancient glory deserve a lengthened examination, and a stay of some weeks will reward the student of history. Its story and the enumeration of its ruins are too extensive a subject to deal with here, but it may be interesting to bring the reader up to its walls. Starting, therefore, from Messina we shall find that it, too, has much to say for itself, but very little to show. Its history is a long one, but political and natural convulsions have so disturbed the town that we should have to pick out a stone here and a pillar there to illustrate its long life. It is not at the extreme corner of the island, but some eight miles down, where the wash of the Tyrrhenian Sea, being met by the currents from the south, has hollowed out a bend in the land that resembles a reaping hook, suggesting to its early Sikel inhabitants their name for that instrument, *Zancle*. Refugees from Samos and the Peloponnesus, chiefly Messenians, changed this name on their arrival in the fifth century B. C. for that which we know, and from their advent its authentic history commences and interweaves itself with Grecian, Roman, Carthaginian, Saracen and Norman. Messina is throned against a background of castled rocks and pine-crested hills that wander into the distance, gradually rising in height and grandeur. There is not the spaciousness and scope about it that Palermo, its rival in commerce, presents, and the mountains press upon one from all sides save that of the sea. Modern commercial activity is not an attractive element in the beauty of a place, and the visitor after seeing the Cathedral will probably seek attractions beyond the limits of the town and revel in the lovely scenery that is afforded from its highlands. We may aspire to the extensive ranges of view afforded from the Rocca Guelfonia, again to find wild, conical, pine-topped mountains around us. In the private grounds of its villa are the remains of Matagrifone, the stronghold of the Norman Roger as previously it was of the Mamertine mercenaries of the Syracusan Agathocles; or upon the hill between Fort Gonzaga and the town we may stand upon the very camp of Hiero II. Indeed, from numerous points we may luxuriate in wondrous landscapes where the colors of the sea and the wild billowy range of the Calabrian Mountains across the water are thrillingly exquisite. The most readily attainable point of vantage, however, will be the terrace before the church and convent of San Gregorio, a spot well worth more difficulties than the tiers of steps and the intricacy of the narrow streets that we thread to take us there. Beneath lie the roofs of the town, beyond stretch the blue straits, with the Faro Point eight miles away north, the ancient Pelorus and the site of the famous Charybdis whirlpool. Two miles separate this from the granite crag of Scylla, standing off from the Italian mainland, behind which, spread out before our eyes, rise the Calabrian heights with the Piani d'Aspromonte. Straggling down the mountain sides or seated on the sea are pretty white villages or towns, the whole picture presenting a scene of great natural beauty and peaceful homely life. Turning southward we see Reggio, to which St. Paul came on his way from Syracuse, and up this strait we may recall how the "Castor and Pollux" bore the Apostle on his voyage to Rome. We may spend hours gazing over the fair prospect, varying with every change of light and most fascinating, whether we come when it is bathed in the amethystine hues of evening or when touched by the magic beams of the rising sun. At the back of Messina the hillsides are covered with vineyards producing the famous Mamertine wine. Olive orchards and orange groves abound, cactus, myrtle and arbutus cover the hilltops, and among the valleys many an old Norman convent still nestles with cypress and pine rising from within its walls. We shall not look down upon the town without recalling that it was here the Lion-hearted Richard spent the winter en route to the Holy Land in 1189, he and Philip Augustus of France fretting at each other's presence, and that within the walls of its recently completed Cathedral the former married Berengaria of Navarre, who came hither chaperoned by the wicked Queen Eleanor, his mother. Nor should we forget that it is at Messina that the whole of Shakespeare's scenes in "Much Ado About Nothing" are placed, and if we could locate the house and garden of Leonato, with its "thick pleached alley in mine orchard," probably of orange trees from Seville (on which the pun "civil as an orange" was based) we might easily picture the story immortalized by the English writer. Every one visiting Messina will want to see Charybdis, and drive to the Faro Point with that purpose. There is a severe eddy just outside the present harbor of the town, which some would have to be the circular current of which the ancients were so fearful, and which from its motion is called the Garafano or carnation, but it does not satisfy the proverbial saying, "*Incidis in Scyllam cupiens vitare Charybdin.*" That off the Faro Point is certainly opposite to the rock, but its violence is now less marked than the one at the harbor mouth; still only lately a French pilgrim ship for the Holy Land was caught in it and sent ashore on the reefs, and scientific mariners have testified to its dangers, one recording that he had seen "several men of war and even a seventy-four-gun ship whirled round on its surface." The currents in this part are always severe and they are intensified by wind and volcanic disturbance, for since this coast is at the line of contact of the primary and secondary geological formations, it is upon the line of cleavage where the force of Ætna and Vesuvius are most felt; steam navigation, however, has become so perfect in our day that it renders most of these old perils harmless. Scylla remains the dangerous rock into which Circe changed the fair maid who had dared to be more charming to Glaucus than herself. The virgin's head and breasts, with the wolf's body and the dolphin's tail, are not apparent now to our prosaic eyes as they were in the childhood of the world, but the baying of the voracious and ravenous mastiffs within the caverns around her may still be heard as the hollows echo with the resounding waves. There is a remarkable natural phenomenon to be seen in these straits that few, however, are privileged to witness, for it occurs but seldom, and only at high tide at sunrise in hot and calm weather. It is known as the Fata Morgana, and is a kind of mirage wherein the Sicilian mariner sees pictured the erect or inverted towns, castles, palaces and ships of the neighboring coasts. A very similar thing occurs at rare intervals on the coasts of Antrim and Donegal in Ireland, especially near the entrance to Lough Foyle.

But we must hasten on, for Messina is, as it were, but the gate of Paradise, and only the beginning of a coast drive southwards that exceeds all others with which we already are acquainted. If we go by the train we shall have to burrow fourteen times into the mountains during the succeeding thirty miles before we arrive at Toarmina, our next point of vantage. The scenery increases in romantic beauty as we advance; on one side we have rocky islets set amid opalesque waters, deepening into sapphire blue and bounded in the distance across the straits by the Calabrian Mountains; on the other, picturesque crags and castle-topped heights succeed one another in riotous profusion, and one wishes to stop at a dozen spots to let their extreme loveliness sink into the memory. In the railway it is difficult to know on which side to turn, both land and sea present such ravishing aspects. Inland broad watercourses down which the winter torrents rush are now, in May, dry and stony, and are being traversed by oxen-carts. They lead up into deep ravines in the mountains, with sides broken and rugged, but green with citrons and pomegranates whose fragrance fills the air. The Norman-looking castles of the Ruffo family, princes of Scaletta, and of the Alcontres, lords of Nizza, stand forth upon their rocky peaks; from many an overhanging crag hang masses of jessamine, in every rock and cranny spring blue and white lupins, marigolds and sea-pinks, while the constant variety of color of both sea and land brings an element into one's northern nature little realized in its intensity before. At the upper end of one of the many small bays that fret this coast rises the rocky throne of Taormina, and at its southern projection, now known as Cape Schiso, is the site of ancient Naxos, the scene of the first colony of Greeks in Sicily. Naxos is but the Doric for Nesos, an island, for to this outlying headland the strangers brought the name of their own Peloponnesian home. What Ebbsfleet was to England, that Naxos was to Sicily, as Freeman remarks, for from it, as from the Kentish strand, began the making of two peoples, giving to both islands their truest life and main history. The learned professor has lovingly traced out some of the remains of the ancient settlement, but for 2,300 years it has lain desolate; lemon plantations cover its site, and there is not much more to be seen than at Ebbsfleet itself. Imagination has to restore the scene, and fancy has to picture Theocles in B. C. 735 with his followers coming across this sunlit sea towards the point that stretches forth as if to welcome the strangers from the East. In the light feluccas still used in the Mediterranean, in the egg-shaped caps and the loose surtout, with hood, of the sailors and fishing-folk, we may see much the same appearance probably as that presented by the early pioneers from Chalcis in Eubœa as they plied their oars towards Sicily. Here they set up the altar of Apollo Archagetes, and although there came in later times colonists to many another spot from different and often antagonistic cities, yet all recognized in this first planted shrine the centre of their national unity. Upon the destruction of the low standing Naxos by Dionysius of Syracuse in B. C. 403, a new town was begun on the northern side of the bay, upon the breaking cliff of Toarmina. High above this again, nearly 1,000 feet above the sea, was placed its acropolis, now marked by a ruined castle; ridge after ridge mounts first 700 feet higher to the hill of Mola, with an even still loftier background of stupendous and precipitous mountains that soar nearly 3,000 feet in air. Amid so much height and depth it might be thought that Taormina seemed a pigmy, yet it stands so clear that it affords from many points some of the grandest views in the world, and to those who have traveled much its prospect remains among scenes ineradicable in the memory. You may walk around the upper circle of its ruined theatre, truly the seats of the gods in a double sense; beneath you at one point in sheer descent of 400 feet is the immense expanse of the murmuring Ionian Sea; your eye looks down like that of an eagle in its flight along a coast stretching away by many a pretty headland and curving back as far north as Reggio and the shadowy mountains of Southern Italy, while Messina is just hidden by a projection of the coast line; through the broken arches of the scena you may watch the sparkle of the amethystine sea, and above the royal entrance in the centre Ætna rises, with its ice fields gleaming in the sunlight and piercing a turquoise sky with its silver peak; this alone is restless amid such a scene of enchanting peace and reposeful beauty that no words can convey its ravishment or painting tell its charm. Along the coast southward you may let your eyes wander to the dome that covers the body of the fair child St. Agatha at Catania, the clear air rendering it nearer than it is in reality, and further on you gaze over a coast where cities once stood bright with Greek life, until Syracuse in the distance arrests the interest from striving to travel further. We had the good fortune to be at Taormina when all visitors were gone; no worrying guardians, beggars or touts dogged our steps and the quiet life of the town was undisturbed. The beauty of the spot was penetrating in its intensity, and one could not but think that the effect of living in such scenes must have influenced the thought of such a highly-strung, simple people as were the ancient Greeks. Life here might be like that in Eden, for earth seemed full of heaven and sin alone a discord in its harmony. Newman felt this in his visit in 1833, and wrote to his sister: "I never knew that nature could be so beautiful, and to see that view was the nearest approach to seeing Eden. O happy I! It was worth coming all the way, to endure sadness, loneliness, weariness to see it. I felt for the first time in my life that I should be a better and more religious man if I lived there. This superb view, the most wonderful I can ever see, is but one of at least half a dozen, all beautiful, close at hand." It was in the Bay of Catania during a rough, unpleasant night journey that he wrote the lines that bear the title "Tauromenium" in the Lyra Apostolica, which are wanting in "ease and spirit," as he says, from the circumstances under which they were composed:

> " Say, hast thou tracked the traveler's round
> Nor visions met thee there,
> Thou could'st but marvel to have found
> This benighted world so fair?
> And feel an awe within thee rise
> That sinful man should see
> Glories far worthier seraph's eyes
> Than to be shared by thee?
> Store them in heart! Thou shalt not faint
> 'Mid coming pains and fears,
> As the third heaven once nerved a saint
> For fourteen trial years."

Toarmina is a place at which to stay for a long time if the traveler be desirous of restful beauty and comfort: it is an ideal spot for any one having reading or writing to do, or for convalescence from illness or worry. Its Græco-Roman theatre is the most interesting in the island, the Romanesque and Gothic remains in its silent street are attractive, walks up to the hill of Mola and climbs to Monte Venere are fascinating, and whether from the windows and balconies of the hotels or from every open space without, we can saturate our æsthetic senses in sweetly scented air, brilliant sunshine, varied color and dreamy landscapes. Both here and on our way South Ætna becomes an all-absorbing source of study; solemn and alone it towers above the great masses of mountain that surround it, "the pillar of heaven, the nurse of sharp eternal snow," as Pindar said. To those who have come from Naples with minds full of Vesuvius, it is like a giant to a dwarf. Vesuvius is little more than the height of one of these attendant mountains that stand at the foot of this monarch's throne. Mount Venerella itself is 2,900 feet, while

Ætna is nearly 11,000 feet, and is not only the loftiest volcano in Europe, but the loftiest mountain in Sicily and Italy. It is true that Vesuvius in comparison is but a modern volcano, its first recorded eruption being in A. D. 79, when Herculaneum, Pompeii and Stabiæ, etc., were destroyed, whereas the first authenticated outbreak of Ætna was in the days of Pythagoras in the sixth century B. C. Homer mentions it, but without reference to its fiery nature, and therefore it is possible it was then quiescent. Virgil, whose description of the Calabrian coast is singularly accurate, makes the Trojans see Ætna after leaving the Gulf of Tarentum, which indicates that its height then was much the same as now. Æschylus and Pindar were both at the court of Hiero of Syracuse a few years after an eruption and were powerfully impressed by it; the "rivers of fire devouring with their fierce jaws the smooth fields of fertile Sicily" as sung by the former is still a true description of its lava streams. Dominating the island without dispute, this terrible lord inspires awe from the helplessness of man to combat its forces of destruction and from the mystery that envelops its action; and it is still a potent factor in forming the peasant's mind of to-day as in earlier times. It is not locally known by the name of Ætna, but by that which we find in Dante of Mongibello. Its cone, high in air and glittering in the sun, looks like a diamond set in sapphire, and this is no poetic exaggeration of its aspect; the breath of the palpitating giants in its bosom, constantly being emitted in puffs of steam, warn the beholder of the peril that lies beneath its beauty; its awful presence both attracts and frightens, while its sublimity is made more fascinating by its incomprehensibility. From that snowy crest the goatherd on its sides has seen to flow the fiery torrent that burnt up the rich fertility upon the mountain's bosom, and with earth trembling beneath him and air resounding with the sharp crackle of appalling thunder the terrified peasant has appealed more confidently to the God of nature than to any earthly means of protection; as flame follows flame in leaping sheets of terror, and the shower of red-hot stones and lava fall about him, it is the prayers of the pure child St. Agatha that he asks to stay the devouring flood from his homestead and to be his covert in the storm. With such an abiding source of dread and yet of attractiveness it is no wonder that the people give ready ears to tales of marvel and romance, and it must always have been so. The Greek had the singularly wise habit of combining the gods and heroes of other religious systems with those in his own Pantheon, and he very probably applied this principle to the local traditions he found existing in Sicily. The cycle of legends identifying the Cyclops and Polyphemus with Ætna is not unlikely to be a continuation of the old nature worship of the Sikel modified under Greek influence. Polyphemus and his one eye may be the embodiment of the volcano and its one outlet, his roars its rumbling earthquakes, his heavy footfalls the tremblings of the mountain and the crushing storm of hurled rocks and thunderbolts the work of his heavy hand. Or else it was regarded as the throne of almighty Zeus, and then it is Enceladus or Typhoeus whom the god has placed beneath his seat, and when these rebel giants turn from side to side the earth quakes, while their breath and cries are the smoke and noise. We shall find the same principle possibly true at many other spots, for the Dorian kept alive the awe of natural phenomena and the magic of rivers by this personification; made the little stream of Acis and the seaside pools tell of the Nereid Galatea and the love of the shepherd boy, just as the waters of Anapus and the fount of Arethusa at Syracuse repeat a similar tale. This allegorizing of the joy of waters and the making of each rivulet and fountain the source of graceful legend has a peculiar charm to the mind and introduced a poetry into life for whose loss we should all be the poorer. Modern music and song have given fresh life to the legend of Acis and Galatea, and along this eastern coast we shall find the names often recalled. Aci reale, Aci Trezza, Aci Castello and five or more other villages retain the name; the "sacred water" of Ovid's "herbifer Acis," formed of the blood of the fond youth slain by the cannibal giant of Odyssey, is identified with many an Ætna-born stream. Making its way out of a volcanic katabothron, it might well seem to flow from beneath a rock hurled by the hand of the parent of many an ogre in fairy tale; the Acqua grande or Fiume freddo rushes terrified to the sea as if from its power, while beneath the base of Aci reale, triumphant above the seven streams of lava that surround it, the fleeting stream hurries to sport with Galatea on the shore. She, too, has become a weeping fountain, and "with ever murmuring sighs and tears and watery spray" bewails her murdered swain. At Aci Castello we see off the pretty coast more embodied legend, for there rise seven huge masses of basalt and limestone, the Scogli dei Cyclopi or Faraglioni, being the rocks heaved by the blinded Polyphemus at Ulysses as he put to sea; the first flat rock near the beach, Isola d'Aci, contains a Grotta dei Cyclopi, but not the cheerful cave of Homer's description or where wearied Trojans took refuge. It is not Homer or Virgil, however, that is the companion to the student in the island, nor is it even Thucydides, Polybius or Cicero that we require just here, but rather Theocritus, the native born, who has left us such a magnificent monument of Sicilian genius in the sphere of idyl and pastoral poetry. With delicate grace he faithfully describes the landscape and life of this eastern shore, and the freshness and modernness of his "little pictures" must be felt by all who read him amid these scenes. Who can see a shepherd on these mountain sides tending his goats, idly watching them as he plays his pastoral pipe or talks with some sun-burnt maid without putting into his mouth the words of the first Idyll: "Thyrsis of Ætna am I and this is the voice of Thyrsis. Where, ah! where, were ye when the voice of Daphne was languishing? ye nymphs, where were ye? By Peneus' beautiful dells or by the dells of Pindus? For surely ye dwelt not by the great stream of the river Anapus, nor on the watch-tower of Ætna, nor by the sacred waters of Acis." How redolent, too, of scenes here, although it be drawn of Southern Italy, are the fourth and fifth Idylls; the cattle straying among the young olive shoots, the driving of them higher up the mountain's broken side for grazing, and the goat running after the cytizus in the tenth. The song of the obdurate Amaryllis telling of the pinewoods on the slopes of Ætna, the old fisherman Œpis looking seaward for the tunny shoals from some vantage spot on its sides, the love charm of Simætha, are all graphically true to-day of life on this sunny shore. Often in the hot and dusty city life of Alexandria, whither he went, must the poet have longed for the "chill water that deep-wooded Ætna sends down from the white snow's midst," and been wistful of the rocks of Polyphemus and Acis flowing to a summer sea. He sings, too, of the love affairs of Aratus, to whom St. Paul refers as a witness to man's instinctive consent to the doctrine of the universal fatherhood of God, an author perhaps recalled to the Apostle's mind when he visited Syracuse three centuries later. It is in these pastoral songs that Theocritus shows his heart more than in the epics he penned to please Ptolemy Philadelphus, and the rural people and life of his Sicilian land are the fragrance of his canticles. Nor can we here forget another native poet, Bion, the "Dorian Orpheus" as Moschus terms him, who bids him, even in Tartarus, "Sing to the maiden (Persephone) some strains of Sicily, sing some sweet pastoral lay. She, too, is Sicilian and on the shores of Ætna she was wont to play and she knew the Dorian strain."

The peace, beauty and sunny radiance of this coast and neighborhood seem to naturally prompt to lyric verse and pastoral idyll; it would seem no surprise to see the Nereids dancing upon its shores or to meet Pan wandering in its uplands. The thick woods of oak and pine are now few, but the banks of thyme and aromatic herbage remain. The sides of the mountain are overhung with masses of scarlet geranium, Palma Christi and yellow appled solanums. The joy of living is vividly felt and the heart finds its outlet in song and the body its harmony in a rhythm of motion. The city of this Ætna district is Catania, now the second in population in the island, and whose pride lies in its views of the mighty lord to whom, however, it owes the obliteration of all that would have rendered it of value to the classical student. Nor in our opinion does it present the best view of the mountain, for we think that obtained from the ancient Sicelian town of Centuripa, on the southwestern side of Ætna, to be the finer; and this, too, is also one of the most remarkably situated towns, being placed 2,300 feet above the valley of the ancient stream Simeto, upon an abruptly rising hill, which the learned tell us stood untold ages before there was any Ætna to overtop it! Still the view from Catania is superb, and the traveler will be sure to make a short stay there. Although only five years younger than the earliest settlement of Greeks at Naxos, the remains of its antiquity are buried deep beneath the floods of lava that have swept over it. Here lived the eccentric law-giver, Charondas, who made in those early days a statute which it would be well to see enforced in all Southern countries to-day. No one was allowed to carry weapons or knives in the city, and only without its walls were they permitted for defense against the brigands of even those times, as Diodorus tells us. Charondas offered an example of rigid obedience to the rule he had made by the sacrifice of his own life, for on some occasion, when returning from the country and being attacked by a tumultuous assembly as he entered the city, the mob espied his weapons upon him and cried out: "See, this maker of laws is a breaker of them." Charondas did not deign to defend himself, but replied: "No, by Jove; I die to maintain them," and then stabbed himself before them.

We shall seek for the tomb of the Sicilian Homer, Stesichorus, the blind singer of Trojan and classic legends, the perfecter of the chorus of the Greek drama, the lyric poet celebrated by Aristeides and Cicero, and of whose twenty-six books not three consecutive lines remain to us. He was buried near one of the ancient gates of the city, and maybe now beneath the Piazza Stesicoro. You have to descend eight flights of stairs excavated out of the lava to see the theatre where he ruled, and from whose stage Alcibiades in B. C. 415 harangued the fathers of the city when endeavoring to win their alliance with Athens against Syracuse. Upon its once marble-lined seats sat Licias and Lamachus as the honied tongue of their orator was soothing Catanian suspicions. While the city fathers become lulled by the charm of his words, the Athenian fleet in the bay is not idle, but is demolishing a little gate, "which undertaking being completed," says Thucydides, "Alcibiades ends his oration and the Athenian fleet finds at Catania a proper anchorage for ships and men in the war against Syracuse." But one cannot enjoy a theatre by the light of a candle! nor find inspiration in a cellar to reflect upon the momentous results that followed the scenes it has witnessed. We might, too, recall the boy-harper Kalliches and many other historic names in connection with Catania, even down to the musician Bellini of our own time, for the city has been adorned with many celebrities and is still the literary and scientific centre of the island. We cannot pass by "la chiarissima," however, without a reverential visit to the tomb of the sweet child St. Agatha, whose tender purity did not stay the torturing hand of the Roman prætor Quintianus, and amid her cries of "Take me, oh Lord, for I am thine," her Maker received again the pure soul He had given. The Norman Roger I. built part of the Cathedral that now covers her shrine, and it is grateful to find here a tribute from the English King most beloved by children, the Lion-hearted Richard, who on his way to the Holy Land placed upon her statue the golden crown that it still wears.

The beautiful bay of Catania is more attractive than the city; across its sun-steeped waters, clear as chrysoprase, you see the headland that hides the great city of Syracuse, which draws one to it as the magnet does iron. Upon its now peaceful stretch of water that seems only to invite repose, Sicilian-Greek and Athenian, Roman and Carthaginian have had many a noble engagement—perhaps none more thrilling and picturesque than that in B. C. 396, when the fleet of Magon the Carthaginian here fought that of Leptius, in the battle of the Cyclopean Isles. Ætna was in full eruption; overhead hung its clouds of smoke; the shower of its ashes fell among the deadly combatants; the lava from its sides blocked with its fiery stream the advance of the Punic land forces! What a scene of human and natural agony for a painter's brush to portray!

After Catania the railroad runs inland, as if rejoicing to get free from the pressure of the mountains toward the sea, and we are borne across the ancient Laestrygonian fields, still, as of old, productive of the means of both food and clothing for the inhabitants, for both cotton and wheat grow here luxuriantly. The old stream of the Simæthus, now weary and shrunken to a rivulet, but formerly one of Sicily's most important rivers, marks the boundary of the men of Catania and those of Leontini; and then after leaving on our right the malarious Herculean Lake, the largest sheet of water in the island, we come to the town of Leontini, the troublesome neighbor of Syracuse and one of the earliest Greek colonies. It was colonized from Naxos at the same time as Catania, and its history is singularly typical of the restless, volcanic temperament of these early communities—first an oligarchy, then a democracy, next a tyranny, said to have been the first ever established in the island; then came submissions to Syracuse, followed by rebellions against it. Indeed, to it may be attributed all the trouble caused by the Athenian invasion; as to Selinus in the West may be laid that brought by the Carthaginian, for in it was born Gorgias, who exercised so strange an influence over the Athenian mind and who induced that people to interfere with the affairs of Sicily. He was the tutor of Alcibiades, whom we have tried to recall in the theatre of Catania, and from this Leontinian-born orator and sophist we derive in unbroken lineage the political and forensic eloquence of to-day. He may be styled the Father of Rhetoric, and his style comes down to us through Isocrates, one of his most ardent imitators, upon whom was modeled the Latin form of oration that gives the strength and delicacy to modern metrical prose.

From Leontini the train again seeks the sea, following the valley of the ancient Terias, and from the lofty cliffs above Augusta we looked across the Bay of Megara to "Syracuse la fidele." Once along this curving beach clustering towns were seen, which now have practically disappeared, while inland is the source of the famous honey of Hybla, a term embodied in proverb. The name is vaguely given to the district more than to one spot, yet Melilli stands as the "*florida quam multas Hybla tuetur apes*" (Ovid Trist., v. 6, 38, etc.) The purple hillsides, covered with thyme and wild flowers, are still beloved by the bees and their produce still deserves the poet's song, yet the fruitful fields, the historic legend of the land and its sunlit mountains is a memory "Far sweeter to me than the honey of Hybla" (Ecl. vii., 37.) Into the Bay of Megara stretches the low-lying peninsula of Magnisi, the more familiar Thapsus, and here we come within the circuit of that wonderful city whose story has thrilled the reader of Thucydides. Now we take his graphic history in one hand as our guide-book; grounding the curved waters of Trogilus we pass beneath the Dionysian town wall of the Acradina and find ourselves at the island home of Ortygia, with many a delightful day's search before us.

ALFRED E. P. RAYMUND DOWLING.

London, England.

AN ESSAY IN PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY.

JUST forty years ago Gustav Theodore Fechner published in German a book with the title "Psychophysik." Fechner defined psychophysics as the science whose object was to furnish "an exact theory of the relation between spirit and body and in a general way between the physical and the psychical worlds." The book was mainly occupied with the revival and development of some ideas advanced by Ernst Weber, a fellow-countryman of Fechner's, who, nearly a quarter of a century before, had made a series of observations on comparative sensations and the stimuli necessary to produce them, and from these experiments had deduced a law. This law, called by Fechner Weber's law, has been stated by Professor Wundt, of Leipzig, as follows: "The increase of the stimulus necessary to produce an increase of the sensation bears a constant ratio to the total stimulus." If to a weight of one pound held in the hand an addition of an ounce be made, the difference will be perceived; but if to a weight of ten pounds an ounce be added, the addition will fail of perception. Not a certain unchanging addition is perceived, but an amount ever larger as the original weight is greater must be added before perception is possible. The same law holds true for other senses besides the sense of touch and the muscular sense involved in the experiment just quoted.

Fechner's observations seemed to verify Weber's law. We now know that this so-called law is only approximately correct. So many conditions modify our sensations that the exceptions to the law are quite as numerous as the examples of its fulfilment. Fechner attempted to give a mathematical expression to the law, but his psychophysic formula, as he called it, met with criticism from the beginning, and now has scarcely any defenders. His book was, however, destined to become a classic because of the methods of investigation as to stimuli and sensation that it outlined. Fechner was a typically patient German investigator, and is said himself to have made and tabulated no less than 24,576 separate judgments in testing Weber's law for weights by the so-called "method of true and false cases." The methods thus employed have laid the foundation for modern experimental psychology.

Fechner's book is famous for another reason, however. In it for the first time occurs the term "physiological psychology," the science of mind as far as it can be studied in the physical basis of the intellectual acts. Ten years later Wundt, of Leipzig, published a book, with the title physiological psychology, which treats of the relation of brain function to psychic activities. Shortly after he opened his laboratory of physiological psychology at the University of Leipzig. Since then the science has continued to attract more and more attention from year to year. Its cultivation has been taken up by all the great universities, and its study has to a large extent displaced metaphysical psychology.

Experimental psychology, which owes its present popularity to the stimulus of Fechner's book, is still inchoate and not out of its developmental period. The significance of the results obtained by observation and experiment is not yet agreed upon even by the experimental psychologists themselves. The investigations so far carried out are rather suggestive than conclusive, and do not form a coördinate body of scientific truth. Physiological psychology, however, inasmuch as it studies the physical basis of mental operations, has accumulated a certain number of interesting facts that may be discussed. As will be evident during the course of this article, it is as yet in an extremely unsettled stage, but the importance of the material it has at command makes even the glimmerings of great truths that are to be seen here and there amid the obscurities of the science a source of general interest.

As with all new sciences, exaggerated claims have been made for physiological psychology and its applications to mental problems. It would seem as though the experience gained when geology and chemistry and biology were in their developmental period might have enabled modern thinkers to discount these exaggerated claims and make them realize that the promissory notes of a nascent science are never to be taken at their full face value. Psychology generally, under the stimulus of the newer methods that have been introduced into the science, has shown a tendency to exaggerate its importance. Professor Münsterberg, in his essay on "Psychology and Education," says: "The good appetite of psychology has sometimes become voracity in our days, and she has begun to devour all mental sciences, history and social life, ethics and logic, and, finally, alas! metaphysics; but that is not a development; it is a disease and a misfortune." Certain unfounded pretensions of physiological psychology can only be considered in the same way as a misfortune. To quote Münsterberg again, (physiological) "psychology would learn too late that an empirical science can be really free and powerful only if it recognize and respect its limits, about which philosophy alone decides." Meantime the attitude of physiological psychology, in its pretense to explain mental operations by physical factors alone, has made it an object of suspicion to many minds, to whom the truths of the new science would be welcome if they came in their simplicity.

Not all of the suspicion that attaches to physiological psychology is due to progressive physiological psychologists. The science is of such fundamental interest that there have been many dabblers in it who can scarcely be considered authoritative representatives of its principles. Scientists whose reputations have been made in other lines of investigation have sometimes been tempted into the expression of opinions with regard to physiological psychology that the psychologists themselves would have been the first to impugn.

A very striking example of this occurs in a recent book that has attracted a great deal of popular attention, Alfred Russell Wallace's "The Wonderful Century; Its Successes and Failures." Mr. Wallace's position in the scientific world as one of the great original evolutionists, assures for him a respectful hearing on any scientific subject. His last book would seem especially to deserve our reverential consideration, since it is, as it were, a great man's testament to his generation, his last word on the great scientific questions of the end of the century. It contains many striking passages of sterling appreciation of the scientific advances of the century and some very judicious pricking of its scientific shams, but it holds besides a most valuable lesson. That is that no man can hope to keep pace with modern science in its advance along all lines, and that even a really great scientist, when expressing opinions on subjects beyond his own special field of study, may fall into most egregious blunders.

Mr. Wallace's contribution to physiological psychology comes as a comment on phrenology. "In the coming century," he says, "phrenology will assuredly attain general acceptance. It will prove itself to be the true science of the mind. Its practical uses in education, in self-discipline, in the reformatory treatment of criminals and in the remedial treatment of the insane will give it one of the highest places in the hierarchy of the sciences. Its persistent neglect during these last fifty years will be referred to as an example of the almost incredible narrowness and prejudice that prevailed among men of science, at the very time when they were making such splendid advances in other fields of thought and discovery."[1]

---

[1] Mr. Wallace's opinion of vaccination in the same book is expressed with like force and directness. Because of the light it throws on his opinion of phrenology it seems to deserve

Needless to say, Mr. Wallace stands absolutely alone among serious men of science in holding such an opinion with regard to phrenology. His position would be especially condemned, if they deemed it worth their notice, by those who have devoted any serious attention to the study of physiological psychology. The opinion is mainly interesting, as I have said, because it illustrates the utter nonsense that may be talked by a really great man of science when he wanders even but a little from his special subject. Claims almost as absurd as Mr. Wallace's for phrenology have been seriously made for certain advances in physiological psychology, but fortunately the day of such shortsighted enthusiasm is gone by.

THE BRAIN AS THE ORGAN OF MIND.

Mr. Wallace's end of the century prophecy of the revival of phrenology is interesting from another point of view. It was the discussion over phrenology that, at the beginning of the present century, first called attention to the fact that the brain was the special organ of the mind, and as such deserved more attention from those interested in mental operations than had been given to it previously. We are apt to consider phrenology now as the catchpenny of the charlatan, and to forget that Dr. François Gall, its inventor, was a reputable physician, an intelligent and sensible individual, who seems to have been thoroughly sincere in his claims for the new science. He had long been a careful student of mental states and of men, and this system was taken with eminent seriousness by most of the savants of his day. The subject was brought before the French Academy of Sciences in a lengthy paper by Gall himself. Phrenology was rightly condemned, yet it has continued to influence the popular mind ever since.

Spurzheim introduced phrenology into England and America, and the system gained many advocates all over the world. The discussion it provoked and the popular interest it aroused had an influence absolutely unforeseen by either its upholders or opponents. As Dr. Henry Smith Williams said in a recent article in "Harper's Magazine:" "It popularized the conception that the brain is the organ of mind." This idea has remained dominant in the popular

---

quotation : "It (vaccination) will undoubtedly rank as the greatest and most pernicious failure of the century. It will be one of the inexplicable wonders for future generations that the delusion as to vaccination should have prevailed among men of science when progress in medicine was at its acme at the close of a wonderful century of scientific discovery." Comment on this opinion is unnecessary. The reputable medical profession of the world is practically a unit in considering vaccination the greatest blessing medicine has conferred upon mankind.

fancy ever since. It has been responsible for a good deal of the initiative that has led to the successful investigation of the relations of brain and mind later in the century. The story of the progress of the discovery as far as regards these relations constitutes the history of the modern science of physiological psychology, *i. e.*, the organized system of knowledge which studies mental operations in as far as they depend on the nature and function of the brain.

The first important observation in this subject was one of fundamental character made by Desmoulins. He pointed out that the brains of old people were of less average weight than those of mature adults. This is the result of the senile change that affects all the tissues of the body and causes them to be less succulent than at maturity. Desmoulins implied that this organic brain change was the cause of the characteristic slowness of mental operations in the elderly and the reason for their lack of initiative. His observations were embodied in a paper which was read before the French Academy. The Academy was, of course, composed of men well on in years. It is not to be supposed that they listened with equanimity to the young enthusiast who would lessen the reverence for age, and at the same time rob it of its dignity, by making its proverbial conservatism and slow deliberateness not a very commendable virtue, but only a necessary result of atrophic changes in brain tissues due to the progress of senility. Aristotle, we believe, said that man was in his physical prime at the age of thirty-five, and in his mental prime at forty-nine. A mediæval commentator on the passage says that recent graduates from the universities always considered this last figure entirely too old, while the old professors thought that Aristotle had put the acme of mental capacity in comparative juvenility. However that may be, the members of the French Academy waxed wroth at the impertinence of the young Desmoulins, and rather peremptorily refused to hear any further communications from him on this subject.

Desmoulins' observations were the first to connect definitely changes in the brain with modifications of the mentality. Since then we have learned how much the condition of the brain, its nutrition, the variations of pressure and of blood supply and the like have to do with changes in the mental activity. On the other hand, the conclusions drawn from Desmoulins' observations and from those of others who followed him have proved a source of not a little misunderstanding. Too much value has been attached to the notion that a definite connection existed between the general condition of the brain and the vigor and accuracy of the mental activities. The conclusion has especially gained wide acceptance that there was a certain ratio between the size of the brain and the quality of the mental faculties. This is, of course, very far from the truth. The animals that are cleverest are by no means always the ones with the largest comparative brain weights. Among men, while brain weight often seems to bear a direct proportion to intellectual capacity, there are so many exceptions to the rule that it can scarcely be called a rule at all. It is not even true that man possesses the greatest brain weight, proportionate to his bodily weight, of all the animals. He is surpassed in this respect by some of the song birds and by the smaller apes. As a rule brain weight increases in proportion to body weight. This is true also among the animals; the elephant and the whale have the absolutely heaviest brains. In man the brain bears a much more direct and unfailing ratio to the size of the body than it does to the degree of intelligence of the individual. It is true that idiots have very light brains and that great scientists and thinkers have commonly the largest brains. All that can be said in general is that among the intelligent classes the brain weight is relatively higher than among the uncultured. The heaviest brain on record, however, is that of Rustan, an uncultivated Scandinavian peasant of rather meagre intelligence. The next heaviest is that of a moderately intelligent man of the better class, while the third is that of Tourgenieff, the Russian novelist, a great thinker, it is true, but still scarcely the man who would be picked out to head the list of supreme intelligences. On the other hand, the brains of some very intellectual men have been comparatively light. A well-known example is that of Gambetta, the great French politician, whose brain weighed only 1,100 grammes, though the average man's brain weight is about 1,300 grammes, and brains that weigh 1,000 grammes are found only among idiots. As some compensation for its lightness it was noted that the brain of Gambetta, who owed his political influence to his power as an orator, was especially well developed in that part of the brain which is known to be intimately connected with the faculty of speech.

BRAIN LOCALIZATION.

The most important contributions to physiological psychology have come from observations which demonstrate that special parts of the brain rule over particular functions. Gall's system of phrenology had set men thinking along this line in the early part of the century, but it was not until more than half the century was past that any definite scientific progress was made. Flourens working at the Jardin des Plantes in Paris in the early '40's made a notable discovery. He undertook a series of experiments to prove scientifically that phrenology, the controversy over which had broken out again, was without foundation in nature. He was led into a series of discoveries which have deserved for him the name of father of brain physiology. His most interesting observation was that there was in the *medulla oblongata*, the bulb as it is sometimes called in English, a very sharply defined area, the slightest touch of which causes death. The *medulla oblongata* is the upper extended portion of the spinal cord, where cord and brain are united. This small point, the slightest injury to which caused death, Flourens called the *nœud vital*—the vital knot. It was thought for a time that all vital activity was concentrated here, and it was called the life centre. We know now that this important area contains the origin of the nerves leading to the heart. It is the interference with the function of these nerves and the consequent stoppage of the heart and not any fancied touching of the ultimate point of union of soul and body that causes the fatal termination.

The discovery of other such localized centres of special activity in the nerve tissue of brain and cord followed before long. In the '50's Claude Bernard demonstrated that there was a point on the floor of the fourth ventricle which, when injured, caused the appearance of sugar in the urine of animals. This we now know to be the site of origin of certain nerves that regulate the circulation of the liver. Flourens' work seemed to show, however, that there was no localization of intellectual functions, or at least of the higher functions of animals. Whatever activities were exercised by the cerebrum seemed to be accomplished by the whole of the organ, and not by distinct portions of it. The contradiction of this conclusion came from the observations of Paul Broca, a French surgeon.

In 1861 Broca presented to the Academy of Medicine of Paris his account of a case in which the main symptom of the brain lesion was an inability to speak because the patient had been deprived of his memory for words or of his power to coördinate the motions necessary to produce them. This particular condition, aphasia, as it is called, that is, loss of the power to speak, had been noticed before as a solitary symptom in a certain number of cases, in which it was more than suspected that its cause was some lesion of the brain. After being twenty years under observation Broca's patient died, and at autopsy proved to have an obliteration of the posterior portion of the third frontal lobe on the left side. Broca considered that this pointed to a localization of the memory for words and of the coördinate motions necessary to produce them in this part of the brain. It may seem rash in the distinguished surgeon to have drawn a conclusion so important and so seemingly contradictory not only of experience, but also of the generally accepted views as to brain function, from a single case. As a matter of fact, however, there were other cases in medical literature in which it had been suspected and one or two in which it was explicitly stated that a lesion of the frontal lobes might cause aphasia.

No discovery is ever quite so unanticipated as it is sometimes thought to be by succeeding generations. Nearly always it is the culmination of a series of observations each approaching nearer and nearer to the truth. The master mind is needed, however, to get at the essential point on which a new order of thought rests. Broca's announcement aroused a great deal of interest. Within five years the claim he made for a centre for speech in the left third frontal convolution was substantiated by observers in various parts of the world. An injury to this region always caused at least temporary loss of speech. In certain cases the corresponding area of the brain on the other side seemed to be capable of taking up the work of the injured part. After some delay, necessary for the education of the new centre, the faculty of speech was once more acquired.

A very curious fact came out during the investigation of the subject. It was found that while right-handed individuals had their speech centre on the left side of the brain, left-handed people have theirs in the right half. The first bit of knowledge of cerebral localization gained in very early times had been drawn from the fact that a hemorrhage or injury to one side of the brain always caused a paralysis of the opposite side of the body. The right side of the body is, as a rule, more used and consequently is better developed than the left side. It was not surprising, then, to find that it was in the hemisphere of the brain controlling this side of the body that the centre for the intricate and important faculty of speech was localized. The confirmation of this hypothesis furnished by the fact that in left-handed men a lesion which caused loss of speech was practically always on the right side was a most welcome contribution to the subject that seemed to substantiate the whole theory of localization very completely. The first cases of aphasia with a right-sided brain lesion that were reported seemed to militate against the conclusion of a uniformly one-sided speech centre, but the concomitant left-handedness of these cases served to make the new doctrine of localization more triumphant than ever.

There began now a series of interesting experiments that demonstrated the existence in the cortex of the brain of certain more or less sharply defined areas, each one of which seemed to rule over the motions of a particular part of the body. In the early '70's Fritsch and Hitzig applied electrical currents to various parts of the brain cortex, and found that the stimulation thus produced was responded to by movements of certain parts of the opposite side of the body. The conclusion they drew from their observations was that there existed certain brain centres ruling over the motion of various members and parts of the body. Their conclusion was received with almost universal skepticism at first. The subject was taken up for investigation in many places, but only with the effect of completely substantiating Fritsch and Hitzig's results. François Franck in France, Munck and Goltz in Germany and Horsley, Ferrier and Schaeffer in England repeated the experiments of stimulating the brain cortex of animals with various modifications of technique, but with surprisingly uniform results.

Little likely as it seemed to be at first and unacceptable as the doctrine was to all who thought of the brain cortex as of higher moment than merely to act as motor centres for the production of simple muscular contraction, the conclusion seemed inevitable. The cortical area of the brain was mapped out after most minute and repeated observations. The anterior part of the cerebrum, the frontal lobes of the brain lying just behind the forehead, gave absolutely no response to electrical stimulation, and were called the silent convolutions. Immediately behind these convolutions occurs the most prominent fissure of the cerebral cortex. Beginning at a point somewhat behind the middle point of the cerebrum, it runs from the great fissure that divides the cerebrum into two almost equal hemispheres downward and slightly forward, ending anteriorly to the middle of the cerebrum. It thus divides the lateral surface of the hemisphere into two approximately equal parts. Two large and important convolutions lie along this fissure, which used to be called the Rolandic fissure, after Rolando, its discoverer, but which is now generally known as the central fissure. The convolution that lies anteriorly to the central fissure is known as the precentral gyrus, or convolution, the one lying posteriorly being known as the post central gyrus.

Fritsch and Hitzig's experiments showed that in these two central gyri were situated the cortical centres that preside over movements in various parts of the body, that is to say that there were here definite and rather sharply defined areas of gray matter, the stimulation of which caused convulsive movement and the removal of which led to paralysis of various parts of the body. The nervous substance that presided over the movements of facial muscles lies just behind the speech centre in the third frontal convolution in the lower part of the precentral and post central gyri. Above this facial cortical area lies the centre for the arm, and still higher at the vertex of the hemispheres the leg centre.

For a good many years this crude, simple doctrine of motor centres occupying the major part of the brain cortex was the accepted teaching of the schools of neurology and anatomy. That it was absolutely true seemed to be demonstrated by the fact that the diagnosis of the presence of a lesion of the cerebral cortex could be made from the observation of the muscles that were affected. These localizing symptoms as they were called became a most important factor in diagnosis for cerebral surgery. When an injury happened to the head, for instance, though there were no external signs on the skull, the location of the injury to the brain could be often picked out with almost absolute certainty and the surgeon directed where to look for the lesion. Brain tumors were located very exactly by the same method. It was the custom to operate more for epilepsy some years ago than it is now. Experience has shown, unfortunately, that the beneficial effect of such operations is only temporary. The surgeon was always directed in these cases, when operation was decided upon, by the muscles that were especially affected during the epileptic convulsion. The aura of an epileptic attack, that is, the preliminary muscular twitching or peculiar sensation that precedes the attack, usually occurs in the muscle or sense organ, whose cortical cerebral nerve supply is most affected by the lesion that causes the epilepsy. Despite these confirmations by actual dissection and demonstration in the living subject of the doctrine of motor cortical nerve centres, the teaching proved to be very incomplete in the light of later observations.

When portions of the brain cortex were affected it was soon noted, though only in isolated cases at first, that besides motor functions sensation was also disturbed. Gradually more and more careful observations seemed to show that these so-called motor centres were also sensory centres. The impression is now gaining ground that these cortical centres are something far more than merely sensory or motor spheres of function, or even a combination of these. They represent the higher order of nerve centres that rule over all the lower centres. They are the storehouse of the physical effects of the interaction of sensory and motor nerve stimuli which makes the accomplishment of an action easier after its repeated performance. They represent the series of cell changes, chemical and physical, which makes for the facility acquired from habit.

Careful observation in a great many cases has shown that the effect of precisely similar lesions is by no means always the same in different individuals. A lesion of Broca's convolution, the third frontal, does not always produce simple motor aphasia to the same extent. Charcot pointed out that the memory for words differs in different individuals. Some recall words by their sound, to some the mental picture of a word is always the written or printed image of it, while there are those who remember them by the group of motions made for their articulation, and still others by the movements required to write them. These four classes of persons, whom Charcot has called the auditory, visual, articulo motor and grapho motor types, acquire their facility of speech in different ways, and the disturbance of speech is consequently manifested in varying causes. Broca's centre presides especially over articulation, and a lesion here would affect most the articulo motor type of person. Just behind and above Broca's centre in the cerebrum is the centre for the arm, still further back the auditory and visual centres, all of them being more or less closely connected with each other. All of these centres together constitute the speech area, and lesions that affect this part of the brain cortex or the fibres leading from it will affect the faculty of speech in various ways. The extent of the disturbance will depend on the character of the individual's memory for words and the image that is called up by his mind before he reproduces them.

In a word, there are, besides the absence of the simplicity of mechanism at first thought to preside over speech, some positive factors in the reproduction of words that take this important faculty out of the realm of the merely mechanical entirely. There is, besides the cellular factors that preside over the various elements that make speech possible, a definite relation between the cells and the various parts of the brain in which they lie which modifies and regulates the speech faculty, making it not a mechanical action, the same in every individual, but a something special for each person. Fancied simplicity of mechanism has given way to the realization of its great complexity. The obvious suggestion obtrudes itself even from consideration of the physical facts alone that there is a mysterious force behind the mechanism that coördinates its various parts and, while preserving the individuality, yet gives a series of results in the communication of ideas to others that seem to be exactly the same as those exhibited by every other human being, yet are eminently personal.

As to the localization of the higher intellectual faculties, at one time considered to be definitely settled, recent observations serve to show that these are something entirely apart from cortical areas or cerebral centres. The frontal lobes of the brain, the silent convolutions, for the added reason that injury to them as a rule sets up no symptoms that can lead to the location of the lesion, were claimed by eminent authorities to be the seat of the intellectual faculties. The idea received such wide diffusion that it is still referred to in popular discussions of mental physiology as if it were an acquired fact. It is one of those bits of popular science that are apt to be so misleading. There was never anything more than the merest conjecture to support the theory of such a localization. One of the best known of the rising generation of physiological psychologists in Germany, Professor Ziehen, of Jena, has recently summed up the present position in the matter. "The hypotheses," he says, "which ascribe a relationship of the frontal lobes to higher psychic processes, to a hypothetical apperception (Wundt) or to 'character' cannot any longer be accepted. We now know that grave lesions of the frontal lobes may take place without interference with these attributes, while on the other hand anomalies of apperception and character have been observed in all kinds of lesions of the cortex, no matter what their location."

PATHOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY.

Pathology, the science of disease, proved so helpful for the development of physiology, the science of function, in other parts of the body, that it was hoped it would prove of service with regard to higher brain functions. This hope was strengthened by the fact that the study of nervous diseases aided greatly in the elucidation of difficult problems with regard to the function of nervous tissue. Disease by eliminating certain of the factors that enter into function simplifies the question of its why? and how? and frequently calls attention to quite unexpected elements that enter into it. In general, however, pathology has proved disappointing in what it has been able to give to psychology. The well-known ordinary types of mental disease, mania and melancholia, present no characteristic lesions of the brain. It might be thought that the serious disturbance of intellectual function they involve would surely be associated with marked changes in the cerebral substance. No uniform pathological conditions have, however, been found *post mortem* in these cases. In some brains a thickening of the membranes is found. In certain of the chronic insanities the skull bones are thickened, and bony plates are found in the dura or outer membrane of the brain. Cystic formations in the middle layer of the membranes have frequently been noticed. Certain sclerotic changes, that is, processes of hardening, are often reported, as also coloid degeneration of nerve fibres.

All of these changes have been reported, however, in cases in which absolutely no anomalies of intellectual activity had been noted during life. On the other hand, cases of intense intellectual disturbance, chronic as well as acute and persistent up to the moment of death, have been noted in many cases without any unusual appearance of the brain or membranes being found at the autopsy to account for them. Like the delirium of fever, these mental diseases are supposed to be due to functional changes in the brain tissues, that is, to nutritive and metabolic disturbances of brain cells, but not to substantial enduring changes in them that can be recognized by any means we have at our command at present. The same thing is true for the delusional states paranoia, hysteria, etc., and even in most cases for epilepsy. Usually these disorders occur in families, and in varying degrees or in their equivalents they may be traced in generation after generation, yet no sign can be found in the brain of any cause for them.

It is different for the dementias. While extremest mental aberration may run its course without the slightest alteration in brain tissues being demonstrable by any known method, failure of mental power is practically always accompanied by gross lesions of the cerebral cortex that are comparatively easy to find. Sclerotic changes are very common in these conditions, that is, there is an over development of connective tissue, with disappearance of true nervous tissue. There is always a lessening of the blood supply, due to the fact that the connective tissue around the blood-vessels increases in amount and so causes a diminution of their lumen and consequently of their blood capacity. The nerve cells of the cerebral cortex are, as might be expected, very much affected by this lowering of their nutritive supply. Some of them disappear completely; some remain only as detritus in the midst of the connective tissue; a few retain the character of cells, but are so much altered in structure that it is easy to understand that their function must be seriously interfered with. This is, of course, the pathological picture presented by advanced dementia. Milder types with less marked alterations are often seen. In fact, senile change in the brain is one of these milder types, and the gradual diminution of intellectual acumen that accompanies it is well known.

There are certain pathological conditions in the brain that cause marked disturbances of intellection. The presence of a tumor, for instance, when it does not cause such intense constitutional symptoms as absolutely inhibit all normal expression of feeling, may cause a marked change of disposition. It may make of an easy-going, quiet-tempered man a querulous, difficult individual, with whom it is extremely hard to get along. All this, of course, before the appearance of any sure physical sign of its presence. It has been noted that a tumor pressing upon the frontal lobes of the cerebrum may cause a tendency to the constant repetition of little witticisms. This symptom, called by the Germans Witzelsucht, "the little joke disease," has been noted so frequently that it is now looked upon with considerable confidence as a good diagnostic sign of the localization of a tumor when other characteristic symptoms of a tumor's presence are to be found. It will make most of us a little more charitable towards the far-fetchers of little jokes to realize that it may not be their fault, but their misfortune, and that their annoying peculiarity is really due to a local excess of pressure on their frontal regions.

Certain diseases by affecting special parts of the nervous system have given us some very interesting side lights on the manner in which we acquire our ideas. For instance, since cold is nothing in itself but only a negation of heat, it might be thought that we derived our notions as to relative heat or cold through the same set of nerves, and that it was a question merely of quantity not quality of stimulus that enabled us to distinguish between heat and cold. There is a disease of the spinal cord, however, syringomyelia, in which sometimes while the sensation for heat is lost that for cold remains. Patients may burn their fingers unawares and yet be very sensitive to cold in the same parts. This has led to careful investigation of the subject of heat and cold perception. By actual experiment it was found that there exist in the skin definite areas for heat and cold perception. These are quite distinct from each other, though their boundaries frequently overlap and probably represent the distribution of special terminal nerve endings.

One of the most interesting features of pathological psychology has been the question of heredity. That there is no heredity of acquired characteristics of any kind in immediately succeeding generations is now pretty generally conceded. There undoubtedly exist in certain families, however, easily recognized tendencies to mental troubles, and these recur in generation after generation. It has been hoped to connect these with some definite anomalies of brain tissue. There are those who, like Lombroso, think that they are able to point out even certain easily perceived arrangements of cerebral convolutions that are usually associated with mental aberration, degeneracy and moral disequilibration. The whole subject is as yet extremely dubious, however. There are certainly changes in the brain tissue that have an influence on the moral sense. The sclerotic changes that mark the beginning of general paralysis of the insane undoubtedly are the cause of the exaggerated feeling of self-importance, the neglect of the distinction between meum and tuum and the sexual divagations that characterize the initial stage of the disease. The failure of moral principles in the idiot is due to the absence of brain development. The soul cannot work through an imperfect physical organ. Neurologists have come to the conclusion that certain definite changes in the brain substance are associated with alterations of the disposition of the mentality. To the student of brain pathology it would seem as though the individuality of men was due to their brain structure, the spiritual source of energy behind matter being equal in all cases. This doctrine of the equality of souls is, I understand, the explicit teaching of St. Thomas.

It is easy to understand, then, how a theory of heredity in mental qualities may be evolved. The child inherits very often the features of either parent to a marked extent. It is easy to trace parental resemblances in the eyes or nose or mouth, in the shape of the jaw and forehead and ear. The stature and build of a parent and child are often closely similar. It would not be surprising if a corresponding similarity of brain tissue should exist between the child and its progenitors. If the conformation of the nose and mouth and ear are similar, why not also that of the convolutions of the brain? If the cerebral lobes that are more intimately connected with some special sense, as hearing or sight, are larger than normal in father or mother, or have a special form that modifies their function, why not also in the child? The external organs bear a resemblance, why not the internal organs? We know that certain changes in the brain tissue may influence the moral sense, the disposition and the mentality. It is probable, then, that variations in the size and form and arrangement of the brain tissue that is given to each individual at conception and by development may have much to do with his character and mental capacity and activity. The inheritance of qualities seemingly beyond the range of matter is thus explained because of the physical basis on which rest spiritual manifestations in the present order of things.

This predicates an inborn weakness or strength of character in certain cases, and so may seem to trench on the freedom of the will. Nothing is surer, however, than that all men are not born equal as regards their will power. This is generally acknowledged, and the expressions "weak-willed," "strong-willed" have become ineradicable parts of the language. Differences in the moral sense that are independent of the individual and that are due to his "make up" are also acknowledged. Some people are naturally good, some prone to evil; some are religious by nature, some not. These qualities do not destroy the free will of the individual, but they make the accomplishment of certain acts easier or harder, according to circumstances. They add to or take away from the merits of a certain course of life according to the individual. Our practical application of the principle that certain irregularities of life may be dependent on the inherited physical basis of character is the doctrine now universally accepted by medical men, that the children of neurotic, paranoiac and insane parents should be most carefully guarded from all nervous and emotional excitement and from over work. Their physical condition must also be faithfully cared for and always kept as far as possible at the very acme of well being. Failure of bodily health will almost surely involve mental deterioration.

Pathology's contributions to physiological psychology constitute some of the most suggestive materials that the new science has obtained for its future structure. From the very nature of the conditions under which this material is secured, however, its ultimate usefulness is as yet a matter of doubt. The general influence of diseased conditions of the brain on intellectual processes has long been known. The detailed knowledge of recent years is full of promise that the relations of mind and body in their highest functions will be better appreciated by further extension of that knowledge. The mystery of the ultimate processes within the cell is as yet hidden all over the body. It can scarcely be hoped that brain cells will yield any of their secrets to investigators before the physiology of simpler cells has been made much clearer than it is at present.

PSYCHOLOGY AND MINUTE BRAIN ANATOMY.

The investigation of brain tissues very early in the study of brain anatomy led to the conclusion that the cells were important elements in the brain substance. For many years, however, it was thought that the network of fibres that makes up the white interior substance of the brain constituted the organ of mind. The association theory by which consciousness was supposed to be the result of the intimate connection of different parts of the brain with each other was for a long time very popular. This theory supposed that all the brain cells of a particular portion of the brain were connected with the cells of every other portion. The meshwork of fibrils in the white substance of the brain was supposed to represent the intercellular connecting links. Whether there was direct connection between any two fibres in their course within the brain was a mystery, though such connections were supposed to exist. The structure of the brain was too intricate for the cruder methods of the early days even of advancing histology to resolve it into its elements with any success.

Much was accomplished by staining methods. Much more ground in the minute anatomy of the brain was gained after the introduction of the microtome, which enabled the investigator to obtain for observation extremely thin sections of tissues and so to use higher powers of the microscope for their study. Besides, he was enabled to follow in serial sections, that is, in successive cuts from the tissue, the various special appearances that were detected in this way to find out with more assurance their significance in the scheme of brain tissue. As a matter of fact for minute anatomy the microtome has been almost of more importance than the microscope. Brain tissue was so lacking in consistency, however, that various hardening agents had to be used to enable it to be cut in sufficiently thin sections with the microtome. The effect of these substances was to obscure normal conditions, and for a long time minute brain anatomy was practically at a standstill because of the difficulties involved.

The important advances in methods of examination that were to lead to a complete change of view with regard to the fibres and cells of the brain and strike a death-blow at the association theory came not from the Germans, who had done so much work in histology, but curiously enough from two Latin countries. The most important discovery of the century in minute brain anatomy was the work of a Spaniard, Ramon y Cajal. Despite the presumable unlikelihood of such a thing, the distinguished discoverer has succeeded in gathering around him a school of progressive young Spaniards, among whom his brother is the best known, who are very ably seconding his efforts, and who, under the guidance of their master, are doing work that is attracting the attention of the whole medical and psychological world

About fifteen years ago Dr. Camillo Golgi, an Italian microscopist well known for his researches on malaria, invented a new method of staining brain tissue. The principal agent in the new method was nitrate of silver. With this substance Golgi succeeded in so staining nerve cells and the branches running from them that he was able to follow them with assurance to their terminations. He succeeded in demonstrating that all the so-called protoplasmic processes of the nerve terminated in a tuft of branches. The tree-like appearance of these branched processes gave rise to the name dendrites. These branches of the cells are not continuous with the branches from other cells. They have no direct connection with any but a single cell. The axis cylinder of the nerve cell was a much larger branch than any of the others. It was along this that nervous impulses were supposed to flow. Golgi did not succeed in tracing this branch to its termination, so that he left the question open whether this branch did not form a direct path of communication between different cells. Golgi's work made nerve fibres of much less importance than they had been. Certain ideas in pathology had exaggerated the value of the nerve fibre at the expense of the nerve cell. It had been noted that nerve fibres degenerated when the cell to which they were attached was seriously injured. The cell was said to exert a trophic influence on the nerve fibre that is somehow to transmit to it the vital stimuli which kept it alive. Now, it was realized that the fibre was only a part of the cell, a prolongation of it for a special function, and, of course, died with the rest of the cell.

The work on the minute anatomy of the brain which was destined to influence psychology most was yet to come from the young Spanish histologist, who modified Golgi's methods for his investigations. Ramon y Cajal succeeded in demonstrating that not even the axis cylinder of the nerve cell is in direct connection with any other nerve cell. The axis cylinder, like the other cell branches, ends in absoultely free extremities. All of its collateral branches terminate the same way. Each nerve cell is a separate entity. The nervous substance of the brain, then, instead of being a complicated meshwork of cells and nerve fibres connected together, is composed of a mass of cells with their prolongations, but all of them absolutely separate and distinct from every other cell. Communication there necessarily must be between the different cells, but it is by contact only, and not by continuity. Though the idea thus advanced was new and revolutionary, it was very soon generally accepted by histologists. Each single nerve cell came to be called a neuron—a nerve entity—

and the theory of the neurons has now become a dogma in minute brain anatomy.

Certain very interesting theoretic considerations have been drawn from the existence of neurons. It was extremely difficult, in fact practically impossible, to understand under the old association theory of an intimate persistent connection between all parts of the brain how that organ could be made to apply itself to one line of thought, to the exclusion of every other. A complicated mechanism controlling the blood supply of the brain, only permitting an absolutely free circulation in the parts to be used and allowing but a limited supply to the rest of the brain, was the best explanation that could be given. Needless to say, this was very unsatisfactory. In the light of the neuron theory the explanation becomes easy. The central nervous system becomes like the central office of a telephone company, the place where connections between the various terminal parts of a system are made. When nerve cells by means of the terminals of their axis cylinders are in contact, the nervous impulses in one flows over into the other. The end nerve fibrils have a function like that of the antennæ of ants. When they touch, the message is conveyed from one to the other. When there is no contact, no nervous impulses pass. Sleep is, as it were, the breaking of all the contacts except those necessary to carry on life—the closing of the exchange, in a word, though the batteries are left in circuit. When the cells contract and retract from weariness, first slowness of function results and then finally cessation of function. When by a sudden severe blow cells suffer from shock, they contract, and unconsciousness results. When the blow is very severe, not only the cells that are used for mental activity may be affected, but even the neurons more especially concerned with vital functions. If these are caused to retract, death ensues. Death from concussion or shock, where the most careful investigation reveals no direct injury to the nervous system, is a well known and not very rare event. Fright or sudden great emotion may kill in this way.

The essential disconnection of nerve cells serves to hint at least how in the present order of things trains of thought are isolated from each other. The brain is always used as an organ, but only those parts are "connected up," as the electricians say, which are wanted for the transmission of the ideas that occupy the mind at a given moment. Every one is familiar with the feeling that the mind is sometimes groping, as it were, for a word or an idea. It is on "the tip of the tongue," the mind seems just on the point of grasping it, yet it fails to come when wanted. Later it bobs up serenely of itself.

The nerve filaments failed to make the proper connections for the reproduction of the word or idea for the moment, but later, impressed by the unsuccessful effort made, they take, as it were, the first free opportunity they have to make spontaneously the connections so persistently but vainly sought for before.

All this, of course, is theory. No one has even seen a neuron move in the higher animals, though they have been seen to contract in some of the very low animals. The theory has, however, a good anatomical basis, and it undoubtedly constitutes the most interesting contribution to physiological psychology that brain histology has made.

The neuron theory is interesting from another standpoint. Under the older theories that made nerve fibres in the brain of great importance and endeavored to explain consciousness and certain relational mental activities on the ground of association, that is, the interaction of cells and the power of nervous reflexes to awaken nervous energy and excite brain function, the necessity for the vital activity behind the mechanism was apt to be more or less lost sight of. With the neuron theory, unless one were to predicate of each brain cell an individual consciousness and purpose that would make of each of them a distinct intellectual being, we are brought face to face with the necessity for a guiding force, a *spiritus rector*, behind the cells, which energises and coördinates them.

We are brought, then, in the light of the most recent advances in physiological psychology to a position not unlike that which biologists have been forced to take up of late years. In biology, mechanical, chemical and physical theories of function held their sway for a good many years. They have all given way, however, to the realization that the cell is the important element in physiological function, and that behind the cell there is a force whose energies are not according to ordinary physical and chemical laws, but represent something entirely distinct from matter. Long ago Huxley said: "The cells are no more the producers of the vital phenomena than the shells scattered on the seashore are the instruments by which the gravitation force of the moon acts upon the ocean. Like these, they only mark where the vital tide has been and how it has acted." "There is more in life than the processes it controls," Gowers, the distinguished English nervous specialist, said. Nowhere in the body is the ancillary character of the cells more manifest than in the brain.

It has, too, been growing more evident of late that perhaps too much importance has been attached to the brain as the exclusive seat of the processes by which sensations are differentiated and intellection accomplished. Even in the brain itself it has been pointed out that the part in which the most complicated mechanism of cells and fibres exists is the cerebellum, not the cerebrum, though it is clear that the cerebellum is associated with functions of lesser dignity than those which are accomplished in the cerebrum. Memory more than any other faculty associated with intellection has seemed to have a definite location in the brain tissues. The obliteration of part of the cerebral function often takes with it a part of the stored up knowledge of the individual. It has been noted more than once that a hemorrhage into the brain would cause the complete disappearance of the power to use a language learned late in life, while leaving absolutely intact another acquired years before. With regard to memory, however, it may be pointed out that every cell in the body seems to possess something of the faculty. The practical value of training depends on this fact. In the modern studies of disease and immunity there are a number of interesting observations that point to the conclusion that certain impressions made even on ordinary body cells are never eradicated.

The neurons of the brain, that is, the cells within the skull and their branches, are very little differentiated one from another. Those that preside over hearing are not recognizably distinct from those that rule over sight or smell. It is doubtful if even certain distinctions that were supposed to obtain among cells devoted to functions even farther apart from each other than are the special senses have any existence in the living cells. Very recently Nissl's staining methods have given some most suggestive pictures of the interior of nerve cells and have aroused the hope that our pathology of mental diseases was to have its development in the observation of changes within the brain cells. So far the hope has not been fulfilled, and not the slightest hint has been obtained of any difference of internal arrangement within the cell to correspond to any difference of function that it may subtend. The nerve endings for the special senses, the rods and cones in the eye, the touch corpuscles in the skin, the olfactory fibres in the nose, the muscle plates in the skeletal muscles, are all highly specialized. It is at the periphery of the nervous system, very probably, not at the centre, that the modifications of sensation are accomplished which cause the translation of sensory stimuli into various terms when they reach the consciousness.

Physiological psychology is as yet groping in the dark with regard to the physical basis that subtends sensation and intellection.

There was much more confident assertion of knowledge ten years ago than there is now. The realization of the utter incompleteness of certain notions that were generally accepted in the first enthusiastic reception of observations that seemed to be of wider significance than they eventually proved to be has had a chastening influence. Exaggerated claims for physiological psychology and the hopes the new science holds out of elucidating the problems of psychology are growing ever rarer and rarer. Professor Hugo Münsterberg, of Harvard, said in a recent essay[2] on physiology and psychology: "The hope that physiological psychology will give us a fuller acquaintance with the psychological facts as such is, therefore, an illusion."

While we may look, then, for great practical benefits from physiological psychology because of its relations to mental diseases, there is no ground for the fear that the science may prove materialistic in its development. Certainly all its tendencies at present are towards a recognition of the mystery that lies behind cell energy in the accomplishment of intellectual acts, while its present position emphasizes the truth that mental processes, though dependent on matter, are evidently beyond the sphere of the material and belong to a totally different order of things.

JAMES J. WALSH.

New York.

A CENTURY OF IRISH IMMIGRATION.

DURING the present century four and a half million people of Irish birth emigrated to the United States, and at the close of the century there are more than five million Americans of Irish parentage—a number greater than the whole white population of the United States at the beginning of the century.

The close of the century, too, finds more people of Irish parentage in the United States than in Ireland. Ireland has sent more colonists to North America during the nineteenth century than all Europe sent in three hundred years. As compared in numbers, all the previous great migrations of history dwindle into insignificance when placed side by side with the Irish migration. The successive migrations which overturned the Roman Empire did not aggregate within a million of nineteenth century Irish immigration.

---

[2] "Psychology and Life." 1899. Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

Less than a million people followed Alaric and Attila; the Vandal migration which overspread Spain and Northern Africa is never estimated at more than a million. The great tribal movement of the Tartars under Genghis Kahn numbered but 800,000. The Huguenot migration from France, in the eighteenth century, did not exceed a quarter of a million; yet, singular to say, the historians have paid more attention to it than they have to the great Celtic trans-Atlantic migration of the nineteenth century.

From 1840 to 1860 two million Irish immigrants settled in the United States; from 1860 to 1880, one million; and another million from 1880 to the present time. The tide of immigration, which was accelerated by the famine of 1847 to "a million a decade," has averaged a little over half a million a decade since 1860.

Had Irish migration been directed to the virgin forests of the Northwest, it might have founded here a dozen great Irish-American States of the Union. Economic conditions and divers other causes decreed that it should end its journey among the New England and Middle States. Here, at the close of the century, reside three-fifths of the Irish immigrants and their descendants. Something over a fourth of this immigration found its way to the twelve agricultural States called the North Central States: Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas, Nebraska and North and South Dakota.

This circumstance of territorial distribution has decidedly influenced the occupation and social condition of the Irish immigrants. The people of the North Atlantic States are more of an urban than an agricultural people, but one-fifth of their number living on farms. On the other hand, nearly half of the people of the twelve North Central States (the "West" of other days) are farmers.

But as the Irish immigrants are most largely settled in the non-agricultural States, it happens that they are to-day less of an agricultural people than any other considerable element of our population, but fifteen per cent. of their whole number residing on the farms of the country.

In the twelve North Central States above mentioned nearly a third of the Irish-born people are engaged in agriculture, a percentage not greatly below that of their neighbors of other racial extractions. In Iowa, for instance, according to the census of 1890, there were over fifty thousand people of Irish maternity pursuing gainful occupations, twenty-five thousand of whom were engaged in agriculture. In the Dakotas, of fourteen thousand persons of Irish maternity pursuing gainful occupations, nearly 8,000 were farmers. In Wisconsin, of fifty thousand persons of Irish maternity pursuing gainful occupations, twenty-two thousand were engaged in farming; these statistics going to show that occupation is largely determined by the matter of a people's territorial distribution.

Among the many important effects of Irish immigration on American history was its decisive influence in destroying the sectional equilibrium between the North and the South, which, since the foundation of the Government, had been the recurring issue in American politics. Irish immigration swelled the numerical preponderance of the North and set in motion Western migration of Northern people, thus building up the great Northwestern States, which gave the non-slave-holding Commonwealths a majority in Congress. "We should have excluded the Irish when we shut out the Negro," said a Southern politician before the war; and the Know-Nothing programme won in the South particularly because of this view.

SOCIAL CONDITION OF THE IRISH-BORN POPULATION.

Since the United States census of 1870 more attention has been paid to gathering statistics regarding our foreign-born population than in previous enumerations. We are enabled from the census reports of 1870, 1880 and 1890 to obtain some interesting facts with regard to the social condition of the Irish-born citizens of the United States.

Although the great tide of Irish immigration ended about the year 1863, the Irish-born population of the United States has remained almost the same from 1860 to 1890. The United States census shows that in 1870 there were 1,856,000 Irish-born people in the United States, in 1880 there were 1,855,000 Irish-born people in the United States and in 1890 there were 1,871,000 Irish-born people in the United States.

In 1880 residents of the United States of Irish parentage numbered 4,530,000 and in 1890 4,913,000. No statistics of this nature were gathered by the census of 1870.

Occupation is an index of social condition. As to the Irish-born residents of the United States, the census reports yield these significant facts:

	Census 1870.	Census 1880.	Census 1890.
Irish-born farmers................	88,000	107,000	100,000
Irish-born laborers...............	229,000	225,000	203,000

Of the whole population of this country pursuing gainful occupations 24 per cent. are farmers; of the German-born population nearly 20 per cent. are farmers; of the Irish-born population nearly 10 per cent. are farmers.

The figures above given indicate that if our Irish-born population is still chary toward its better destiny on the farms of the country, it is, nevertheless, also emerging from the status of a laboring population.

The total number of Irish-born persons pursuing gainful occupations was in 1880, 979,000, and in 1890, 1,065,000. In 1880 23 per cent. of the Irish population were laborers. In 1890 the percentage of Irish-born laborers is 19 per cent.

While the number of unskilled Irish-born laborers shows some decrease, there is some gain in Irish-born skilled labor, as the following figures respecting the chief trades will indicate:

	1880.	1890.
Irish-born blacksmiths	13,000	13,490
Irish-born carpenters	14,000	16,126
Irish-born masons	13,000	14,540
Irish-born machinists	6,000	8,200

Fifteen per cent. of the people of the United States are engaged in trade and transportation, or what is ordinarily called mercantile pursuits. Only 9 per cent. of the Irish-born population are thus engaged, according to the census of 1890. They have, however, made a slight gain in this respect as compared with the census of 1880.

In the professions Irish-born people are also making progress:

	1880.	1890.
Irish-born clergymen in the United States	2,516	2,817
Irish-born lawyers in the United States	1,008	1,248
Irish-born teachers in the United States	3,916	3,937
Irish-born physicians in the United States	1,028	1,065
Irish-born journalists in the United States	324	462

Here are some facts for the votary of temperance, indicating that not only the Irish, but also the Germans are leaving the liquor business:

	1880.	1890.
Irish-born saloon-keepers	8,500	7,500
German-born saloon-keepers	21,000	19,200

A prejudice which regards the policemen as too numerously of Irish birth may be corrected by these figures:

	1890.
Total policemen	74,629
Irish-born policemen	12,500
German-born policemen	5,800

The census of 1890 shows that there are 1,216,000 female domestic servants in the United States, of whom 154,553 are Irish-born and 133,500 of German and Scandinavian birth. Two-thirds of our female domestic servants are of native birth.

THE SECOND GENERATION.

Our studies in the last census reports (of 1890) give us very hopeful indications respecting the social condition of the second generation of the Irish race in America. Taking occupation as an index of social condition, we note that in the United States (according to the census of 1890) there were engaged in gainful occupations a total of 1,065,000 persons of Irish birth and 1,122,000 persons of native birth, but of Irish maternity. Now the question as to whether the second generation of the Irish race is improving in social condition compared to its parent stock will be answered by noting how these two armies of workers are distributed in the occupations.

It appears that while there are 203,000 laborers in the United States of Irish birth, there are less than 90,000 laborers of native birth and Irish maternity. In other words, while one out of five of the Irish-born people in the United States belong to the ranks of unskilled labor, but one out of twelve of the second generation is thus classed. There are 154,000 Irish-born female servants in the United States, or one out of seven of the working Irish-born population here; but there are only 68,315 domestic servants among the second generation, or one out of 16 of that generation.

The second generation is not taking to the farms, however. While there are 100,000 Irish-born farmers in the United States, but 77,000 native persons of Irish maternity are so classed. The obvious drift of the second generation of all classes is away from the farms.

In "trade and transportation," which includes all mercantile pursuits, 162,000 Irish-born persons are engaged, and 245,000 persons of native birth, but Irish maternity. This indicates the drift of the Irish race in America from the ranks of unskilled labor to the higher avocations of trade and commerce.

In the department of skilled labor progress is also apparent:

	Irish Born.	Native born of Irish Maternity.
Carpenters	16,100	17,500
Shoemakers	14,500	23,000
Machinists	8,200	15,000
Blacksmiths	13,500	11,300
Dressmakers	12,230	43,500
Plumbers	4,224	13,300

It is in the professions, however, that we note the strongest evidence of the social amelioration of the Irish-American:

	Irish Born.	Native born of Irish Maternity.
Clergymen	2,817	2,342
Lawyers	1,243	3,390
Physicians	1,063	2,125
Journalists	462	1,000
Teachers	3,937	24,900
Engineers	1,114	2,085
Theatrical	700	2,375
Government officials	750	5,448
Artists and authors	350	986

The second generation is not filling the ranks of the priesthood as readily as the parent stock; but their great increase in all the professions, and especially in the desks of authority in the schools, is noteworthy.

For purposes of comparison these figures will be of interest:

PERCENTAGE OF CLASSES OF POPULATION ENGAGED IN CERTAIN OCCUPATIONS.

	Of the whole Population.	Of the Irish born.	Of Native born with Irish Mothers.
Lawyers	.39	.11	.29
Teachers	1.50	.37	2.29
Officials	.35	.34	.52
Policemen	.34	1.15	.68

The following statistics will also be of interest:

	Irish Born.	Native born of Irish Maternity.
Saloon-keepers	7,575	5,600
Policemen	12,500	7,600

Thus, there are more lawyers, doctors and authors among the second generation of Irish-Americans than there are saloon-keepers, and more teachers than policemen.

IRISH AND GERMAN IMMIGRATION COMPARED.

Ireland and Germany, having furnished the two main streams of immigration to the United States, comparisons will naturally be of interest. The climax of Irish immigration was reached in the decade 1850-60; the climax of German immigration in the decade

1880-90. In the latter decade German immigration outnumbered Irish immigration by over 800,000, and solidly established the Germans in the first rank as the most considerable "foreign" element in our population.

The statistics of Irish and German immigration by decades are here given:

	From Ireland.	From Germany.	From Great Britain "Not specified" (Mostly Irish)
1820-31	50.754	6,751	7,942
1831-40	207,381	152,454	65,347
1841-50	780,719	434,626	229,979
1851-60	914,119	951,657	132,199
1861-70	456,593	822,007	349,656
1871-80	444,588	757,698	7,908
1881-90	655,482	1,452,970	....
1891-99 (June 30)	366,767	529,666	....
	3,876,444	5,107,829	793,031

The total Irish immigration to the United States from 1820-99 is set down in books of statistics at 3,876,444. But Carroll D. Wright in "The Statesman's Year Book" (1899) says: "Many persons immigrated from Ireland are brought under Great Britain, not specified, or the British provinces." From Great Britain, "not specified," the total immigration (1820-98) was 793,000, and from the British provinces, 1,048,000. It is a very moderate estimate to figure half a million Irish among these, especially as most of those classed as "Great Britain, not specified," immigrated soon after the Irish famine of 1847.

The census returns for the last forty years with reference to the Irish and German elements in the population are of interest:

	1850.	1860.	1870.
Irish-born	961,719	1,611,304	1,855,827
German-born	583,774	1,276,075	1,690,563

	1880.	1890.
Irish-born	1,854,571	1,871,509
German-born	1,966,742	2,784,849
Irish parentage	4,529,523	4,913,238
German parentage	4,883,842	6,871,524

In 1850 the Irish were two-fifths of all the foreign-born; in 1890 they were one-fifth. In 1850 the Germans were one-fourth of the foreign-born population; they are now three-tenths. No compilations of foreign parentage by separate countries were made until the census of 1880.

In 1870 there were 165,000 more Irish-born people in the United States than people of German birth; but in 1880 the German-born population exceeded the Irish-born population by 112,000. This gain of 377,000 was principally due to the fact that German immigration during the decade 1870-80 exceeded Irish immigration by 313,000. Again, in 1890 the German-born population shows a further gain over the Irish-born population of some 800,000, due to the fact that German immigration during the decade ending 1890 exceeded Irish immigration by 787,000.

The American-born children of the Irish immigrants numbered in 1890 somewhat over three millions, and the American-born children of German immigrants somewhat over four million. The fact that Irish immigration is older than German immigration may justify us in estimating that the Irish element (counting the third and fourth generations) is not, however, much behind, numerically, the German element.

German immigration, coming later than Irish immigration, peopled the West, so that to-day one-fifth of the German-Americans are farmers. In the North Central States there are 816,000 German-born persons pursuing gainful occupations to 238,000 Irish-born persons (census of 1890).

It is apparently a mistake, however, to assume that the Irish are by any large disproportion a city element in this country. To reside in the cities is more or less the fate of all immigrations. Taking the census returns of 1890 for the thirty large cities of the United States, we find the German-born population exceeds the Irish-born population in twenty-three cities, including New York, Chicago, Brooklyn and St. Louis.

Of the Irish-born population in 1890 56 per cent. was found in the 124 principal American cities; 48 per cent. of the German-born population was also found in these cities. Of the whole number of Russians, Poles and Italians 57, 58 and 59 per cent., respectively, were found in the principal cities—these three foreign elements being more inclined even than the Irish to crowd in the cities.

The number of persons of Irish maternity pursuing gainful occupations is only a few thousand larger than the number of persons of German maternity pursuing gainful occupations. How the second generation of these great elements is distributed in occupation will be of interest:

	Natives of German Maternity.	Natives of Irish Maternity
Farmers	148,000	77,000
Servants (female)	73,371	68,315

	Natives of German Maternity.	Natives of Irish Maternity.
Saloon-keepers	6,978	5,585
Clergymen	1,974	2,350
Lawyers	2,177	3,390
Teachers	10,052	24,900
Officials	2,827	5,448
Policemen	3,193	7,621
Laborers	63,400	90,400
Trade and transportation	221,000	245,000

The Irish element is far behind the German element in agriculture, but far ahead in the professions and slightly ahead in the pursuits classed as mercantile.

SOME VITAL STATISTICS.

According to the statistics gathered by the United States census of 1890, the death rate in the United States is about 18 to 1,000 inhabitants (Part II., Miscellaneous Statistics, p. 3). The rural districts are healthier, of course, than the cities, the actual death rate in the country being estimated at probably 15.5 per 1,000; in the cities, 23.5

The birth rate in the cities, according to the census of 1890 (Part II., Vital Statistics), is 27 per 1,000 of the population. So it happens that the modern city grows naturally in population. This was not the case with cities in former centuries. Their death rate exceeded their birth rate; they would have shrunk in population except for the reinforcements they received from the rural districts.

The birth rate in New York city is 28⅜ per 1,000 inhabitants; in Chicago, 31; in Milwaukee, 33⅛; in St. Paul, 31½—these being cities where the foreign-born population is largest (38 to 42 per cent. of the whole). In Baltimore the birth rate is 25½; in Indianapolis, 20⅜; in Washington, 21—these being cities where the foreign-born population is smallest.

During the census year 1890 9,569 children were born in the city of New York of native parentage and 26,845 of foreign-born parentage. In other words, 27 per cent. of the births were of native parents and 73 per cent. of foreign parents. The foreign population of New York in 1890 was 42 per cent. of the total population. The birth rate to foreign-born parents was 42½ per 1,000 of foreign-born persons. The birth rate to native parents was 11 per 1,000 of native-born persons.

The excess of births among the foreign-born population is to be attributed to the fact that they are more largely an adult population and probably more fecund. In Boston, where the foreign-born population was 35 per cent. of the total population, the births of native maternity number 2,408, and of foreign 6,098 (8 to 1,000 of the native-born population; 39 to 1,000 of the foreign-born population). Here we observe that the foreign-born population, numbering a little more than one-third of the whole population, had more than twice as many births as the native population. In Cincinnati the births of native maternity were 3,420; of foreign maternity, 3,083. The foreign-born population of Cincinnati in 1890 was 24 per cent. of the entire population.

The death rate in our cities averages 22.78 per 1,000 whites. (In London the death rate is 20.3 per cent.; in Paris, 24½; in Dublin, 26½.) The element of Irish maternity, which is largely a city element in this country, averages a death rate of 26.74. Those of German maternity average a death rate of 19.87. In New York city the death rate among those of Irish maternity is 32.2. Among those of German maternity it is 22. As indicating that this large death rate is chiefly due to the crowding of people in the tenement quarters, we may note the contrast presented in such cities as Milwaukee, Detroit and Cincinnati. In Detroit the death rate among those of Irish maternity is 18 per 1,000; in Milwaukee, 17.45 per 1,000; in Cincinnati, 15.77 per 1,000. The death rate of those of German maternity in the two latter cities is slightly greater than the death rate among those of Irish maternity.

These conclusions, applicable to the Irish element, are derivable from the foregoing statistics:

I. Had the Irish immigration been settled on the farms of the country rather than in the cities, its numerical strength in the several census enumerations would be greater.

II. It has been distanced numerically by the German element (1) because German immigration was larger; (2) because the conditions for natural increase are better among the Germans—they being more largely settled on the farms.

III. Compared with the native population, in the Eastern States especially, the Irish element (in common with other immigrant elements), is increasing and will increase relatively much more rapidly. In many New England cities, and in three of the New England States, the Irish element will ultimately constitute an actual majority of the population. This would also be the case with New York and Chicago, except for the larger German element which keeps pace with or passes the Irish element in natural increase.

BOOKS RELATING TO THE AMERICAN IRISH.

About the year 1850, when fully a million Irish-born people were settled in the United States, the Irish-American community became sufficiently self-conscious to wish a survey of its status and its prospects. In that year Thomas D'Arcy McGee, then editor of the *Boston Pilot,* and a man of fine literary accomplishments and patriotic sympathies, published a book entitled "A History of the Irish Settlers in North America." Its chapters called attention to the large Irish emigration here during the eighteenth century and the part the Irish race bore in the American Revolution.

McGee also discussed the position and requirements in 1850 of the Irish in America. Out of a population of twenty-four millions, he estimated the Irish-American element at four millions. The census of 1850, however, shows an Irish-born population of a little over 900,000. McGee was plainly of opinion that the future of the Irish lay in newer States. "The torrent of emigration from Ireland," he said, "must in a few years abate its force. Whatever we can do for ourselves as a people must be done before the close of this century; or the epitaph of our race will be written in the West with the single sentence *Too Late.*"

It was in furtherance of this view that McGee coöperated in calling an Irish-American convention at Buffalo to promote Western emigration. Bishop Hughes, of New York, opposed the plan. Even without the Bishop's opposition conditions were adverse.

At the time of the great influx from Ireland (1850-8) there was an abnormal development of American industries in the East. The Irish immigrant was attracted and held in the bondage of these industries. The natural stream Westward to Government lands was stayed, and the future of Irish-America thereby markedly modified. Instead of an agricultural and farming people, the Irish immigrants became hewers of wood and drawers of water to Eastern capitalists in Eastern mines and mills.

In the year following the close of the Civil War, John Francis Maguire visited the United States, and, as a result of what was evidently a very careful survey of the field, gave to the public his book entitled "The Irish in America." Mr. Maguire was proprietor of the *Cork Examiner,* a leading Nationalist daily of Ireland. He had been for many years a member of Parliament, representing, as an advocate of tenant right, an Irish and Catholic constituency. His study of the Irish in America is by all odds the best record extant of nineteenth century Irish emigration. It is apparent that his point of view emphasizes the moral and religious side of the subject—the history of Irish emigration seeming, in the pages of his work, to be a record of the growth of the Catholic Church in the United States. In common with McGee and all subsequent writers who have dwelt upon the condition of the Irish in America, he notes their great numbers in the cities and the small percentage on the farms. And he concurs in the view that the race should be given such incentive and such direction as would promote its colonization in the agricultural districts of the West.

A work especially written with a view of promoting Irish colonization is Bishop Spalding's "Religious Mission of the Irish People," published about the year 1880. It expresses the plain consciousness of the race that the opportunities it had in the early tides of its immigration to found great Irish Commonwealths in the Northwest has been lost, and that the cities have been the cemetery of the race's energy. There is a chapter on the Irish-Catholic Colonization Society, an enterprise in which the Bishop was interested about the year 1880, together with Bishops Ireland and O'Connor and Mr. W. J. Onahan, and which, like its companion movement, the Irish-American Colonization Company, managed by John Sweetman, so slightly affected the great problem and so little recovered the lost opportunity. Bishop Spalding's thesis is that the Irish Catholics are the most important element of the Church in this country, but that their environment is a hindrance to their working out, in the fullest measure, their religious mission.

"The Irish Race, Past and Present," by Rev. August J. Thebaud, S. J., is a sympathetic and eulogistic study of the religious and moral strong points of the Irish as displayed in their history. It contains a few chapters bearing on the American Irish, written altogether with reference to the religious mission that Father Thebaud marks out for the race.

Following the great recrudescence in 1880 of Irish-American patriotism (which had suffered abatement in the dying out of Fenianism, only to revive with the agitation of the land question), Philip H. Bagenal, an Oxford man, published a book entitled "The American Irish." Mr. Bagenal, who writes from a Tory standpoint, but with some claim to the judicial quality, comes to the study of the question too much with reference to the movement of the day, to-wit, the Irish land question and the influence of the Irish-American element on American and British politics. While this must limit, to some extent, the value of his investigations, his work is interesting as exhibiting the awakening of the British conscience to the hereafter that its misrule of Ireland has prepared for it in this country. Mr. Bagenal is also impressed with the way the Irish race congest

American cities and their avoidance of what their best interests dictate—settlement on the farms. His study of Irish parties in America and the political and moral status of the Celtic race in this country is instructive reading, despite his tendency to arrive at alarming or despondent conclusions.

No survey of American history or politics since 1840 would be complete without some reference to Irish immigration and the influence of "The Irish Vote;" and we have a wide and varied mass of estimates on this subject, from the few but judicial references to the American Irish in Bryce's "American Commonwealths" to the uniformly disparaging and hostile views of Van Holst in his "Constitutional History of the United States" (a work said to have been subsidized by the Prussian Government).

Of course, we may read much bearing on the Irish-American community in the periodical literature of the last half century. A glance at Poole's Index will convince one of this. O. A. Brownson, a New Englander, who became a convert to the Catholic Church about the year 1845, published a *Quarterly Review*, and for nearly twenty years, dating '46 to '65, its pages contain frequent articles referring to the social and political status of Irish-Americans.

In the *North American Review* for January, 1841, we meet one of the first magazine articles which notes the growing problem of Irish immigration. Called forth by the Nativistic movement, it dwells largely on the question of naturalization. This and similar transient issues of the kind furnish the main points from which Irish immigration is discussed up to the period of the Civil War in numerous pamphlets and review articles. As for more recent magazine articles on the American Irish it is sufficient to mention Froude's two papers in the *North American Review* of December, 1879, and January, 1880; Bocock's "Irish Conquest of Our Cities," in the *Forum* (vol. xvii., p. 186); Merwin's discussion of "The Irish in American Life," in the *Atlantic* (vol. lxxvii., p. 28), and two notable articles in the English magazines—the *Westminster Quarterly Review* (vol. cxxxiii., p. 290) and the *Fortnightly Review* (vol ix., p. 220), the latter article by John Morley.

H. J. DESMOND.

Milwaukee.

SIR THOMAS MORE AND THE PERSECUTION OF HERETICS.

AN HISTORICAL INQUIRY.

IT is a trite saying, the paternity of which might in all probability be traced to Machiavelli, that "a skilful advocate will never tell a lie, when suppressing the truth will answer his purpose; and if a lie must be told, he will rather, if he can, lie by insinuation than by direct assertion." It was no doubt this axiom, or one strongly analogous to it, that prompted Dean Swift to give us his deliciously quaint dissertation on "*lies*," categorically classifying them as "additory, detractory and translatory," and which unlovely congeries his inimitable wit illumines in a manner at once droll, satiric and instructive. The latent energy and full development of this axiom, which in some of its diversified and variable forms is found in the proverbial philosophy of almost every civilized nation, probably finds no wider field or extensive application than in ecclesiastico-historical writing. Here it usually becomes obtrusively conspicuous and clamorously assertive, bringing its concentrated energies in full action when it deals with the Church of God. As long as these assaults on the Church find themselves voiced in the melodramatic vaporings and falsetto shrieks of a King, Thompson, Fulton or Hittel—with a sophomoric display of erudition and a kindergarten capacity of credulity that intuitively relegate their labors from the domain of critical analysis to that of psychiatric diagnosis, leaving only a vague and confused impression on what Carlyle misanthropically designates as the "inarticulate multitude" —the "multitude" which Sir Thomas Browne, with an acrimony not wholly destitute of truth, calls "the great enemy of reason, virtue and religion"—they will usually be found abortive, reactionary and always in the end—self-defeating. When, however, they present themselves under the sponsorship of accredited, even thought-moulding literary media, the vehicle itself giving a prestige which the author could not otherwise command, then critical interest for the moment becomes aroused, and the vindication of truth becomes a solemn obligation, a sacred duty. These reflections suggest themselves in reading a recent article in one of our most conservative American reviews,[1] where a tabulated and chronological catalogue of hoary, obsolete and exploded charges are made against the Church, while ostensibly unraveling the tangled skein of Ritualism. The article is noteworthy for several characteristics usually inseverable from conventional Protestant polemics. There is an absence of all studied rudeness and offensive arrogance, of ludicrous conceits and coarse invective—but all the same there is found a naïve ingenuousness and insidious dogmatism, which

---

[1] "The Rebellion Against the Royal Supremacy," *North American Review*, November, 1899.

> . . . under fair pretence of friendly ends,
> Baited with reasons not unplausible,
> Wind them into the easy-hearted man,
> And hug them into snares.

In honest polemics it is always more chivalrous to face an opponent with lowered visor in open field, than introduce the enemy into the citadel by the strategic wooden horse. To attempt a refutation of charges that sound scholarship has long since remanded to professional purveyors of anti-Catholic pabulum, the commercial value of whose merchandise is daily depreciating and becoming more unmarketable, would be about as heroic as Sir John Falstaff hacking the corpse of the dead Percy.

Among the charges which press the axiom above alluded to, to its full extent, we find a calumny affecting the name of one of the most eminent statesmen and intrepid patriots of English history: a man whose profound learning was the admiration of world-wide scholarship; whose moral splendor was the eulogy and envy of European courts; whose preëminent sanctity, before ecclesiastical beatification took the initiative, by public acclaim, blazoned the halo of sainthood on his brow; one whose inhuman execution sent a thrill of horror and consternation over the civilized world; one whose martyrdom was a fitting crown to a life consecrated to duty and justice, humanity and God. We refer to Sir Thomas More.

"Sir Thomas More," says the writer of the article in question, the Earl of Portsmouth, and it may parenthetically be stated, with apodictic lordliness, citing no authority, "Sir Thomas More, whose noble death has obliterated, if it has not largely condoned, the recollection of his acts, was especially active in this direction [suppression of heretics] . . . Men and women were taken and tried in Sir Thomas More's house at Chelsea and burned for their principles. . . . James Bainham, a gentleman of the Temple . . . [was] brought before More, who had him whipped in his presence and then taken to the Tower and racked before his eyes."[2]

Was Sir Thomas More a religious persecutor? Were men and women tried in his house and burned for their principles? Was James Bainham racked before his eyes in the Tower?

---

[2] *North American Review*, ut. sup., 724-725.

It is a strange and rather bewildering fact that in the light of modern historical research: the buried treasures of unpublished and unedited documents sifted and analyzed by such unimpeachable writers as Brewer, Gardiner, Freeman, Gasquet: the cumulative evidence of these researches exposing a conspiracy of falsehood formidable enough to shake one's confidence in the integrity of the whole body of historical writing: this evidence at the same time reversing the original verdict of history, and the ripened judgment and clearer vision of mankind acclaiming that reversal a providential triumph of truth and justice, the scathing indictment, attainting Sir Thomas More a bloodthirsty persecutor should again make its appearance. It has been said, with no little truth, that the posthumous vicissitudes of great men are not only of absorbing interest, but permanently fix their status in history; again, as if contradicting this very maxim—that the resuscitation of a character which the Muse of History, after trial, has sentenced to death was a task, humanly speaking, impossible. In the case of Sir Thomas More we have an instance of an historic figure, buried like another Pompeii or Herculaneum under a veritable volcanic scoria of falsehood and slander, after centuries of shame and obloquy—rising Lazarus-like from its grave at the commanding voice of posthumous history. It was the modern historian whose largeness of vision would not be distorted by political bias, obscured by sectarian rancor, daunted by human fear, who toiled and delved until he exhumed the great Chancellor in his superb proportions. Instead of discovering a deformed pigmy, he found a colossal giant. A summons issued, not like that of Henry VIII. to the enshrined bones of More's illustrious predecessor in name, office, martyrdom and sainthood, Thomas a'Becket, to undergo the mockery of a ghoulish post-mortem trial, but in this instance to announce his honorable acquittal of all the odious charges brought against him, fixed his place on the bead-roll of England's worthies. The Muse of History, discovering the imposture which made her the vehicle of the evidence of a perjured judiciary, suborned witnesses and slanderous malignants, was perhaps somewhat tardy, but all the same unswerving in her sacred mission, and with fearless deliberation expunged the record of her momentary weakness and unconscious deception by penning with consistent emphasis and irreversible finality the decree that the superstitious devotee was, after all, a fervid Christian of the sanest piety, the bloody persecutor a public functionary of the most humane impulses, the beheaded felon one of the loftiest types of moral grandeur in the annals of our race. From that moment, like Socrates, with whom More had more points of resemblance than the mere identity of martyrdom, his life, virtues and fate became the glorious inheritance of mankind.

It must be owned that among More's contemporaries there were isolated and feeble appreciations, not to allude to the Catholic tradition that revered him as "England's honor, Faith's zealous champion and Christ's constant martyr," which clearly indicated that, left to its better instincts, mankind unerringly detects true merit. But it did not tend to one's peace of mind, protection of property or security of life during the reigns of "Henry the murderer of his wives, . . . Somerset the murderer of his brother . . . and Elizabeth the murderer of her guest,"[3] to be effusive or demonstrative in admiration of persons or policies that did not receive the government's sanction or the royal favor. Roger Ascham, the teacher of Elizabeth and Lady Jane Grey, tells us that the Chancellor was "a man whose virtues go to raise England above all nations,"[4] but with a prudence born of danger, confined his admiration to the reign of Queen Mary. We know that Cochlæus voiced the sentiment of the "new learning" when he eulogizes his hero as "a man whom all praised, loved, admired for his culture, his manners, his affability, courtesy, eloquence, prudence and innocence, who, moreover, as Lord High Chancellor, as the friend of the King, served the commonwealth with distinction from his youth, who as royal ambassador acquitted himself brilliantly of all his duties, and on the threshold of old age, in his gray hairs, stood an object of universal veneration,"[5] but his eulogy did not find utterance in ear-shot of London Tower. The cry of sorrow and execration, "*Interfecistis, interfecistis hominem omnium Anglorum optimum*," uttered with bated breath and choked voice, hardly reached the royal ears, with the epithalamic ballads, ditties, balls, mummeries, jouets anent his recent nuptials, drowning aught else. Erasmus, the devoted friend and admirer of his companion in letters, had committed himself to warm and eloquent tributes, so much so that he, who disowned the intrepidity which canonized martyrs, found a happier and more assured asylum far from the land that endeared itself to him by ties of happy recollections and affectionate friendships.

Thomas More was born in 1480, four years before Luther; he was martyred in 1535, when the Reformation proudly rode the topmost crest of its dark, swollen waters, formless and inconstant as the waves that surged about it. Upon the fall of Cardinal Wolsey, he was selected as Lord Chancellor, assuming office in 1529, being then in his forty-ninth year. He was presumably the first layman, and admittedly the greatest lay or clerical incumbent who ever occupied the office. The comparative estimates sometimes instituted between More and Bacon, his only formidable rival, will hardly detract from the glory of the former, but in a crucial scrutiny dim the lustre of the latter. Both were men of eminent genius. With the tread and confidence of master minds both made successful, brilliant incursions into the fields of history, philosophy, theology and jurisprudence. If we balance them in their judicial characters, which falls in our present purview, we discover that Bacon may exhibit a more perfect mastery of technical detail, a greater knowledge of precedent, a more thorough grasp of the abstract principles of English law, a more masterful familiarity with

---

[3] Macaulay's Essays, Vol. I., p. 199. [4] " . . . *quo viro uno universa Anglia exteris gentibus nobilior est habita*." Letter 156 Works of Roger Ascham, Vol. I., Part II., p. 118. London, 1865. [5] Stapleton, *Vita Thomae Mori*, c. xxxi. 1869.

> . . . the lawless science of our laws,
> The codeless myriad of precedent,
> The wilderness of single instances ;

but these qualifications, rare as they are, were more than outweighed by More's innate juridical poise of mind, intuitive perception of the most complex legal difficulties and an illuminant clearness of decision which, if it did not always carry conviction, invariably commanded respect, even in the face of the most vehement dissent. When it comes to moral attributes the comparison becomes a glaring contrast. Not a remote insinuation of scandal ever affected the stainless integrity of More, not a mote of suspicion ever flitted over his untarnished ermine, while obsequious servility, unpardonable ingratitude, criminal malversation in office, left blotches on "the greatest, wisest and meanest of mankind" that three centuries of persistent and aggressive apologetics have not explained away, much less effaced.

If his appointment was received with popular approbation in England, where his conspicuous ability, blameless life and earnest piety was the theme of national praise, it was hailed by a perfect chorus of classic latinity and exuberant enthusiasm in Continental Europe, where his epigrammatic wit, profound scholarship and zealous advocacy of classical learning earned him the respect and applause of all cultivated minds. As Chancellor his irreproachable conduct and legal supremacy was only equaled by his methodical application and indefatigable capacity for arduous work. The legacy of accumulated work left by his predecessor was disposed of with astonishing rapidity, so that one day the docket being found empty, a condition probably without precedent, some humorous punster celebrated the event in the clever epigram:

When More some years had Chancellor been,
No more suits did remain;
The like shall never more be seen
Till more there be again.

In entering upon his office as Lord Chancellor he "had to swear," to quote Seebohm, "by his oath of office, among other things, to carry out the laws against heresy. He became by virtue of this office the public prosecutor of heretics."[6]

The law against heresy as we find it in the English Statute Book[7] made it a capital felony. The origin and cause of this drastic legislation lies deeper than the superficial student of history supposes. It was enacted in 1401 against the Lollards and Wickliffites, who "had been," as Froude, with manifest reluctance and to the surprise of those who know his historical methods, owns, "political revolutionists as well as religious reformers, the revolt against the spiritual authority had encouraged and countenanced a revolt against the secular, and we cannot be surprised, therefore, that the institutions should have united to repress a danger which was formidable to both."[8] It is always well to bear in mind, especially in view of the fact that has been sedulously kept out of sight, that "when we speak of the Lollards as martyrs," to put it pithily in the words of Dean Hook, "we ought to regard them as a kind of political martyrs rather than religious; they made religion their plea in order to swell the numbers of the discontented, but their actions all tended to a revolution in the State as well as Church." Like the Reformation in the sixteenth century and the French Revolution in the eighteenth, which historical criticism pronounces cause and effect, for both had a common genesis, the Lollards "directed their first attacks upon the Church because the Church was a most vulnerable part of the constitution. But the civilians," and this almost gives the analogy the force of an identity, "the citizen people were quite as much alarmed at their proceedings as the ecclesiastical. Both Church and State regarded the principles of the Lollards as subversive of all order in things temporal as in things spiritual."[9] This view is further confirmed by another fact usually overlooked, and one which Canon Stubbs brings clearly to light—that an exhaustive research of the history of England during the Middle Ages can produce but three instances, up to the legislation against Lollardism, where heresy was punished.[10]

---

[6] "The Era of the Protestant Revolution," pp. 180-181. [7] 2. H. iv., c. 15. [8] "History of England," Vol. II., p. 33. [9] "Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury," Vol. III., p. 72. [10] Stubbs: "Constitutional History of England," Vol. III., p. 353.

It was the identification of false doctrine with civil disorder, the association of heresy with rebellion, that made them an alarming menace to the populace, a political treason to the State, an object of condemnation to the Church. By a simple and pardonably specious process of reasoning, one that seemed imperious to the lawgiver, reassuring to the patriot and endorsed by conservative sentiment in Catholic and Protestant countries, and one that still finds a strong constituency, orthodoxy was legally defined, to quote an eminent Protestant theologian, Hagenbach, as "an obligation which man owed to the State; heresy, on the contrary, was considered a political crime."[11] "It was argued, to quote another Protestant authority and press the analogy closer, "that if treason and disrespect to earthly powers incurred the severest penalties, much more ought there to be inflicted on the guilty parties who, by their maintenance of false doctrine, had both imperiled souls and done despite to the majesty of heaven. . . . All sects agreed in the duty of exterminating heretics and unbelievers by the sword."[12] "To the sixteenth century," is the observation of one who speaks with commanding authority, Professor Gairdner, "heresy was a very serious evil . . . it was not mere wrong opinion, it was arrogance tending to a breach of the peace. Coercion of some kind seemed to be fairly called for. . . . A heretic," he continues, with striking clearness, "it should be remembered, is not only one who holds wrong opinions, we all do that more or less in the course of our life; he is one who arrogantly asserts in the face of authority that he is right when he is not competent, either in learning or in judgment, to discuss the matter. Thought was as free in the Middle Ages as it is in the present day," a demonstrable fact which is daily receiving wider recognition with thinking men; "but," he goes on, "if a fresh thinker saw any new light upon old questions he was expected to dispute the point in the schools with competent theologians, and not pour a flood of sophistries into the minds of admiring congregations, while claiming absolute irresponsibility for the position he took up."[13] In short, to reject the State religion was like refusing the State currency and, borrowing an illustration from St. Thomas Aquinas, establishing a mint of one's own.

Religious persecution, call it a folly, a madness or a crime, was indigenous to every soil, Christian or Pagan, Catholic or Protestant, with the one cogent, palliative plea in favor of Catholicity, that its endeavor was to preserve the integrity of Christian Unity. The effort made to father the ill-favored offspring, with all its brood of exaggerated monstrosities, on the Catholic Church has long since been abandoned to the recondite investigation of freshmen prize essayists, or the innocuous deliberations of the annual rustic Sabbath school convention. "Persecution among the early Protestants," writes Lecky, "was a distinct and definite doctrine, digested into elaborate treatises, indissolubly connected with a large portion of the received theology, developed by the most enlightened and farseeing theologians and enforced against the most inoffensive as against the most formidable sects. It was the doctrine of the palmiest days of Protestantism. It was taught by those who are justly esteemed its greatest leaders."[14] "Persecution," in the opinion of Hallam, "is the deadly original sin of the Reformed churches, that which cools every honest man's zeal for their cause, in proportion as his reading becomes more extensive."[15] The multiplication of sects and the dogmatism of private interpretation only aggravated matters, substituting for the one corporate authority, which was decried as the source of persecution, an infuriated host of ranting and canting sects, who in the same breath that they cursed the intolerance of Rome, inflicted the most pitiless punishment on each other. "Individuals," says Froude, "did not hesitate to ascribe to themselves the infallibility which they denied to the Church. Everybody was intolerant on principle, and was ready to cut the throat of an opponent whom his arguments failed to convince."[16] Probably the most truculent language on this subject we find, not in the imperial edicts of Trajan, Diocletian or Caracalla, but in the religiously preserved writings of the Saxon Reformer of Wittenberg. "If we punish thieves by the rope," fairly shouts Luther, "murderers by the sword, heretics by fire, why do we not attack with every weapon . . . the whole sink of Romish Sodoma . . . and wash our hands in its blood?"[17] The glosses usually adopted to explain away this savage ferocity have been abandoned by writers familiar with Luther and his language. The eminent Tübingen Professor of Theology Weizsäcker very judiciously contends that "it must not be overlooked that Luther in these fierce expressions, in the *Epit. Resp. Silv. Prier.*, and in his treatise against the Bull of Antichrist, represents his procedure against the hierarchy as a punishment for heresy, therefore a justifiable interference!"[18] A subject of uncommon interest to the psychologist would be the attempted solution, how far the mind that gave utterance to such a doctrine would have allowed the will under advantageous conditions to put it in execution! Calvin, the Moses of the Reformed churches, the reign and dominion of the Genevan predestined saints firmly established, himself in the height of his unchallenged power, enforced his doctrines with an inflexible Mohammedan rigor. For the most trivial moral derelictions the most summary penalties were dealt out. "Between 1542 and 1546," says an authority of unimpeachable character in this specific case, "no fewer than fifty-eight persons were sentenced to death and seventy-six to exile. On the 6th of March, 1545, the gaoler reported to the Council that the prisons were full and could hold no more. . . . 'Human life,' says Professor Kampschulte, 'appeared to have lost its value in New Geneva.' "[19] Surely no Spanish Inquisitor, painted in all the revolting hues of traditional bloodthirstiness, could approximate the Mephistophelian ingenuity of the same spiritual autocrat, when in vindicating his conduct in the Servetus murder[20] he not only maintains that "heretics should be put to death without mercy," but intimates a doctrine by the closest inductive reasoning—one that stands unprecedented and unparalleled in the history of civilized or even uncivilized nations—that even "those who doubted this [inflicting the death penalty on heresy] should die for their doubts."[21]

---

[11] "History of Doctrines," Vol. I., p. 244. [12] Chamber's "Book of Days," Vol. II., p. 504
[13] J. Gairdner in "Academy," 1891, pp. 491-492.

---

[14] "History of Rationalism," Vol. II., p. 61. [15] "Constitutional History of England," Vol I., p. 154. N. Y., 1886. [16] "Short Studies on Great Subjects," Vol. I., p. 173. [17] Walch, "Luther's Werke," Vol. 20, p. 223; 2203-2207 et seq. [18] "Göttingen Gelehrten Anzeigen," p. 845. 1881.

Nor can we claim an amelioration, much less immunity from this spirit of persecution, in studying the growth of our Republic. During the entire colonial period "we were essentially a nation of Protestants . . . and took similar [European] methods in maintaining and perpetuating our Protestantism, excluding those who dissented from it from sharing in the government and frankly adopting the policy which had prevailed in England from the time of Queen Elizabeth."[22] We must hang our heads in shame and sorrow when we study the Pilgrim Fathers' theocracy, when "the cruelty of their laws against freedom of conscience," says Judge Black, "and the unfailing rigor with which they were executed made Massachusetts odious throughout the world."[23]

Another salient point, a contributing if not essential factor in studying the question, is the extreme severity of the law and contemptuous valuation placed on the sanctity of human life during the period of history under consideration. The law encompassed the cattle and game of the nobleman with the most rigid legislation, pitilessly enforced; it exposed human life to the most bloody penalties for the most petty transgressions. It is an axiom that no law was ever enacted without the object of its enforcement. Had all the laws of the English Statute Book, with capital punishment attached, been enforced according to their letter and intent, the population would have been decimated, the nation deluged in rivers of blood. According to Hollinshedd, 72,000 persons perished during the thirty-eight years' reign of Henry VIII. (1509-1547), mostly for being "rogues and beggars," in other words, their only crime was poverty. During the reign of Queen Elizabeth (1558-1603), extending over forty-five years, 16,000 were executed.[24] The golden days of Christian love and fraternal helpfulness,

---

[19] *Edinburgh Review*, January, 1870, p. 75. [20] *Fidelis expositio errorum M. Serveti et brevis eorundem refutatio ubi docetur jure gladii coercendos esse haereticos.* [21] Ib., p. 78. [22] Stillé: "Religious Tests in Pennsylvania," p. 10. [23] "Essays and Speeches of James Black," p. 193.

> When good and bad were all unquestioned fed,
> When monks still practiced their dear Lord's command
> And rained their charity throughout the land,

were fast becoming nothing more than lingeringly sad memories of what was once "merrie old England." The suppression of the monasteries, sealing the beneficent channels of applied charity, threw the needy, homeless and helpless on the munificence of the government's bounty. To cope with the unexpected problem it in turn had recourse to a novel and effective altruism hitherto unknown in Christendom—one of the first and permanent fruits of the Reformation—by expunging poverty from the Christ-like virtues and placing it on the penal code, and by one blow extirpating poverty and its unfortunate victims. Even as late as the reign of George I. (1714-1727) the bloody code was still more amplified by enacting laws, inflicting the death penalty on all who were armed or disguised in any forest, park, highway, open heath, common or town; unlawful hunting, killing or stealing deer, robbing warrens, stealing or taking any fish out of any river, injuring Westminster Bridge or any other bridge.[25] The heresy act stood unrepealed in full force until 1677.

Such were the times, conditions and customs, contemporary motives, intentions and judgments under which More entered upon his official duties. Good sense and generous impulse would at once endeavor to wipe out the stigma cast on his name by establishing the valid claim that his violence in dealing with heretics was more an error attributable to his time than to his heart. But even this admission unduly and unjustly magnifies the rôle he played in suppressing heresy. The office involved upon him and his friends a nice and somewhat vexatious point of ethics, a perplexing tangle of casuistry. His theory of freedom of conscience was clearly formulated in a work in the hands of every cultivated Englishman, read and quoted throughout the continent. His friendship with men like Erasmus and Colet no doubt only emphasized and intensified it. How could he then administer the office of an inquisitor of heretical pravity? But to bring the analogy to a closer range of vision. How can the judge, painfully cognizant of the disastrous evils of intemperance, grant a license to sell liquor? How can the judge whose conscience revolts against capital punishment inflict the death penalty? How can the judge whose soul shrinks from the sickening iniquity of the divorce procedure dissolve the bands of matrimony? Must individual predilection subordinate itself to official duty; harassing scruples yield to oath-bound obligations; subjective interpretation of the law surrender to the manifest intent of the law giver? "How was it possible for More the Statesman," asks a writer in the *Quarterly Review,* "to advocate toleration of sectaries, who sought violently to subvert the existing religion with which the civil order was so strictly united? Or for More the Magistrate to ignore the provisions of the laws he had sworn to administer for the maintenance of that religion?" He strengthens his position still further by quoting Jeremy Taylor's clinching argument that "the commonwealth is made a church; the law of the nation made a part of the religion; Christ is made King and the temporal power is His substitute. But if we say, like the people in the Gospel, '*Nolumus hunc regnare,*' then God has armed the temporal power with a sword to cut us off."[26]

---

[24] *Edinburgh Review*, Vol. xix., p. 391. [25] 9 George I., c. 22; 12 George II., c. 29.

More was an avowed advocate and fearless champion of freedom of conscience perilously in advance of his time, his path-breaking innovations, promulgating "advanced opinions," according to Hume, "which even at present would be deemed somewhat too free."[27] In his "Utopia," a work prototyped in Plato's "Republic," and which was not a mere philosophical romance, but contained a perfect storehouse of legislative wisdom and political maxims, he published to the world his real views, as Erasmus tells us, "to show how commonwealths might be better managed," and above all, that "he had England, which he knows thoroughly, principally in view." The mere publication of this work was an act of daring hardihood. "Only a thinker who placed conviction above even life," says a writer whose admirable study of More is unfortunately somewhat distorted, "would have dared put forth a work so bold and so well calculated to open the eyes of the people to the shallow pretense as well as criminality of the rich and powerful."[28] And in it we find such a vehement advocacy of liberty of conscience that it lends more than an allusive importance to the letter of Erasmus,[29] in which he strongly intimates that it was neither More nor the Bishops who encouraged the proceedings against heresy, but Henry VIII. himself. Erasmus, in the confidence of the King, an intimate in the household of More a great deal of the time, was in a position to speak with knowledge and authority. What other meaning can we take from this letter, where he tells us that "he has it on good authority that the King is somewhat more severe to heresy than the bishops and the priests?[30] Jortin does not convey the full import of More's ideas when he tells us that "he makes it one of their [Utopian] maxims that 'no man ought to be punished for his religion;' the utmost severity practiced among them being banishment, and that not for disparaging their religion, but for inflaming the people to sedition; a law being made among them that 'every man might be of what religion he pleased.' "[31] More displays a deeper political sagacity, a wider human experience, a more observant legislative farsightedness. "Therefore all this matter [religion]," are his own words, which we modernize, "he [Utopus] left undiscussed and gave to every man free liberty and choice to believe what he would." When a fanatic inveighed against the Christian religion and began "to wax so hot in his matter that he did not only prefer our religion before all others, but also did utterly despise and condemn all others, calling them profane and the followers of them wicked and devilish and the children of eternal damnation," then, after fruitless efforts to bring him to his senses and ineffectual remonstrances to silence him, he was condemned to exile "not as a despiser of religion, but as a seditious person and a raiser up of dissension among the people. To do away with all dissension King Utopus issued a decree "that it should be lawful for every man to favor and follow what religion he would, and that he might do the best he could to bring others to his opinion, so that he did it peaceably, gently, quietly and soberly, without hasty or contentious rebuking and inveighing against others. If he could not by fair and gentle speech induce them into his opinion, yet he should use no kind of violence and refrain from displeasant and seditious words. . . . And this he surely thought a very unmete and foolish thing and a point of arrogant presumption to compel all others by violence and threatenings to agree to the same that thou believest to be true. Therefore all this matter he left undiscussed and gave to every man liberty and choice to believe what he would."[32] "By my soul," is the solemn reiteration of the same sentiment . . . "I would all the world were all agreed to take all violence and compulsion away upon all sides, Christian and heathen, and that no man were constrained to believe but as he could by grace, wisdom and good works induced; and that he that would go to God, go in God's name, and he that will go with the Devil, the Devil go with him." Continuing about heretics, he states what Maitland, Lee, etc., have proved beyond the shadow of a doubt, that "while they forbore violence, there was little violence done them," and that "never were they, by any temporal punishment of their bodies, anything sharply handled, till they began to be violent themselves."[33] This in clear, unambiguous and forceful terms explains More's attitude on heresy and the punishment of heretics.

---

[26] *Quarterly Review*, October, 1896. pp. 361-362. [27] "History of England," Vol. III., p. 122 Philadelphia, 1796. [28] Arena, vol. 15, p. 118.

---

[29] *Epist. 426.* [30] ". . . *aliquanto minus aequum esse novis dogmatibus quam episcopos aut sacerdotes.*" [31] Jortin: "The Life of Erasmus," Vol. I., p. 172.

More was too much of the statesman, too deeply conversant with human nature, not to realize, to borrow an illustration, that spiritual machinery at best turns out an indifferent article, that penal laws may teach conformity, but never conviction. The "outward sign" may be demonstratively exhibited, but the "inward grace" will be found lamentably absent.

But, continues the indictment of the Earl of Portsmouth, "men and women were taken and tried in Sir Thomas More's house at Chelsea and burned for their principles." James Bainham . . . [was] brought before More, who had him whipped in his presence . . . racked before his eyes!"

A rather exhaustive study of the subject, involving no little amount of laborious reading and painstaking research, traces the More myth to two sources—John Foxe, its parent, and James Anthony Froude, its last defender. Foxe and his Puritan confederates are the polluters of history whom Maitland, in words of burning indignation, pillories for stating "with great deliberation and solemnity . . . what they knew to be false; and that the manner in which such falsehoods were avowed by those who told them and recorded by their friends and admirers is sufficient evidence that such a practice was not considered discreditable," men whom he arraigns with verified evidence "for reckless imputations of all the worst motives and the most odious vices."[34] The same Foxe Brewer charges with downright dishonesty and wilful tampering with documents.[35] The same Foxe Dr. Arnold, when professor at University College, Oxford, denounced "as a rampant bigot, and, like all of his class, utterly unscrupulous in assertion; the falsehoods, misrepresentations and exaggerations to which he gave circulation are endless."[36] The same Foxe and Wyatt, who are the Puritan myth-mongers whom Froude, in blind slavishness, follows if they buttress his theories, but on whose veracity he casts doubt and suspicion if they militate against them. It is hard to tell whether his language is apologetic or censorious when he tells us that these English Reformation oracles "were surrounded with the heat and flame of a controversy, in which public and private questions were wrapped inseparably together; and the more closely we scrutinize their narratives, the graver occasion there appears for doing so!" As for Foxe's modern protagonist, if we follow the sliding scale of the deplorable decadence and moral debasement of contemporaneous historical writing and reach the zero mark of peerless dishonesty we arrive at the name of Froude,[37] whose historical fictions are taken with no more seriousness by critical students than the quips of a mediæval court jester. Incidentally it may be of archaic interest that Luther[38] espouses the Puritan cause; but the Reformer was in that period of life when "as a controversialist"—we are quoting Canon Mozley—"he was literally and wholly without decorum, conscience, taste or fear,"[39] and therefore he can be charitably dismissed.

---

[32] "The Seconde Booke of Utopia," pp. 146-147. Cambridge, 1883. [33] A dialogue of Sir More, touching the pestilent sect of Luther and Tindal, C. IV., p. 16. London, 1530. [34] "Essays on Subjects Connected with the Reformation in England," pp. 2, 48. London, 1849. [35] "Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic," etc., Vol. I., p. 60.

Lord Campbell, whose conduct of the Newman-Achilli trial gave an exhibition of anti-Catholic bias that shocked England, Protestant as it was, replies to the charge. "That More was present at the examination of heretics before the Council and concerned in subjecting them to confinement cannot be denied, for such was the law, which he willingly obeyed; but we ought rather to wonder at his moderation in an age when the leaders of each set thought they were bound in duty to heaven to persecute the votaries of the other."[40]

The case of James Bainham is worked up with unctuous rhetoric and imaginative fervor by Foxe,[41] and in the deft hands of Froude[42] becomes a climacteric episode, full of dainty thrusts, telling side plays, cunning suppressions and artful distortions, until the *tout-ensemble* reveals More to us as a heart-chilling, soul-paralyzing ogre. Fortunately More himself has shed some light on this charge. "Let us"—we again quote Lord Campbell—"let us hear what is said on this subject by More himself, allowed on all hands . . . to have been the most sincere, candid and truthful of men:" "Divers of them have said," is the sobbing pathos of the man whose cheerful wit did not desert him under the glistening blade of the headman's axe, "that of such as were in my house when I was Chancellor I used to examine them with torments, causing them to be bound to a tree in my garden and then piteously beaten. Except their sure keeping, I never else did cause any such thing to be done unto any of the heretics in all my life, except only twain; one was a child and a servant of mine in mine own house, whom his father, ere he came to me, had nursed up in such matters and set him to attend upon George Jay. This Jay did teach the child his ungracious heresy against the blessed sacrament of the altar, which heresy this child in my house began to teach another child. And upon that I caused a servant of mine to strip him like a child before mine household for amendment of himself and ensample of others. Another was one who, after he had fallen into these frantic heresies, soon fell into plain open frenzy, albeit he had been in Bedlam, and afterwards, by beating and correction, gathered his remembrance. Being therefore set at liberty, his old frenzies fell again into his head. Being informed of this relapse, I caused him taken by the constable and bounden to a tree in the street before the whole town, and there striped him until he waxed weary. Verily, God be thanked, I hear no harm of him now. And of all who ever came into my hand for heresy, so help me God, else had never any of them any stripe or stroke given them so much as a fillup in the forehead."[43] "More, if any man," says the writer in the *Quarterly*, "may be believed on his bare word,"[44] and this should summarily dispose of this charge.

---

[36] Quoted in *Catholic World*, Vol. XV., p. 567. [37] "It was a calamity to himself" is the language Augustus Jessop uses in summing up Froude's historical knight errantry; "it was a great misfortune to English historic literature, when Mr. Froude, nearly forty years ago, became possessed by that historic delusion which he has never been able to shake off, of which he is now the unhappy victim, and which, like all fanatics, he is passionately desirous to impose upon all who will listen to his pleading. More than thirty years of argument and criticism and evidence the most irresistible and convincing to all cultured intellects except his own, of new light coming from the right hand and the left, of documentary proof accumulated from the archives of almost every country in Europe, and pointing all to the same conclusions, have been wasted upon him." . . . *English Historical Review*, April, 1892, p. 360. [38] "Sämmtliche Werke," Vol. LXI., p. 365; LXII., p. 347. [39] "Essays Historical and Theological," p. 378. [40] "The Lives of the Lord Chancellors, etc., of England," Vol. I., p. 448. [41] "Book of Martyrs," Vol. IV., p. 702 et seq. [42] "History of England," Vol. II., 89-90.

But it may be demurred that More himself admitted, even gloried, in his severity to heretics, for did he not write his own epitaph, in which he tells us—*furibus, homicidis, hæreticisque molestus*—that he was troublesome to thieves, murderers and heretics?

"But this," in the words of Professor Gairdner, who will give our reply, "is really not very difficult to answer. Suppose that instead of a Lord Chancellor of England," he continues, with incisive logic, "it were the case of a respectable gamekeeper who was compelled for one reason or other to give up his employment? Suppose that such a one were to say to a friend, 'You may write upon my tombstone that I served my master faithfully for many years to his entire satisfaction, and that all honest men about me held me in good esteem; but that I was very troublesome to thieves, murderers and, above all, to poachers?' Here you have precisely the same ascending scale that you find in the epitaph More wrote for himself; but it would not imply that even a gamekeeper considered that poaching, especially poaching from mere thoughtlessness or ignorance of the law, was quite as bad a thing as robbery or murder. It would only mean that the gamekeeper's duties brought him into direct collision with poachers, but that occasionally he had to deal with some of the most desperate characters, as indeed poaching, a wrong thing in itself, was very apt to lead on to worse things. So also Sir Thomas More"—we cannot refrain giving the quotation in its entirety—"as Chancellor had but little to do with the ordinary administration of the criminal law, but we know that he sat a Commissioner for the suppression of heresy and heretical books. And I presume that as a leading member of the Privy Council he must have heretics sometimes brought before him in the Star Chamber. In fact, Erasmus extols his clemency in that, having the power of putting men to death for heresy, he strove only to cure their mental condition and prevent the spread of the evil. For it was difficult to deny that, judged by its fruits, heresy was a very real evil in those days. . . . In England it was publishing scurrilous pamphlets full of the most shameful falsehoods and irreverence. It was no more a theological evil than Mormonism. More hated it with all his soul, and did his utmost to suppress it by means strictly humane as well as legal."[45]

---

[43] "Apology." C. 36, "English Works," p. 902, ac. Campbell ut. sup., pp. 447-448.

[44] *Quarterly Review*, October, 1896, p. 362.

Would not the epitaph More wrote for his father be a most apposite and truthful one of himself, when he describes him

"Homo civilis, innocens, mitis misericors, æquus, et integer,"

which his great grandson feelingly paraphrases "a man courteous and affable, innocent and harmless, meek and gentle, merciful and pitiful, just and uncorrupted?"[46]

That Gairdner stands not alone in his belief of More's complete innocence, but that he reflects the consentient opinion of modern English historians, men who have skimmed the froth and scum from history's stream and sounded and analyzed its undercurrents, is convincingly evident from the judicial pronouncement of a man who, in his endeavor to trace these calumnies to their source, "has searched every contemporary document that could be found," says one of the most authoritative of English reviews, "and who is beyond the suspicion of misrepresenting facts."[47] This man, Paul Friedmann, examining the charges brought against More, says: "These accusations against More have been repeated by some later writers, but there is not a tittle of evidence that he was guilty of the cruelties imputed to him. Such charges conflict with all that we know of his character and his modes of thought, and to his contemporaries they were absolutely incredible. Henry gained nothing by the attempt to tarnish the fame of one whose virtues were so widely known and so cordially appreciated."[48]

---

[45] *Academy*, 1891, p. 491. [46] "The Life of Sir Thomas More, Cresacre More," p. 9. London, 1838.

Thus we see that under the most searching criticism and piercing scrutiny, Protestant writers alone having been laid under contribution, Sir Thomas More's innocence of the charge of persecuting heretics becomes an historical fact proved to actual demonstration. The calumnies which for centuries tried to blacken and blast his reputation will be tearlessly, even joyously, consigned to their final resting place beside the other bleached, dessicated bones in the charnel house of John Foxe's consecrated falsehoods, beyond the possibility of a transient galvanization, beyond the hope of an ephemeral resurrection.

As for More, the resistless sweep of historical truth, the avenging hand of retributive justice, the almighty power of a justifying Providence, will not only elevate him to a niche where he shall be hailed as "the glory of his age," a reluctant tribute that even Burnet pays him, enshrine his memory as one of the greatest geniuses and benefactors of his country, but lift him to the apex of the world's Immortals, where few loom over him, and viewing his social, political, judicial and spiritual virtues, still fewer dare stand beside him. For in what Englishman do we find such a prodigal combination of the most soaring human attributes as in More? "To say that Sir Thomas More was the brightest character of the age in which he lived, an age which exhibited the ferocity of uncivilized man without his simplicity, and the degeneracy of modern times without their refinement, were praise beneath his merit; to challenge the long and splendid series of English biography to produce his equal at any period might be deemed presumptuous; but if the wise and honest statesman, the acute and incorrupt magistrate, the loyal but independent subject, constitute an excellent public man; if the good father, the good husband and the good master, the firm friend, the moral though witty companion, the upright neighbor, the pious Christian and the patient martyr, form a perfect private character—*ecce homo.*"[49]

---

[47] *Edinburgh Review*, January, 1886, p. 61. [48] "Anne Boleyn: A Chapter of English History," Vol. II., p. 88. London, 1884.

H. G. Ganss.

Carlisle, Pa.

"THE SACRIFICES OF MASSES."

THE REFORMERS AND THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

"It is often urged, and sometimes felt and granted, that there are in the Articles propositions or terms inconsistent with the Catholic faith; or, at least, when persons do not go so far as to feel the objection as of force, they are perplexed how best to reply to it, or how most simply to explain the passages on which it is made to rest."

With these words the Rev. J. H. Newman opened the famous Tract 90, which was intended both to allay the scruples about subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles then beginning to be felt by his followers, and at the same time to test how far the authorities of the Church of England were prepared to go in allowing the promulgation of the new teaching. The Tractarian leaders, like their predecessors and models—the Caroline divines—were diligent students of the ancient fathers. And like those divines, too, they had come to see that the Reformers had erred grievously in their successful attempt to root out from the English Church the very notion of an objective sacrifice, leaving nothing in its place but the offering of ourselves, our lauds and thanksgivings. The writings of the fathers had taught them to regard some external sacrifice as of the very essence of religion, of an adoring recognition by the creature of His Creator. They were ready to echo the plaint of the Catholic Dr. Scot, speaking against the reintroduction in Elizabeth's reign of the Prayer Book and the consequent abolition of the offering of Christ, "taken away by this booke, as the authors thereof do willingly acknowledge; cryinge owte of the offering of Christe oftener than once, notwithstanding that all the holie fathers do teach it, manifestly affirmynge Christe to be offered daylye after an unbloody manner. But if these men did understand and consider what dothe ensue and followe of this their affirmation, I thinke they wolde leave their rashness and return to the truthe again. For if it be trewe that they say that there is no externale sacrifyce in the Newe Testament, then dothe it follow that there is no priesthood under the same, whose office is, saythe St. Paul, 'to offer up gyfts and sacrifices for synne.' And if there be no priesthood, then is there no religion under the New Testament. And if we have no religion, then we be 'sine Deo in hoc mundo;' that is, we be without God in this worlde. For one of these dothe necessarily depend and followe uppon an other."[1]

---

[49] "Portraits of Illustrious Personages of Great Britain." Edmund Lodge, Vol. I., p. 41. 8 vols. London, 1849-1850.

With such belief in their minds the Tractarians set themselves to the task of overcoming the obstacles presented by the wording of their Church's formularies. They took for granted that the Church of England was an integral part of the Church Catholic. Any formulary, therefore, accepted by her must be capable of interpretation in a Catholic sense. "Had it [a Catholic sense] not been provided for, possibly the Articles never would have been accepted by our Church at all."[2] Nor were they concerned to prove that this Catholic sense was intended by the actual framers of the Articles. They were quite ready to admit the utter Protestantism of the chief Reformers, whose only object in leaving the Articles ambiguous was "to comprehend those who did not go so far in Protestantism as themselves."[3] "The framers have gained their side of the compact in effecting the reception of the Articles, let Catholics have theirs, too, in retaining their own Catholic interpretation of them. . . . The Protestant confession was drawn up with the purpose of including Catholics; and Catholics now will not be excluded. . . . We could not then have found fault with their words; they cannot now repudiate our meaning."[4]

We have quoted thus at length from Tract 90 to try and make evident the bona fides with which the Oxford men set about their difficult task. The first feeling of a Catholic, when he hears of an attempt to make the Thirty-first Article harmonize with the Sacrifice of the Mass, is one of disgust and irritation at the seemingly manifest insincerity of the interpreter. Is it not beyond dispute, he exclaims, that the Reformers abhorred the very name of sacrifice, loathed and trampled upon the Mass and stereotyped their hatred of it in those blasphemous words: "The sacrifices of Masses, in which it was commonly said that the priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits?"[5]

All that may be true, replied the Tractarians, yet "it is a duty which we owe both to the Catholic Church and our own to take our reformed confessions in the most Catholic sense they will admit;

---

[1] Cardwell: Hist. of Conf., p. 111, ed. Oxf., 1841. [2] Tract 90. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid. [5] Art. xxxi.

we have no duties towards their framers. . . . The interpretation [Anglo-Catholics] take was intended to be admissible; though not that which their authors took themselves."[6]

According to this view the Reformers, whilst in their hearts rejecting any external sacrifice whatever, so framed their article that it might be understood as rejecting only that which all England, and all genuine Catholics, too, would fain see rejected. "On the whole, then, it is conceived that the Article before us neither speaks against the Mass in itself, nor against its being an offering, though commemorative, for the quick and the dead for the remission of sins; especially since the decree of Trent says that 'the fruits of the Bloody Oblation are through this most abundantly obtained; so far is the latter from detracting in any way from the former; but against its being viewed, on the one hand, as independent of or distinct from the sacrifice on the cross, which is blasphemy, and, on the other, its being directed to the emolument of those to whom it pertains to celebrate it, which is imposture in addition."[7] "It was the 'sacrifices of Masses' [that was spoken against], certain observances, for the most part private and solitary, which the writers of the Articles knew to have been in force in time past,[8] and saw before their eyes, and which involved certain opinions and a certain teaching."[9]

This interpretation met with instant and vehement opposition from the authorities of the Anglican Church. But as it was felt to be vitally necessary for the Anglo-Catholic position, it was stoutly defended, *e. g.*, by Dr. Pusey and Dr. W. G. Ward. And it has been maintained by the High-Church party ever since, though with considerable variation in important details from its presentment in Tract 90. It will not be without profit to note these at the outset. Newman was ready to admit that the framers of the Articles were themselves opposed to any external sacrifice, but so worded Article 31 that it might be interpreted as condemning only abuses in practice and errors in teaching offensive to all good Catholics. The abuses were connected with the chantry system and stipend Masses, and were of long standing, having "crept into the Church these many hundred years." The erroneous doctrine was that the Mass was an offering independent of the cross.

W. G. Ward[10] seems to agree with his leader as to the inner mind and spirit of the framers; yet he attributes their repugnance to a sacrifice to ignorance, not to a deliberate heretical intent such as apparently animated Luther. "On the subject of the Mass, the quotations brought forward from Cranmer and Ridley in the *Edinburgh Review* make it to my mind a good deal more probable that they really mistook the doctrines held by the Church on the subject."[11] Then, after a quotation from Cranmer which we shall here have occasion to use presently, Mr. Ward adds: "So writes the 'Father of the English Reformation:' whatever other feelings may rise in the mind of the religious reader on perusing the passage, this is plain that he altogether misunderstood the sacred doctrine he opposed, and was even in his own despite, in this instance at least, preserved from any direct 'fighting against God.' "[12]

---

[6] Tract 90. [7] Ibid. [8] "What dens of thieves the churches of England have been made by the blasphemous buying and selling the most precious body and blood of Christ in the Mass, as the world was made to believe, at dirges, at months' minds, at trentalls, in abbeys and chantries, besides other horrible abuses which we now see and understand . . . all such fulsomeness and filthiness, as through blind devotion and ignorance hath crept into the Church *these many hundred years*."—Homily on repairing churches (quoted in Tract 90.)
[9] Ibid. [10] "A Few More Words in Support of No. 90," Oxford, 1841.

The words of Bishop Forbes, of Brechin, indicate a similar view on his part with regard to the Reformers. After quoting largely from St. Catherine of Genoa's treatise on Purgatory, he says: "Had this been even *an* aspect of Purgatory, presented to the minds of the framers of our Articles as a possible authoritative exposition of the doctrine, who would say that 'the Romish doctrine of Purgatory' would ever have been censured in it?"[13] And of Article 31 in particular he writes: "It is probable that the English Reformers were not conversant with the Eastern Liturgies, otherwise we cannot conceive how they could have preferred the Second to the First Book of Edward, or have rested content with the emendations at the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth."[14]

On the other hand, there were apparently some who felt that to attribute to the Reformers an intention of doing away with every kind of external sacrifice would endanger the Anglican position. Accordingly we find Dr. Pusey holding[15] that the writers of the Article had the "private special Masses" mainly in view and only included the "public Mass" so far as it agreed with them in the doctrine that it was Christ Himself who was offered and that such offering *specially* benefited the individual chosen by the priest. That this particular kind of oblation was the only one intended to be condemned Dr. Pusey considers evident from the fact that Bishop Ridley "states his objection to the Romish doctrine of the sacrifice to be founded on the error of Transubstantiation: 'Transubstantiation is the very foundation whereon all their erroneous doctrine doth stand;' and '*This kind* of oblation standeth upon Transubstantiation his cousin-german, and they do both grow upon the same ground.'

---

[11] "A Few More Words in Support of No. 90." Oxford, 1841, page 62. [12] Ibid. [13] XXXIX Art., ed. 1868, p. 350. [14] Ibid, p. 602. [15] "A Letter to the Rev. R. W. Jelf, D. D." Oxf., 1841, pp. 62-65.

And the celebrated dictum of Bishop Andrewes, which has passed almost into a proverbial statement of the principles of our Church, is but a following out of this of Bishop Ridley, 'Do ye take away from the Mass your Transubstantiation, and we shall not long have any question about the sacrifice.' Bishop Jewel also in like words states this to be the only point at issue. 'St. Cyprian . . . saith not as you say, we offer up *the Son of God substantially and really* unto the Father. Take away *only this blasphemy* wherewith you have deceived the world, and then talk of mingling the cup and of the sacrifice whilst ye list.' "[16]

Dr. Pusey is evidently in favor of rejecting Transubstantiation, whereas Newman, Ward and Forbes, whilst not openly professing their belief in it, try to give to the Anglican declaration in Article 28 a sense which would not exclude the Catholic doctrine. Since those early days the more prudent example of Dr. Pusey has been generally followed, viz., of maintaining the "orthodoxy" of the chief Reformers. Thus *e. g.*, Messrs Denny and Lacey, in "De Hierarchia Anglicana," do their utmost to show that the doctrine of the Real Presence was held by them and that they by no means intended in Article 28 to reject the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation as the mode of that Presence. In the latest work on this question,[17] the Rev. B. J. Kidd adopts in the main Dr. Pusey's position both as to the "orthodoxy" of the Reformers and also as to the "ratio" of that "orthodoxy," viz., the rejection of Transubstantiation. We think that examination of the Reformers' writings and acts puts beyond doubt the accuracy of Newman's judgment that they, in their hearts, were opposed to *any* external sacrifice. With respect to Dr. Ward's contention that they rejected the Catholic doctrine because they misunderstood it, we think that this is true in the sense that they had a clear knowledge of the doctrine itself, but could not perceive how it could be reconciled with the fundamental fact that Christ's death upon the cross is the all-sufficient price of man's redemption. We will give some quotations in proof of these two points. 1. *That they were fully acquainted with the true Catholic doctrine.* In a "Confutation of Four Romish Doctrines"—a work attributed to Bradford and his fellow-exiles during Mary's reign—we read: "How concerning the sacrifice they teach that, 'though our Saviour Himself did indeed make a full and perfect sacrifice, propitiatory and satisfactory for the sins of all the whole world, never more so; that is to say, bloodily, to be offered again, yet in His supper He offered the same sacrifice unto His Father, but unbloodily; that is to say, in will and desire, which is accounted often for the deed, as this was. Which unbloody sacrifice He commanded His Church to offer in remembrance of His bloody sacrifice, as the principle mean whereby His bloody sacrifice is applied both to the quick and the dead; as baptism is the mean by the which regeneration is applied by the priest to the infant or child that is baptized."[18]

---

[16] "A Letter to the Rev. R. W. Jelf, D. D.," Oxf., 1841, pp. 64, 65. [17] "The Later Mediæval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice." Church Historical Society, 1898.

It is equally evident that Cranmer himself had before his eyes the true Catholic doctrine free from all alleged errors and excesses. He thus quotes the argument of Bishop Gardiner:

"This is agreed and by the Scriptures plainly taught that the oblation and sacrifice of our Saviour Christ was and is a perfect work, once consummate in perfection without necessity of reiteration, as it was never taught to be reiterate, but a mere blasphemy to presuppose it. It is also in the Catholic teaching, grounded upon the Scripture, agreed, that the same sacrifice once consummate was ordained by Christ's institution in His most holy supper to be in the Church often remembered and shewed forth in such sort of shewing, as to the faithful is seen present the most precious body and blood of our Saviour Christ under the forms of bread and wine; which body and blood the faithful Church of Christian people grant and confess, according to Christ's words, to have been betrayed and shed for the sins of the world, and so in the same supper represented and delivered unto them, to eat and feed of it according to Christ's commandment, as of a most precious and acceptable sacrifice, acknowledging the same precious body and blood to be the sacrifice propitiatory for all the sins of the world, whereunto they only resort and only accompt that this very perfect oblation and sacrifice of Christian people, through which all other sacrifices necessary on our part be accepted and pleasant in the sight of God."[19]

To this Cranmer replies:

"For answer to all that you have here brought . . . the reader need not to do more but to look over my book again, and he shall see you fully answered beforehand."[20]

In that "book" he had written:

"It is a wondrous thing to see what shifts and cantels the popish antichrists devise to color and cloke their wicked errors . . . For the papists, to excuse themselves, do say that they make no new sacrifice, nor none other sacrifice than Christ made (for they be not so blind but they see that then they should add another sacrifice to Christ's sacrifice, and so make His sacrifice imperfect;) but they say that they make the selfsame sacrifice for sin that Christ Himself made.

---

[18] Writings of Bradford—Letters, Treatises, etc. Parker Society, p. 270. [19] Cranmer, On the Lord's Supper. Parker Society, p. 344. [20] Ibid.

"And here they run headlong into the foulest and most heinous error that ever was imagined. For if they make every day the same oblation and sacrifice for sin that Christ Himself made, and the oblation that He made was His death and the effusion of His most precious blood upon the cross for our redemption and price of our sins, then followeth it of necessity that they every day slay Christ and shed His blood, and so be they worse than the wicked Jews and Pharisees, which slew Him and shed His blood but once."[21]

Cranmer knew, too, that the Catholics taught that no new redemption was wrought by this sacrifice of the altar, but that, as Bradford had written, it was a mean, like baptism, whereby the bloody sacrifice could be applied to quick and dead. For in his defense of the Catholic doctrine of the sacrament the fourth error with which he charges the papists is that "they say that they offer Christ daily for the remission of our sins *and distribute and apply the merits of the Death of Christ* by their Masses."[22]

It is beyond dispute, then, that the Reformers were acquainted with the true Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and that they deliberately rejected it even in its pure, authoritative form as Newman thought. 2. And undoubtedly they did this because, as Ward surmised, *they misunderstood it;* they were unable to see that it in no way derogated from the all-sufficiency of the cross, nor introduced a new redemption. Their theological incapacity led them into the paths of heresy. In this they are more excusable than the heresiarch Luther. We have his own confession that for years he deliberately set himself to overthrow the Mass, and this against the clear light of his reason. At first he had to confess that the Scripture was too strong for him. It was only when he had excogitated his theory of consubstantiation that he saw his way to undermining the doctrine of the sacrifice. Then he began to instruct his English friends,[23] who, more logical than he, ended in Calvinistic tenets on this matter of the Real Presence and sacrifice.

It may seem strange that men who, at least before they became utterly Solifidian, recognized the necessity of the sacraments as means to apply to us the merits of the Passion should find insuperable difficulty in accepting the sacrifice of the altar even under this same ratio of a means. But we must remember that there is a great difference between the sacraments and the sacrifice. According to the Catholic doctrine Christ was truly present—whole Christ—in the latter and He was present in virtue of the priest's act: present, too, in a victim condition. Thus there was in the Mass a true sacrifice, a real offering of Christ to His Father. If this were so, then, as Bishop Harold Browne remarks,[24] "no other sacrifice could be compared with it. It must far exceed in glory and in value everything besides." If it be really in the priest's power to offer to the Father the beloved Son, then necessarily the Father must be "well pleased by such offering: it becomes, in fact, a propitiatory sacrifice. Here lay their difficulty. They could understand the sacrifices of the old law, for these had only an *imputed* propitiatory virtue: the victims were but brute beasts or fruits of the earth having in themselves no power to placate the wrath of God; therefore they in no way impugned the sufficiency of Calvary. But this sacrifice, if Christ were really there mystically immolated, must have a propitiatory, placatory virtue of its own, and so would become either the rival of or a supplement to the sacrifice of the cross. We shall have to deal with this difficulty again. Here a few words must suffice. Catholics have no difficulty in recognizing that every act of Christ when He was upon earth, that is, *in statu viatoris,* was infinitely meritorious *in itself*, and, *had God so chosen,* would have sufficed for the redemption of the world, *e. g.*, His incarnation, circumcision, crowning with thorns or scourging. The choice, by divine decree, of the Passion and Death as the sole ultimate cause of redemption, its formal price, did not deprive those other acts of the God-Man of their individual merit, neither did their being meritorious *in se* derogate from the supreme excellence and sufficiency of the Passion. This would hold good of the oblation with Mass, too, even if it were a meritorious act *in se* and could be considered independently of the Passion. But it is, as a matter of fact, neither meritorious *in se* nor independent; for it is the act of Christ as *comprehensor,* not *victor,* and the perpetual representation of that past act—His death upon the cross. It has infinite, infallible efficacy to propitiate God just because it is that death mystically perpetuated, unceasingly pleaded.

---

[21] Cranmer, On the Lord's Supper. Parker Society, p. 348. [22] Ibid, appendix, p. 25.

[23] " . . . the Germayne wryters, the cheffe schoolemasters and instructors of our countreymen in all these novelties." Abbot Fecknam :Cardwell's Conf., p. 101.

Luther had thought to get rid of the sacrifice by his doctrine of consubstantiation, and he did so, at least in any ordinary sense of "sacrifice." For an act that is merely *unitive,* and in no way "*destructive,*" does not fulfil the conditions required by the notion of sacrifice. Thus we do not call the unitive act of the Incarnation a "sacrifice." But in 1552, when the Articles were first put forth, the English Reformers had outrun their Lutheran comrades and determined to make once for all an utter end of the sacrifice by denying to the priest any power of causing Christ to be present, whether by consubstantiation or Transubstantiation or any other way. The believing communicant alone had power to draw Christ down, and that only at the moment of manducation. In their judgment to claim the power of "offering Christ" was a blasphemy, to claim a sacrificial priesthood was a lie. Thus Cranmer:

---

[24] Exp. of the Articles. Third ed., p. 741.

"All such priests as pretend to be Christ's successors in making a sacrifice of Him, they be His most heinous and horrible adversaries. For never no person made a sacrifice of Christ, but He Himself only. And thereforth St. Paul saith that Christ's priesthood cannot pass from Him to another."[25] And Ridley:

" 'By His own person He hath purged our sins.' These words, 'by His own person,' have an emphasis and vehemence which driveth away all sacrificing priests from such office as sacrificing, seeing that which He hath done by Himself He hath not left to be perfected by others."[26]

There remains one other point to be considered before we leave the Tractarians for their successors of to-day. Newman based his claim to taking the Articles in a Catholic sense on the supposition that some of the Reformers were not so far gone in Protestantism as their leaders, and would have interpreted the Articles as he himself wished to interpret them. Whatever force this plea may have with regard to such doctrines as Protestants themselves were divided upon, we do not think it can be urged as applying to this Article 31. We know that Gardiner and those who thought with him strained every point to prove the First Book of Edward VI. "patient" of a Catholic interpretation. But the only result of their efforts was their own deposition from office and the issue of the thoroughly Protestant Second Book. By the time the Articles came forth there were none of Catholic dispositions left in any important office. Neither they nor the clergy in convocation were given any opportunity of expressing their views upon the Articles, for they were issued by the King's authority alone. Moreover, as the Reformers' instinct truly told them, the doctrine of Transubstantiation was the very root and foundation of the sacrifice; and this doctrine was held in abhorrence by all save the Catholics. And this state of mind continued, perhaps we may say deepened, as time went on, so that when the Articles were reissued in 1562 and again in 1571, the authorities in Church and State were as far as ever from approximating to any notion of a true sacrifice in the Eucharist. We have already seen what Jewel and Andrewes had to say upon this matter. The highest point ever reached by Anglican divines before our own days was probably that of John Johnson in his work on "The Unbloody Sacrifice"—and that asserts no more than a sacrifice of the bread and wine.

---

[25] On the Lord's Supper, p. 348. Parker Society.

[26] Works, p. 107.

We have mentioned the recorded attempts of Gardiner and a few others to read Catholic doctrine into the First Book of Edward VI. When similar evidence is adduced of like attempts to claim an ambiguity for this Article, whether in Edward's reign or Elizabeth's, then we might consider that the contention of Tract 90 had something in its favor. As things are, we cannot but believe that the Article was accepted in the full sense of its framers, especially seeing that, at its reissue in 1571, it enjoyed the running commentary of penal laws, dungeons, tortures and death, which left no room for doubt as to the sense in which it was then promulgated by the convocation of the Established Church.

II.

THE CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY ON ARTICLE XXXI.

Tract 90 and its defenders, Ward and Pusey, made little or no attempt to prove the existence of the alleged erroneous doctrine of the sixteenth century by quotations from Catholic writers of that period. Dr. Pusey, indeed, takes the doctrine of so late a writer as Lessius as being the one which Anglicans protest against. But modern Anglicans of the extreme school accept such doctrine as the true one. Accordingly their efforts have been directed to finding an erroneous teaching in the writers of the sixteenth century itself or the period immediately preceding it. This was done by Messrs. Denny and Lacey in their "De Hierarchia Anglicana" in 1895. Perhaps because of this work being in Latin, and so not accessible to the many, and perhaps, too, because of the tacit acceptance therein of Transubstantiation, the Church Historical Society have thought fit to issue a little work[27] on this question more adapted to the capacities and views of the Anglican majority. The author, the Rev. B. J. Kidd, has not only utilized the material gathered for the previously mentioned work, but has added much new matter culled from various sources. We may conclude, therefore, that we have here the utmost that can be brought forward in support of the theory that, in the sixteenth century, there existed a practical system and its supporting doctrine so outrageous and so widespread as to justify steps which led to the severance of England from Catholic unity. The argument of Mr. Kidd's book is as follows: Attention is first drawn to the use of the plurals, *Masses* and *priests*, in Article 31. In two versions there is an addition of a third plural, viz., *sacrifices*, so that the article ran: "The *sacrifices* of *Masses* in which it was commonly said that the *priests* did offer Christ," etc. This use of plurals where singulars might have sufficed leads our author to enquire whether there was any system and doctrine current in the sixteenth century to the indication of which the plurals were meant to point. Such a system he finds in the numerous chantries, etc., which tended to multiply *Masses* beyond measure and so to increase the number of *priests*. Behind this practical system, and affording it a theological support, he detects a widespread theory that each Mass was a new sacrifice of Christ distinct from, perhaps independent of, the sacrifice of the cross; also that this new sacrifice had a definite, quantitative value of its own, which could be applied in a "mechanical way," at the mere will of the priest, to the remission of so much sin or punishment incurred by the individual for whom it was to be offered.

---

[27] "The Later Mediæval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice."

This theory, he considers, has in it elements utterly foreign to the primitive idea of the Eucharistic sacrifice which was enshrined in the definition given by St. Isidore of Seville (A. D. 595-636). "It was simply this: Sacrificium dictum quasi sacrum factum, quia prece mystica consecratur in memoriam pro nobis Dominicæ passionis. Such a view can scarcely be called sacerdotal."[28]

This definition, we are told, prevailed until the days of St. Thomas Aquinas (A. D. 1224-74), who added to it a novel theory about the necessity of some physical change taking place in the thing offered if it was to be properly termed a sacrifice. Thus was laid the foundation of later doctrines on the victim-condition of Christ in the Mass. Nor was this the only innovation made by St. Thomas. In certain statements, "scarcely more than *obiter dicta*," he prepared the way for his successors, the later scholastics, to assign to the priest undue prominence in the offering of the sacrifice and to exalt the act of consecration at the expense of the people's communion. Furthermore, there was a passage in the Fourth Book of the Sentences (dist. xii. qu. 2 a 2 ad 4) out of which was evolved by later writers a theory that the sacrifice could operate in a way that can best be described as "mechanical" or "of the nature of a magical charm."

The fully developed form of these errors had taken possession of the popular mind and even of theologians in the sixteenth century. It was against this pernicious doctrine and superstitious system that the denunciations of Article 31 were leveled, not against the true "primitive and Catholic" doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass.

The widespread hold of these errors is abundantly proved, says our author, by the testimony of English and foreign Reformers, as also by the admissions of "Romanensian" theologians of eminence—*e. g.*, Melchior Canus, Cajetan, Vasquez and Suarez.

Finally, there may be traced a continuous "growth of the theory that sacrifice involves destruction," from the days of the Council of

---

[28] P. 43.

Trent to our own times, though the writers on this subject are not agreed amongst themselves, but fall into two classes, viz., "the maximizers, who agree in holding that in some sense Christ is destroyed or suffers change in each Mass," and "the minimizers, who either ignore the need for such change altogether or explain it as virtually affecting merely the material elements." These are the chief points in Mr. Kidd's argument.

Considered in itself, this new attempt, like all its predecessors, to turn the flank of that uncompromising Article 31 is a matter of purely domestic concern for Anglicans. It may therefore be asked why Catholics should trouble themselves at all about it. One chief reason is that Anglicans, in their efforts to prove their own communion orthodox, find it necessary to represent the Catholic Church as negligent or dilatory in guarding the purity of the faith. For this reason, if for no other, we think we have a right to "interfere" in this particular phase of the internecine strife of the Established Church.

For clearness' sake we will resume in a few brief heads the charge which we conceive Mr. Kidd now brings against our forefathers. According to his view, therefore, the current popular system and much of the current theology of the sixteenth century taught:

1. That there was in the Mass an immolation (an "induced victim-condition") of Christ, distinct from (some said independent of) His immolation on the cross.

2. That this immolation constituted a true sacrifice, not merely *impetratory*, but propitiatory also.

3. That it had a certain quantitative value which

4. Could be set over against so much sin (culpa) or so much punishment (pœna).

5. That it could be applied to individual cases at the will of the offerer.

6. That it operated in a merely mechanical way, like a magical charm.

Such were the features which it is supposed the Reformers condemned and rejected in Article 31 as forming a pernicious accretion upon the idea of the sacrifice prevalent before the days of St. Thomas Aquinas.

III.

SUMMARY OF INDICTMENT AND EXPLANATION OF TERMS.

We shall now set down as briefly those points of the above indictment which we *allow* to have existed in the current theology of the sixteenth century, and *maintain* to have been the Church's teaching from the beginning. At the same time we shall indicate those points which are neither primitive nor Catholic, and show that they are falsely imputed to our forefathers. We allow, then,

1. That in the Mass there is an immolation of Christ *distinct* from His immolation upon the cross. We deny that it was ever currently held to be *independent* of the latter.

2. That this sacrifice is truly *propitiatory* as well as impetratory.

3. That considered absolutely (*absolutè*), as being the offering of Christ to His Father, its value is *infinite;* but its *efficiency,* as determined to this or that individual case, is *finite* and therefore *quantitative.*

4. That this sacrifice avails for obtaining the remission of sin (culpa) and of the temporal pœna due for sin.

5. That the special fruit of this sacrifice is determined to individual cases by the priest's intention, and that it is infallibly received by those individuals provided they have the requisite "disposition."

6. That this sacrifice, by reason of its intrinsic excellence, produces its effects *ex opere operato: immediately,* with regard to the remission of *pœna; mediately,* with regard to the remission of *culpa.*

A few words of explanation before we begin the proof of our position. When we say that a sacrifice is not only *impetratory,* but propitiatory as well, we mean that it not only *asks and obtains* of God remission of sin, etc., *as a favor,* but *demands it as a right,* as a matter of justice, and at the same time appeases His just anger. It depends solely upon the will of God what sacrifice shall have this power. In the present order of Providence it is the self-offering of His Divine Son.

We may institute a parallel between the virtue of the Passion and its application to individual souls and the virtue of the Mass and its application. Considered absolutely—*i. e.,* in itself, as the *opus operatum*—the Passion is of *infinite* virtue; it would *suffice* for the remission of each and every sin and of all the punishment, eternal and temporal, due for sin. As a matter of fact, its *efficiency* will never be extended to the sins of the rebel angels nor to those sins for which the wicked will be condemned to hell. Its efficiency will extend to the remission of the whole *eternal pœna* of the saved, but they themselves will have expiated, in their own persons, much of the *temporal pœna* they have incurred. Thus, viewing redemption as a whole, we see that the Passion is *infinite in sufficiency* and in *undetermined efficiency,* but in *determined, i. e.,* actually *applied, efficiency* it is limited.

So again, if we consider the virtue of the Passion as it is applied to individual souls, we see that it is *infinite in sufficiency,* but *limited in* *determined efficiency*, since it produces not an infinite but a finite effect in each soul. We shall find that this also holds of the sacrifice of the Mass; but we must first consider its relation to the Passion. The ordinary means appointed by God for communicating to us the virtue of the Passion are the sacraments and the Eucharistic sacrifice. Each *sacrament* produces its own special effect in the soul; that is, it determines in this or that way, as a *secondary* cause, the infinite virtue of the *primary* cause, the Passion. The sacrifice of the Mass resembles both the Passion and the sacraments. Like the latter, it is one of the means or secondary causes by which the virtue of the Passion is applied to individuals. And in one respect its excellence as a means exceeds that of any sacrament: for these have narrower limits of application determined by the specific character of each, whereas the sacrifice of the Mass avails for countless needs as well of body as of soul. It is of well-nigh universal applicability. None but the already damned are beyond the reach of its aid. This surpassing excellence as a means is due to its most intimate connection with the Passion. It is the mystical renewal of Christ's death; it is the true, though unbloody, immolation of the same Victim by the same Priest as were found on Calvary; it is the oblation of Christ by Himself, and as such is infinitely pleasing to God. The Passion is the *ultimate cause* of God's being propitiated as regards mankind at large, and of His being willing to shower blessings upon them; the Mass is, like the sacraments, the *proximate cause* of His being propitiated *hic et nunc* towards this or that individual, and of His actually conferring this or that grace, of remitting this or that sin or punishment.

Now, considered absolutely—*i. e.*, in itself, as the *opus operatum*—this offering of Christ is of infinite virtue for propitiating God and demanding the application, in all their fullness, of the merits of the Passion. But when this infinitely meritorious *opus operatum* is applied by the priest's intention to an individual (as by administration he applies a sacrament), the actual effect produced is finite in its extent, whether that effect be some grace conferred or some *pœna* remitted. Therefore we say that the value of the Mass, *as applied to some individual case*, is finite, of a certain limited amount (though only God knows its extent), or, if you will, it is *quantitative* in value.

From one point of view every Mass is a "good work" performed by the *Church*, since the priest is her minister. Consequently every Mass brings God's blessing upon the whole Church and every one of her members. This fruit of the Mass is called by theologians the *fructus generalis*. As all members of the Church partake of it, so in a special manner do those who are actually present at its offering—the assistants at the altar and the congregation.

But the Mass is also the personal "good work" of the *priest* who offers it; and, like all other "good works," it brings a special blessing upon the doer. This is called the *fructus specialissimus* of the Mass.

Again, God has made us in some sense our "brother's keeper," his helper. As we learn from the story of Sodom and Gomorrha, God is willing to accept the "good works" of just men as a counterbalance of the evil deeds of others. In the Christian Church this communion of saints, this participation in the good works of one another acquires a much stronger foundation in the fact of the unity of all the baptized in Christ (I. Cor. xii., 25-27). And even as God accepts our prayers for one another, so also He accepts the offering, on behalf of individuals, of our "good works." The most acceptable to Him of all possible "good works" is the offering of that sacrifice which is, at one and the same time, the actual oblation of the mystically slain Christ and the memorial of that supreme "work"—His death upon the cross. This, too, then, can be offered on behalf of some given individual, or for some particular purpose.

There remains one other word to be explained—that bugbear of Protestants, *ex opere operato*. Perhaps a great deal of the mystery supposed to enshroud this term and its antithesis—*ex opere operantis*—may be due to slight variations in their signification necessitated by regarding an action from diverse points of view. An example or two will be the best way to explain them.

Suppose I give a sum of money to a man. My act may be good or bad, according to the motive from which it proceeds. I may do it from mere natural pity, and that is good; or from true Christian charity, and that is incomparably better; or to effect some evil purpose, and this would be a sin. The mere giving the money, *i. e.*, the mere *opus operatum*, is in itself a thing "indifferent," neither good nor bad, worthy of neither praise nor blame. *Ex opere operato*, then, the act has no value. It is only as it proceeds *from me* that it acquires "virtue:" its "value," whether for merit or demerit, depends *ex opere operantis*, upon my doing it with good or bad intent.

Another example. A heathen King has issued an edict for the putting to death of every child who shall have received baptism. A man, wishing to injure his neighbor, takes the latter's child and baptizes it with the intention of afterwards procuring its death. Provided that he used right matter and form, and intended to do what the Christians did, that child certainly received the inestimable boon of sanctifying grace, of divine sonship. Yet the act, or "opus," *considered as the miscreant's*, was fiendish; *ex opere operantis* it was a heinous sin; but the *opus operatum,* the baptism considered absolutely in itself, was an "opus" having "virtue," which "virtue," by God's appointment, was inseparable from it and capable of effecting spiritual regeneration in any infant or "disposed" adult notwithstanding the wickedness of the minister. In other words, the effect was produced *ex opere operato,* by virtue of the "opus" itself, and not *ex opere operantis,* by virtue of the doer.

Using this same example of baptism, we have now to notice a slight change in the application of the two terms *ex opere operato* and *operantis.* Catholics, and a large number of non-Catholics, believe that baptism really and infallibly effects the spiritual regeneration of *infants.* Yet the infant does not *actively* contribute anything to the production of this effect; it may be asleep or unconscious at the moment of baptism. Whatever is effected in its soul is due to the sacrament, the "*opus operatum*:" *i. e.,* the sacrament operates *ex opere operato.* Thus we see that this term is used in contradistinction to *ex opere operantis* not only when the latter signifies the *doer,* but also when it signifies the *recipient* of an "opus."

Moreover, an "opus" is said to produce its effect *ex opere operato* not only when, as in the case of the infant, the recipient actively contributes *nothing,* but also when he contributes something which yet is not sufficient of itself to produce the effect. Thus an act of *perfect contrition* suffices, without the sacrament of penance, for the remission of mortal sin in one who, at the moment, cannot have recourse to a priest, or is under no immediate obligation to do so. An act of *attrition,* on the other hand, does not suffice by itself for the remission of mortal sin, but it does constitute a sufficient "disposition" for receiving absolution in the sacrament of penance, which absolution, in remitting the sin, is said to act *ex opere operato* by its own "virtue." The penitent, by his *attrition,* removed the impediment to the working of grace, he turned his will from sin, he "disposed" his soul for the grace which the sacrament conferred.

From this it will be evident that when we say a sacrament, or whatever else, works *ex opere operato,* it by no means follows that there is no need for some "disposition" on the part of the recipient. The nature of the "disposition" varies for the various sacraments, and for the various mental developments of the recipients—*e. g.,* infants, idiots, sane adults. Unless there be a moral certainty of the presence of such "disposition," it would be both useless and sacrilegious to administer a sacrament. Hence the unfairness of the charge against Catholics, made in the Apology for the Confession of Augsburg, that they hold "quod *per ceremoniam* justificemur, sine bono motu cordis, hoc est, sine fide;" and repeated in the English "Thirteen Articles" of 1538, "Neque . . . verum est, quod quidam dicunt, sacramenta conferre gratiam ex opere operato sine bono motu utentis." There is a sense and there are cases in which Catholics, and non-Catholics, too, maintain this; there are others in which they reject it. Faith is not required of an infant for baptism, nor a "bonus motus" of the minister, beyond the bare intention to administer the sacrament validly. For absolution, a "disposition" or "bonus motus," at least to the extent of true attrition, is absolutely requisite on the penitent's part. In the sense in which the Reformers, English and German, made this charge, it was absolutely untrue; and Mr. Kidd is mistaken in supposing that the Council of Trent "quietly omitted to say anything in support of 'sine bono motu utentis,' and dropped all allusion to it." On the contrary, in so far as it was untrue, they said: "Quamobrem falso quidem calumniantur catholicos Scriptores, quasi tradiderint, sacramentum Pœnitentiæ absque bono motu suscipientium gratiam conferre, quod nusquam Ecclesia Dei docuit nec sensit." Sess. xiv., c. 4.

Having now cleared our terms from all ambiguity, we could in other papers, if time permitted, and occasions presented themselves, deal with the chief points raised by our author. Our first task would be to show that St. Thomas and his successors, whether mediæval or modern scholastics, in claiming for the Eucharistic sacrifice a true immolation, a true propitiation for sin and *pœna,* and applicability by the intention of the priest, were in perfect accord with the primitive fathers. Then we should examine the four Catholic witnesses adduced by Mr. Kidd to prove the widespread acceptance of a gross and pernicious theory of the sacrifice. The passage ascribed to St. Thomas and the case of Catharinus could be dealt with in a separate article. It would not be necessary to deal explicitly with the question of the sacrifice of the Mass being *distinct* from that of the cross; for an immolation which differs in time, place and mode from another must *ipso facto* be distinct from that other.

J. F. Besant, S. J.

St. Asaph, Wales.

THE "COUNCIL OF TEN" SYSTEM IN IRISH NATIONAL EDUCATION.

SOME remarkable admissions recently made by persons in authority have thrown a ray of white light on the system known by the rather misleading title of National Education in Ireland. For more than half a century that hapless country has been the theatre of experiments on the spiritual and intellectual framework of its people at the hands of doctrinaires and theorists utterly out of sympathy for the most part with their genius, their religious convictions and their higher aspirations in all fields of thought and human activity. Impressed with a full sense of the importance of education as an agency for moulding the destinies of large masses of mankind, their maladroit influence and ability were for a long period persistently devoted to the hopeless task—as it proved—of weaning the youth of the country from those ideals in religion and political development which had for centuries been the Irish tradition. Clearly perceiving that the tendency of modern civilization rendered the introduction of a universal system of education for the people a thing inevitable, the framers of the original scheme determined to lay its foundations on such a principle as would be certain, in their limited view, to divert the minds of the rising generation, and the succeeding ones, into such channels as would be favorable to the eventual Anglicization of the country by detaching it from those influences which had hitherto frustrated all attempts to plant the religion of England among the Celtic population, and at the same time, by the banishment of Irish history from the schools, draw a veil of oblivion over a past so full of incitements to bitter memories and noble emulation as the story of a strangled nationality which the truthful chronicler must certainly unfold. One of the chief architects of the National system was the celebrated Archbishop Whateley; and his confession, posthumously published, laid bare the motive which actuated him. It was to wean the Irish youth from the religion of their fathers. This artless avowal can hardly be said to have been instrumental in any considerable degree in the defeat of the astutely-conceived idea. The quick wit of the people themselves enabled them to detect it at a very early stage of the experiment. The religion of the Irish is still cherished steadfastly by what remains of its Celtic population, while the wealthy and powerful Protestant Establishment of which he was the gifted representative has, thanks to the energy of the Irish population, been laid in the tomb of all the Capulets.

Hardly more successful has been the dogged persistency in the vicious course of ignoring the national history of the country. That plan was steadily persisted in down to a couple of years ago. Not a syllable that would shed light upon the glorious past of Ireland before the English conquest, or on the causes of its melancholy decline under foreign rule, was ever permitted for more than half a century to get into a book issued under the sanction of the so-called "National Commissioners." At length the force of public opinion broke down in some measure the defenses of the ostrich-headed system. A handbook of Irish history, prepared somewhat on the Bowdlerized Shakespeare plan by the skilful hand of Dr. Joyce, was at last placed upon the list of works supplied by the National Board.

Concurrently with this obscurantist policy in regard to the history of their own land, there was developed a cunning design to glorify the country and the people who had imposed the yoke on the neck of Ireland. Poems in praise of both, pitched in the key of "A happy English child," were artfully introduced, together with occasional soul-stirring historical references in prose composition. At the same time a sort of negative proselytism, by means of Scripture quotations and religious maxims, was sought to be carried out in the early text-books, prepared under the able guidance of Archbishop Whateley and his sympathetic collaborators on the National Board. The Catholic representation on that board in the beginning was almost nil. Hence the "National" system was fiercely denounced by such stanch defenders of faith and nationality as the great Archbishop McHale. Several of his brother prelates were equally outspoken on the subject, and forbade their flocks, under penalty, to patronize the new schools. Seeing the probable failure of the whole grand scheme through persistence in this janissary policy, the Commissioners modified their methods so far as to give an equal representation of Catholics and Protestants on the Board, but this was not done until after the system had been a considerable time in operation.

This cursory outline of the beginnings of the National system is necessary, especially in the United States, because of the adoption of a similar policy of hiding away the truth on the part of those intrusted with the task of enlightening the American public on the progress of public education in other countries. Not one who ever read the Reports of our Bureau of Education could ever glean from them a knowledge of the real state of the case from the carefully prepared and elaborate statements published by that department of our Government. It would, however, be unjust to impugn the *bona fides* of the Commissioner for this defect. Of course the official at the head of the department could not of his own knowledge do any better than he did. He had to take the reports presented by persons whom he believed sufficiently impartial and competent to prepare reliable papers on the subject in the many fields of inquiry which his annual reviews embrace.

Educational problems in no place can be regarded as in a state of rest, not to say finality. They may be considered rather as a series of experimental advances, in which the views of one set of thinkers prevail for a time and then give place to others arguing from a different base of generalization. "*Experimentum fit in corpore vili*" seems to have been the motto whose spirit commended itself to the early devisers of the present Irish system. In Ireland the Catholic people had for a century and a half been in the position of a criminal on the rack. The aim of their "Sworn Tormentors" did not merely seem, but really was, to discover how much the Catholic Celt could endure in the way of moral degradation and physical suffering before his reason gave way or his spirit was broken to the point of submission to the torturer's will. It was the same determination which forbade him, in the penal days, to acquire knowledge of letters that in the more liberal age laid down the law as to what he should learn and what he should not. This is where the iron of foreign domination enters the soul of the vanquished. It is the very essence of slavery that out of the taxes wrung by force from a conquered people, what is administered to them for their mental sustenance is not that for which their souls hunger and thirst, but that which their despot thinks likely to further his own concealed designs. The Act of Parliament which in 1831 began what it called the National Education system for Ireland was in spirit and intent as much a penal law as any passed in the reign of Elizabeth or William of Orange. So, too, was the law of Sir Robert Peel which called into existence the trinity of Queen's Colleges known as the Godless. It is not because Ireland is a little place remote from these shores that its struggles with the English Kulturkampf have no interest for us; far from it. They are a microcosm of the vastly larger developments here, and the results of the struggle, by the laws of mental sympathy and vibration, must in time be felt upon our own intellectual littoral. The most crucial stage of the struggle appears to be at hand now, and the final triumph of the principle for which the indomitable Irish Catholics have contended, even when the last rays of hope seemed to have departed from Ireland's horizon, seems to be nigh. There is on foot a movement to reconstruct the whole National system—a movement so far-reaching and momentous as to justify the Archbishop of Dublin—always a very cautious prelate—in styling it a revolution.

Not from the outside, it should be noted, has this startling effect been produced. There has been no agitation of late years in Ireland, save for some alterations in matters of administration and the relations of teachers to school managers. It is the system itself which confesses its helplessness to keep pace with the impulse of the age. Progress it finds impossible along lines laid down for conditions which have become obsolete. The rails are there, but the sleepers are rotten and the permanent way awry and sagged.

One very striking point in the criticism of the Irish National system which we find embodied in the United States Educational Report, 1890-91 (the most important one in the brief series), is the shrewdness with which the anonymous writer detected the flaws in the system, considered from a practical working standpoint. Looking at what is now transpiring, as we shall shortly describe, the remarks appear to be almost prophetic:

"In the theoretical elaboration of the system . . . apparently no detail has been overlooked. Judged from the American standpoint, the system would seem to be entirely wanting in the force and spirit of spontaneous action. Nothing else gives a system so strong a hold upon the sympathies of a people nor such powerful effect upon their development. Systems wanting in this element have the character rather of expedients than of deep-rooted institutions, and to this general rule the Irish system is no exception. Its results as a practical expedient may be judged from several particulars.

"The average daily attendance maintained in the schools is low, being, as already noted, but ten per cent. of the total population, forty-seven per cent. of the total enrollment and fifty-nine per cent. of the average annual enrollment. This is explained in part by the sparse population of many districts, the poverty of the people and the absolute demand for the help of the children in agricultural regions. The failure of the system to modify class distinctions is due in some measure to the fact that it has little attraction for the rural gentry of Ireland."

There was insight in this judgment, as will be seen, but all was not visible to the keen critic who passed it. There were hidden springs of disorganization, and these are now being laid bare by the force of public events. Not long ago Mr. Charles Redington, the able and accomplished successor of Sir Patrick Keenan, died, and the post of Resident Commissioner was bestowed upon the present occupant, Dr. Starkie. The functions of Resident Commissioner constitute him the executive head of the system. He carries out the general policy of the honorary Commissioners, but his advisory power is also a great factor in the determination of the problem. In this case it would seem that the transformation about to be effected has been decided upon entirely through the Resident Commissioner's action, and if this be so the importance of having one man with a head and a heart at the helm, instead of twenty-one (the number of the present Board), must irresistibly suggest itself. Dr. Starkie recently delivered a speech on the state of the educational machinery—a thing almost unprecedented in his office—and pronounced the doom, because of the failure, of the present worn-out methods. He did not indicate the nature of the substitute which had been devised, but its character is sufficiently perceptible from the comment of the Archbishop of Dublin. "It is not a reform," said His Grace, "but a revolution."

All this has arisen over the recently issued Report of a "Royal Commission of Manual Instruction." This body, since its appointment, had gone into its work of inquiry so thoroughly, with the help of the Resident Commissioner, that there was no possibility of hiding the unworkable articulation of the old ramshackle pile. The stage coach of the Georges' days is no more fit to draw a modern passenger train than the antique construction thrust on the Irish people for the work of directing present-day school ideals.

The point most emphasized by Dr. Starkie was the impossibility of local initiative under the existing system. Its chilling influence leaves no choice of action to either managers or teachers. This rigidity both in rules of school management and educational syllabus is condemned by the Archbishop, by Dr. Starkie and by the Manual Instruction Commission by the description of "cast iron." It leaves no room for what the American commentator deems requisite—"the force and spirit of spontaneous action." The Archbishop is hopeful that this deadening influence is near its end. The Royal Commission will insist upon the necessity of altering it *in toto*. "The system administered by our Board," the Archbishop declares, "must be either a system of centralization or one affording abundant scope for intelligent local initiative." Now, the Report of the Manual Commission, he insists, has made the continuance of the centralized system impossible. There is, to all appearances, then, no alternative for the Government but to give up the control of the schools, a function which it had never the slightest moral right to assume, and retire into the position of mere distributor of the public funds in this respect. Blatant bigots and ignoramuses prate and write about the overweening ambition and despotic spirit of the Church where the control of the minds and the consciences of the people is concerned. Did they ever cast a thought on, did they ever know, of this prolonged endeavor of an impersonal succession of alien officials in London to compel the intellectual part of a people into the channels it would not run in and to weaken their faith in the ancient religion for which their fathers suffered martyrdom?

It is difficult to imagine the sources of such crass reasoning as impels statesmen and governments to cling to the notion that they can fight against moral forces with cast iron rules and mere physical weapons. It had long been seen in England that the central plan was unworkable in regard to the general education of the people, and accordingly the local control principle found full embodiment in the creation of the School Board system more than twenty years ago. How it could be imagined that the plan which had failed in England and Scotland, where the people are in harmony with the governmental power and the religion of the country, could be successfully maintained in Ireland, where the conditions are entirely reversed, it is hopeless to conjecture. Despotisms seem to be subject to the law of compensations. As a makeweight to the advantages they enjoy, as the fruits of arbitrary rule, they appear to inherit by nature a double dose of stupidity.

Another feature of the National system in Ireland, ushered in with a great flourish and a loud "Eureka" a quarter of a century back as something both novel and practical, was the rule of paying by "results." By making results' fees portion of the teacher's salary it was thought to stimulate the energies of both teacher and pupils by an infallible recipe. The results system, however, was emphatically condemned by the Royal Commission. Under "that wretched system," as it was styled by the Archbishop, the inspectors became only inspectors in name. Examination afforded no real test of the capacity of either pupils or teachers. To make the income of the teacher depend upon the greater or less degree of parrot power of the children or the temporary state of their nerves at examination times seems like a piece of capricious cruelty.

But the real "dead hand" at the apex of the "National" system was the grasp of the English Treasury on its purse-strings. This Treasury is a thing constructed on the principle of a cash register. Its mental equipment is marked by the same absence of soul or conscience as one of those clever mechanical contrivances. No public expenditures can be made in Great Britain or Ireland save through the hands of this Treasury in London. Every docket which signifies money must be viséd and certified by this universal paymaster before it can be honored anywhere. But the Treasury is more than a supervisor of expenditures. It is also a controller and an investigator for whose "why" there must be always forthcoming a satisfactory "because" before payment is furnished. No change in the system of results' fees could be made without obtaining the consent of the Treasury—unless, indeed, the teachers were prepared to give up the million dollars a year which is the Government's contribution to the results' system. On this point the Archbishop's statements are more than emphatic—they are decidedly original and picturesque. "It is a discouraging thing," says Dr. Walsh, "and it necessarily has a very deterrent effect to feel beforehand that one can do nothing unless he can succeed in first instructing and then converting to his views a number of people whose very identity is unknown to him, who live, in fact, during official hours, cloaked and masked, behind a sort of screen in London, like the judges we read of in the tribunals of the old Venetian republic. It requires no small stock of persevering determination to take such a thing in hand at all. This deterrent effect of the system is its worst feature, and Lord Salisbury spoke words of weighty truth in what he said in the House of Lords a few weeks ago: 'The exercise of its powers,' he said—that is, of the powers of the Treasury—in governing every department of the Government is not for the public benefit. I think much delay and many doubtful resolutions have been the result of the peculiar position which, through many generations, the Treasury has occupied. I do not assume that it is only in large measures the difficulty was produced. But salutary reforms are built up by a long series of useful changes. Individually they are small, but in the aggregate they are large; and here I think the control of the Treasury has done harm. I think it has had the effect of discouraging, of impeding and of taking away the freedom and diminishing the initiative of the respective departments. I think it is an evil. Much of the immobility of the departments is, I think, due to the existence of that control."

A striking parallel, truly, that of the secret Venetian tribunals and the procedure of the English Treasury. The terrible "Council of Ten," the secret executioners, the Bridge of Sighs and the awful dungeons below the water and under the *piombi* all at once rise up in dread phantasmagoria before the mind's eye. The closest moral similarity exists between those agencies and methods of mediæval despotism and those employed in London to repress the right of the Irish people to free education after their own ideals.

Step by step, ever since the foundation of the system was laid in the minds of Stanley, who began it in 1831, and Peel, who completed it in 1840, the Government have had to recede from the original design. By sheer tenacity the people were enabled to secure such modifications as by slow evolution transformed the system from a Godless unelastic three R's arrangement to one of denominational education in practice. The local manager in the Catholic district is the parish priest; in some Ulster parishes, the Episcopal or Presbyterian minister. These respectively arrange the amount and the time of religious instruction in the various schools. A "conscience clause" protects the rights of those parents who, though obliged by local circumstances to send their children to schools where the religion of the majority dictates the form of the spiritual exercises, elect to have them go without any or depend upon home training in whatever form they prefer.

What share the great teaching body, the Irish Christian Brothers, have had in compelling this alteration of purpose is an equation with too many unknown quantities for any one to essay. But with the certain action of the pole upon the magnetic needle, their policy caused the ship of state to swerve in her course. Their fine schools, established early in the century, were equipped with the best apparatus, handled by the ablest scholars. The teachers were all picked men, full of that sympathetic power which is essential to the successful pedagogue. In their great halls the courses were carried out with clock-work regularity, and the most perfect order and decorum were maintained apparently without an effort on the part of those in charge. The exercises of religion took place at stated hours, before its quickening symbols exhibited on the walls. The morning's work was opened with prayer; the half hour for play was preceded by the devotion of the midday Angelus; and the afternoon dispersal did not take place until after thanks for the day's work done. The personal and affectionate interest taken by many of these whole-souled teachers in their pupils contributed another powerful guarantee for success beyond the staff of the National schools, who, lacking in the religious incentive which spurred the Christian Brothers, lacked the moral qualities which were its outer denotements. Had the Brotherhood not been compelled to charge a small weekly fee and to demand more for their text-books than those supplied by the Government to the National schools' pupils, they must have been far more successful still in diminishing the attendance at the new establishments. But this was unavoidable. Ireland was at the time steeped in appalling poverty, and the resources of the Brothers were jejune indeed. But as it was, they educated many thousands of boys every year, for they had exceedingly spacious schools in Dublin, Cork, Waterford and other large centres. The Government soon perceived the formidable character of this obstacle to the grand scheme of de-Catholicizing and denationalizing. Besides teaching the fundamental principles of religion, the Brothers actually taught Irish history!—a most pestiferous derangement of England's programme.

A course of action was resolved on which leaves no doubt of the mind of the Government at this particular phase of Ireland's trials. The Christian Brothers were offered State aid for educational purposes, but on what condition? In effect that they would become accomplices of the Government in its secularizing scheme by stripping their schools of their religious emblems. If they would only eliminate the Cross and the Madonna and the images of the saints, they might have a proportionate share of the public fund. But an indignant refusal was the response to this temptation. The Brothers steadfastly persisted in their attitude whenever at various turns of the discussion on educational policy renewed opportunities of falling into line were politely offered them. This discreditable attitude was maintained toward the sturdy Brotherhood down to the passage of the last Bill for the improvement of the National system, supplementary to Sir John Gorst's much more liberally-conceived measure for England and Wales. Even a Minister so favorably disposed as Mr. John Morley could not be moved from a stubborn adherence to so unjust and paltry a position. Fair and equitable on all other great questions of Irish policy, he was immovable as a rock on this one point. A firm believer in the cold tenets of Mill and Herbert Spencer on the relations of the State toward public education, he could never be persuaded, while conceding that the special circumstances of Ireland demanded special methods of legislative treatment, to concede that any departure in this, the most important respect of all to her, was compatible with true statesmanship. To the firm stand taken by the Irish Nationalist members of Parliament the ultimate surrender of the Government on the point was due. Mr. Sexton, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Healy, Mr. W. O'Brien and other prominent men of the party brought forward arguments in their favor whose force it was impossible to withstand. As Mr. O'Brien said: "The Christian Brothers had practically the education of the whole Irish urban population in their hands, for their schools were situated in all the chief centres of population. The most influential men in every city and large town in Ireland had been their pupils. Their system was regarded in Ireland as the really national system. It was adapted to the genius of the people, it was deeply grounded in their respect and affection." (*London Times*, March 23, 1892.) But it was not Mr. Morley or the Liberals who reluctantly displayed the white flag. The surrender came from the Unionists and the Tories. It did not come even from these until it had been demonstrated repeatedly, by the results of the Intermediate examinations, that the teaching system of the Christian Brothers was capable of achieving in secular fields of learning a perfection unsurpassed by institutions which had long enjoyed all the advantages of State favor and unlimited material resources.

Side by side with this absorbing chapter of heroic struggle for principle in the field of primary education should be placed the review of the cognate one for university rights for the Catholic people. But this subject would demand exclusive consideration. Yet it is impossible to repress the feeling of wonder at the weakness of a powerful Ministry which, while confessing the justice of the Catholic demand through the mouth of its responsible spokesman, shrank from the duty of conceding it in act because of the bigoted opposition of a miserable handful of Orange and Presbyterian anti-Irishmen and the clamor of a section of English Nonconformists and secularistic Radicals. So humiliating an exhibition of moral weakness is not to be found in all the history of political vacillation.

Many eminent statesmen resort to the ingenious idea in vogue in the old French Court for the benefit of offending Dauphins—a vicarious penitent whose back should bear the punishment to which the genuine delinquent had been sentenced by stern governess or preceptor. Mr. Balfour, who must feel in a bad plight over his ignominious surrender on the Catholic University question, appears to have fallen back upon this clever notion. He has a faithful henchman in the head of the Irish Local Government Board, Mr. T. W. Russell. This official, although a Scot by birth and a Presbyterian by religion, is yet a Liberal Unionist as to politics. As a Liberal Unionist he was pledged, when seeking his seat for South Tyrone, to the removal of every Irish grievance, to satisfy every reasonable demand of Ireland short of the restoration of an Irish Parliament. Mr. Russell is a conscientious kind of man, in his own way. He has felt bound to support the demand for a Catholic University on the merits of the case; but he sits for a constituency in which the Orange and Presbyterian elements are in a slight majority. The time for a new general election is drawing nigh, and Mr. Russell's time of embarrassment with it. He has been offered seats in other parts of the United Kingdom, he declares, but he prefers to represent South Tyrone, if South Tyrone only prefer him. The fact that a seat in any place outside Ireland would not qualify Mr. Russell for the retention of the comfortable post he now holds as head of the Irish Local Government Board he does not deem it the part of good taste to allude to, because, probably, he deems the wit of his constituents equal to the delicate problem he thus negatively puts before them. It is this University question, he shrewdly judges, which is the centre of the coming battle—the key of the position. "Nobody," he declares, in a public letter to his constituents—"nobody at the present moment can very well say what the position of the University question really is. Judging by appearances, Mr. Balfour's proposals or views have not met with the full approval of the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church. If I am right in this supposition we should be fighting in Tyrone upon an issue that may not become practicable during the next Parliament."

This is not a very ingenuous statement of the premises. Mr. Balfour made no definite proposals on the subject. He merely put forward a series of tentative questions, with the purpose of eliciting a statement of the lengths to which the Irish hierarchy were prepared to go on the subject of lay influence on the controlling board of the contemplated University. The Bishops' reply was clear enough. They were satisfied to have an adequate representation of lay scholarship: they could give no more definite answer to a query very vague and fishy in its terms. Therefore Mr. Russell's plea—which may be regarded as Mr. Balfour's apology, in view of the official and political relations between the two politicians—is entirely creditable to the former's skill in dialectical subterfuge. Whatever public correction or castigation it may draw forth, Mr. Balfour, by his silence, escapes the whipping; and thus the wisdom of the French Court method will be triumphantly vindicated. At the same time Mr. Russell saves his own reputation for perfect *bona fides* and sportsmanlike magnanimity. "Elect me again," he says to the South Tyrone voters, "and if the Catholic University question reach the stage of proposed legislation, I will then resign and submit myself to the judgment of my constituents on this particular question." This incident furnishes a clue to the singular gyratory action of the Government from time to time on questions of gravest importance to Ireland. Men are put into office who go there to learn the business called statesmanship, and to acquire the statesman's conscience. They may have the most profound conviction, in their private capacity, of the justice of certain popular demands, but when they find, by exposition, that their principles are not acceptable, in some regards, to their constituents, they willingly submit them to alteration. Every step taken by the English Government with regard to public education in Ireland has borne the impress of this spirit. Between the necessity and justice of the case, on the one hand, and the weight of popular prejudice in England on the other, the conscience of the statesman—whenever he happened to have any—was as between the upper and nether millstones. It is not, under the circumstances, going too far to say that the principle of action disclosed in Mr. Russell's letter appears to be that on which Mr. Balfour has proceeded ever since the discussion over the Catholic University question was reopened; and Mr. Russell is only proving his devotion to his exalted model by tendering him the delicate flattery of imitation.

The fact is that the policy underlying the withholding of a Catholic University despite the reiterated insistent demands for one is the very same policy that has always been acted on in Ireland since the time that statesmen began to see that it was the duty of the State to educate the people. It is not what the people claimed and hungered for that was to be given them, but what their English masters deemed good for them. Dr. Starkie, breaking away entirely from the traditions of his predecessors, stated the case bluntly, without either disguise or palliation, in the memorable speech at Glasnevin which has given the discussion a new and irresistible impulse. The "National" system was alien in spirit and unsuitable to the genius of the Irish people, he declared. It was an attempt to graft foreign ideals upon a race entirely out of sympathy with the people who offered it and sought perforce to fasten it permanently upon unwilling recipients. And now it is discovered that, even taking it as a system designed to nullify and refrigerate the religious and national ideals of the Celt, it is unworkable, reactionary and useless even from this point of view. "I was but a very short time attending the meetings of the National Board," remarks the Archbishop of Dublin, "ere I found how hopeless it was to effect any reform, because of the fact that the smallest change was impossible without the consent of some unknown Treasury clerk in London." These are not exactly His Grace's words, but they exactly reflect his complaint. "It is not a reform which is coming, but a revolution." This will be news indeed to that large class of easy-going people who have year by year been imbibing their knowledge of the educational status of the Irish people through those carefully-compiled and apparently authoritative literary productions called Parliamentary blue books. The language of these compilations never would lead the reader to suspect that there was the smallest hitch or friction in the motion of the huge piece of mechanism held together with an ingenious mesh-work of red-tape. Take, for instance, the statement of the case furnished to our own Commissioner by the unknown expert who drew up the special Report already referred to—*i. e.*, for 1896-97. It is the soul of blandness and respectable impartiality, as these passages will show:

"The principles controlling the policy of the British Government with respect to popular education already referred to, *i. e.*, the sense of public responsibility in this matter and immemorial regard for local prerogative and private rights, have been displayed in a striking manner in the system of National education maintained in Ireland since 1831. The growth of the system has been phenomenal; the schools which in 1834-35 numbered 1,106, with an enrollment of 145,521, or 1.8 per cent. of the population, having increased to 8,298 in 1890, with an average enrollment of 828,520 pupils, 17.6 per cent. of the population. The ratio of average daily attendance to the population at the later date was 10 per cent., or more than five times the ratio of enrollment to population in 1835. The annual expenditure which in 1883 was estimated at £47,224 ($229,509), and which it was supposed would ultimately reach a fixed sum of £200,000 (about $1,000,000), was actually in 1890 £973,062 ($4,729,082). The administration of the system is confided to a National Board of Commissioners appointed by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. The managers of schools, who are generally clergymen, come into immediate relation with this Board. There are no elected school boards, as in England and Scotland, nor do civil authorities appear in the matter at all.

"Several details pertaining to the internal conduct of schools, which in Great Britain are left to local managers, are in Ireland entrusted to the Board of Commissioners (*i. e.*, the representatives of the Government). This policy grew out of the religious question, which presented the greatest obstacle to the development of a National system of education in Ireland. At the time of the organization of the system it was necessary to allay the jealousies which had been excited by previous attempts to force Protestant schools upon a population overwhelmingly Catholic. To this end a formal declaration was made on the part of the Government that its purpose was "to superintend a system of education from which should be banished even the suspicion of proselytism, and which, admitting children of all religious persuasions, should not interfere with the peculiar tenets of any.

"The sincerity of the Government with respect to this purpose was evidenced in the constitution of the Board, which comprised eminent representatives of both Catholic and Protestant churches, and in placing under their control all matters affecting the subject of religious instruction. They were directed to separate literary and moral from religious instruction and to remit the latter subject to the clergy. All efforts to compel or to persuade the attendance of any child upon these exercises against the wishes of parents and guardians were strictly forbidden.

"The authority of the local managers is extensive and in most districts is reposed in one man, the priest, Presbyterian minister or other clergyman, as the case may be. He appoints and dismisses the teachers, arranges the daily time-table of the school and determines the character of the religious instruction. A report of January 31, 1891, shows that 48 per cent. of school managers at that date were Roman Catholic clergymen; 30.5 per cent. clergymen of the Episcopal Church; 18.1 per cent. Presbyterian ministers; 2.2 per cent. Methodist ministers."

The ordinary reader of this smooth sketch of the beginnings of the system never could glean the idea that there had been a fierce fight for the principle of Catholic representation on the National Board, or an insidious attempt at that proselytism so smoothly disavowed by the Government—nor of the determined stand of the Bishops and clergy which compelled the change in the ways of the "National" Board. Thus it is that history is written. It is part of the general method resorted to for the suppression of the part played by Catholicism in public education all over the world. Not one official Report that we have ever seen has taken the slightest notice of the wonderful work of the Christian Brothers in Ireland. Their name is never mentioned. Of what value, we may ask, is any return purporting to give the proportions between literacy and illiteracy in Ireland which omits the bearing which the figures of the Christian Brothers' school population must have on the question? In the particular report now under notice occurs the following statement:

"The recent census (1891) reveals a favorable view of the results of education in the country. The census commissioners observe that 'the progress achieved in both primary and superior instruction may be considered the most gratifying fact elicited by the census. In 1881 the percentage of wholly illiterate persons was 25.2, whereas in 1891 it reached no more than 18.4 per cent. Of the whole population above 5 years of age, 70.6 per cent. could read and write at the latter date, as compared with 59.3 per cent. in 1881. The addition to the number of schools and of pupils has been relatively small.'"

There is nothing in this passage to show that any returns but those of the National Board were consulted or sought for in the calculation of the school attendance; nor in these further particulars:

"The classification of pupils by religious denomination is important as showing the progress of the system in overcoming sectarian opposition. Every teacher is accordingly expected to enter upon his register the church relation of each child. Of the schools whose returns were summarized, 3,866 were mixed schools, *i. e.*, attended by both Protestant and Roman Catholic pupils, and 4,394 were separate schools, *i. e.*, attended by Roman Catholic or by Protestant pupils exclusively.

Mixed Schools.	Pupils.
Under Roman Catholic teachers exclusively	327,966
Under Protestant teachers exclusively	127,159
Under Roman Catholic and Protestant teachers conjointly	12,855
Total	467,980

"Of the pupils in separate or unmixed schools, 468,222 were Roman Catholic and under teachers of that sect, and 100,733 Protestant under Protestant teachers. The percentage of schools exhibiting a mixed attendance declines steadily from year to year, having fallen from 55.1 in 1881 to 46.7 in 1890."

Returns of such a character as the above are useful only in giving an approximate idea of the literary status of the population. The very large number of pupils in the Christian Brothers' establishments must, had they been tabulated, affect the relative proportions of Catholic and Protestant scholars, as well as alter the conclusion as to the comparative triumph of the "National" over the denominational system. In Dublin, Cork, Belfast, Limerick, Waterford, Galway and other places the Brothers' schools accommodate thousands of boys. In Cork they have three large schools in different parts of the city under their care, and some of the buildings have six different school-rooms for the purposes of grading and classification, and each of these rooms or halls may accommodate from three to five hundred pupils. The same is true of the schools in Dublin and other places.

A statement recently furnished by Brother M. M. Hill to the *Catholic World* shows that about thirty thousand children attend the schools of the community. About three thousand of that number are receiving intermediate education, the remainder primary. Mr. Hill's statement is exceedingly interesting, not only as a disclosure of the work the Brothers are doing, but as an exposure of the animus of the Government and the so-called National system. "The programme of studies in our schools comprises Greek, Latin, French, Celtic, German, Italian, Mathematics in all its branches, Chemistry, Natural Philosophy, Type-writing and Shorthand, besides other studies which children in some localities require. All our schools are connected with South Kensington, so that drawing is universally taught. The Brothers receive no aid from Government for Primary Schools, and in my opinion one of the principal reasons is that our schools are the only National Schools in the country. The English Government does not favor a national education, as it is not favorable to having Irish history taught as it should be taught; nor does it favor denominational education, which is the system of the Irish Christian Brothers. The English Government has tendered no remuneration to Irish Christian Brothers. Some English statesmen essayed doing so, but failed. As to our status as teachers, as compared with the teachers of the Government, and also as to the success of our pupils at Civil Service, I may give a quotation from Lord Justice Fitzgibbon in 1894. (He is not a Roman Catholic, but he is a man of broad views and recognizes merit.) He said in the King's Inns at a debating society about two years since: 'The result was that after a certain number of years so large a proportion of Christian Brothers' unendowed schools were carrying off prizes that it was said the system was not high enough. The standard was raised for the purpose of excluding schools that had not a high standard of teaching. The schools that were squeezed out were those that thought they would remain in, and a larger proportion of Christian Brothers' schools than ever were successful when the standard was raised!' On another occasion His Lordship stated, before the Protestant Church Society, that if they (the Protestants) wanted to hold their own in Civil Service, they should organize their schools on the lines of the Christian Brothers, whose boys, His Lordship said, were taking a large percentage of places in the Civil Service."

That work of this kind has been done a half century and more without the help of a penny from the State is a truly surprising fact. But much more surprising still is it to know that official Reports and blue-books have been published all this time, year after year, without making the smallest reference to that fact, or hinting that any such agency was at work for the education of the Irish people in their own way and according to their own religious and national tendencies.

It should never be forgotten that the Christian Brothers could have had generous State help, long ago, were they only willing to conform to the State's idea of the function of education. All that was needed was merely to remove the crucifix and the religious pictures from the walls and omit the prayers which three times a day intermit the work of secular teaching for both teacher and pupil. This offer was made to them more than once—under the régime of Mr. W. T. Forster, and again under that of Mr. John Morley. But the answer of the Christian Brothers was always an unfaltering "no surrender." On no account would they offer up incense to the gods of the modern paganism. They steadily held aloft the highest standard in education—highest in the moral sphere, highest in the secular.

It is little wonder that the Archbishop of Dublin found in the methods of mediæval Venetian judges a parallel for English methods in the field of Irish education.

One more anomaly remains to be noted in this connection, in order to a full understanding of the anti-National idea underlying the whole plan of the State system of education in Ireland. This is the dogged attempt made to extirpate the National language. When the system was first set in motion seventy years ago there must have been several millions of people whose only medium of thought was the Irish language. The children of such could not receive any instruction save through the vernacular. Yet no provision whatever was made for their instruction. It was this Irish-speaking population which furnished the chief holocausts to the Famine tribute in 1847, yet there remained, and still remains, despite the emigration drainage, a large section of the Irish-speaking peasantry—mostly on the western seaboard and in the mountain districts of the North. About thirty years ago a society was started in Dublin with the object of averting the extinction of the venerable and euphonious tongue of the Gael in Ireland, and its most difficult task in all the years since then has been to induce the "National Board" to aid in this most commendable undertaking. The driblet concessions which the Board made from time to time have always been of a niggardly and hampering character. So obstructive have been its tactics that a strongly-worded memorial, gotten up by Dr. O'Donnell, Bishop of Raphoe, and some hundreds of priests of the Irish-speaking districts, was recently presented. It is nothing short of a grave indictment. For instance, the memorialists say:

"We are convinced that primary education in our respective districts has hitherto been rendered gravely defective, and that the best results of education have been thrown away by the neglect to utilize Irish systematically as a part of the pupils' knowledge and as the natural medium of their instruction. The children of these districts come from Irish-speaking homes, where all the familiar converse of life, still more, all the higher and more spiritual ideas are habitually expressed by their parents and elders in Irish. The first foundations and the most important part of the mental development of the children are thus naturally made in the Irish language. To ignore the utility of Irish in teaching these children from the outset is, in our opinion, a primary blunder for many reasons. It deliberately puts on one side all that the children may have learned not alone of the vocabulary of common life, but of the finer shades of thought and feeling which are eminently characteristic of the Irish language. Experience has shown that the native traditional taste for poetry and other forms of literature and for music is taken away from the people along with their native language. It often happens under the present system that after a number of years at school young people practically lapse into illiteracy and forget how to read and write simple English. Even of those who may seem to have profited more, a large number have little better than a mechanical proficiency, and from the standpoint of material advancement are hardly to be distinguished from the class of illiterates."

It is difficult to comprehend the obstructive policy of the National Board in this particular matter. Perhaps there was not policy, but only dislike of the language and a desire to avoid responsibilities for which the Board was not equipped. If, on the other hand, there was a policy, and that the idea was to help Anglicize the people gradually by this additional means, it was a singularly foolish one, for the keeping any people in ignorance only adds to the piled-up grievances which often eventuate in destructive outbursts. The Protestant missionaries were more astute. The Kildare-place Association had trained Irish teachers early in the field, and thousands of Bibles in Irish were distributed by the proselytizing societies in the Irish-speaking districts in periods of distress, besides tons of controversial literature also in the vernacular. Although the investment did not prove profitable, the design showed tactical genius. But the crass hostility of the National Board produced no result but a more profound dislike year after year of the alien system.

The upheaval which is now convulsing the whole system is the natural result of dogged persistence in a vicious course. For seventy years this coercive Board has been trying to educate the Irish people out of Irish ideals and Irish love of the ancient faith. That the means employed to further this dark design should in detail resemble those of the Council of Ten was only in keeping with the principles of high art, as understood in the old text-books. But a new century is bringing new and perhaps truer ideals. The question is, is the Briton too old to learn?

John J. O'Shea.

[Since the foregoing pages were written the first official step toward a partial reconstruction of the lines on which the National system had been laid has been taken, and the fact is publicly notified. From the date of the notification, it is announced, the principle of payment of results' fees ceases, and in its stead will be substituted grants from the Treasury arranged according to classification. This is only one reform, and in a matter of financial detail more important to the teachers themselves than to the mass of scholars, but it is in the right direction. It will remove the tendency toward the "forcing" method of which the results' fees could not help being productive, and it will give the diffident pupils who may be just as clever naturally as their more alert and pushing companions a chance of getting their fair share of the teachers' attention. It is likely to operate also toward effecting a larger attendance, since the per capita principle stirs up the managers and the teachers to continuous effort to keep the attendance at as large an average as may be. The change will entail an additional draft on the Treasury, to the extent, perhaps, of a couple of hundred thousand pounds; but what can that trifle be to a Government which thinks nothing of squandering hundreds of millions upon wars and preparations for wars? The National Board also authorize some further concessions in the matter of the teaching of the Irish language. But these steps are only preliminaries. They are precursors of the larger changes, however, adumbrated by the Archbishop of Dublin, and satisfactory in so far as they intimate the conversion of the English Government from the reactionary and futile ideas upon which the whole National system was originally laid out. The system is at last seen to be a failure, and for this disillusioning the steady passive resistance of the people for nearly three generations is to be accorded the credit.—J. J. O'S.]

THE STORY OF THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

II. THE STORM.

THE return of Knox from the Continent in May, 1559, could scarcely have happened at a more opportune moment for the fortunes of his party. The Queen Regent awaited the arrival of the Protestant preachers at Stirling, while they with a large following were assembling at Perth, determined to resist. Erskine of Dun, one of the leaders, desirous of preventing harsh measures, went alone to the queen, having prevailed upon the Congregation to remain at Perth. Mary of Guise, while anxious to keep peace with the Protestant party, was unwilling to let the contumacious ministers go unchallenged. Erskine, therefore, with some others, became security for their appearance before her at the time appointed.

Meanwhile the preachers at Perth occupied themselves with the delivery of inflammatory sermons, which set forth "how odious idolatry was in God's presence; what commandment He had given for the destruction of the monuments thereof; what idolatry and what abomination was in the Mass."[1] At this crisis Knox appeared on the scene. There is little doubt that it was by his persuasions that the preachers decided to refuse to answer to the summons of the Regent; for, as he himself bears witness, he went to Perth "to assist his brethren" and "to give confession of his faith with them," and arriving among them, "began to exhort, according to the grace of God granted unto him."[2] When the preachers failed to appear, sentence of exile was passed against them, while Erskine and their other sureties were fined.

On the day after these events Knox assembled his followers in St. John's Church, and, as a contemporary writer says, "made such an excellent Sermon to them that he set their Minds, already moved, all in a Flame."[3] The subject of the discourse is given by Knox himself, although he does not mention that he was the preacher. "The sermon," he says, "was very vehement against idolatry."[4] At its conclusion, while "the most part were gone to dinner,"[5] as Knox takes care to state, a priest, somewhat imprudently as it would seem, entered the sanctuary and began to make preparations for offering the Holy Sacrifice at the high altar. As he unfolded what Knox calls "a glorious tabernacle"[6]—probably a triptych adorned with paintings or images—a boy cried out, "This is intolerable, that when God by His Word hath plainly condemned idolatry, we shall stand and see it used in despite."[7] The priest, roused to indignation, gave the boy a blow; he retaliated by throwing a stone, which struck one of the sculptured images of the altar and broke it in pieces. This served as a signal to the people present. Already excited by the Reformer's sermon, the incident roused them to action. In a moment they threw themselves upon the pictures and carvings of the altars, the statues of the saints, the painted windows and all the other adornments of that glorious church and destroyed them utterly. The sumptuous building, with its forty altars, the pride of the "Fair City" and the origin of its familiar appellation, "Saint Johnstown," was left a wreck—stripped of everything that marked it as Catholic.

---

[1] Knox: "History of the Reformation" (ed. 1644), p. 143. [2] Ibid, p. 142. [3] Buchanan: "History of Scotland" (ed. 1752), Vol. II., p. 248. [4] Knox: "History," p. 143. [5] Ibid.

Knox, in his endeavor to shield himself and the Protestant leaders from blame, calls the perpetrators of these sacrileges "the rascal multitude" and "the common people;"[8] but, as an historian justly remarks, "when the feelings of an excited populace have been systematically roused, when at the very time exhortations to violence are ringing in their ears, when the act itself is neither checked nor punished, it is obvious that the multitude are not the worst criminals."[9] Yet some writers, carried away with admiration for their hero, acquit Knox of all blame. The reformer's biographer, Dr. McCrie, actually asserts that Knox "exerted himself in putting a stop to the ravages of the mob;"[10] it would be interesting to know what authority he has for the statement, as there is nothing in the way Knox relates the circumstances to warrant it.

Their appetite for destruction once whetted, the mob rushed to the other ecclesiastical buildings of the city to repeat the same scenes of desecration. For two days they hacked and hewed at crosses, images, paintings and windows of stained glass till every fair church and chapel was reduced to ruin. The Charterhouse had been founded by James I. and Jane, his queen, in 1431, and richly endowed; its buildings were of "wondrous cost and greatness,"[11] and were esteemed one of the special ornaments of the city. The bodies of two queens lay buried there. This magnificent pile was entirely destroyed, so that only the walls remained. Knox places it to the credit of the "reformers" that the prior "was permitted to take with him as much gold and silver as he was able to carry."[12] A generous indemnity, truly, for the ruin of his beautiful home! The Dominican and Franciscan convents suffered the same fate as the Charterhouse. The former, a favorite residence of Scottish monarchs, was often referred to as "the Palace." In its church many parliaments and ecclesiastical assemblies had been held, and the decrees of the National Councils of the Scottish Church, deposited there for safe keeping, perished in its downfall. The inmates of these houses are styled by Knox "Black and Gray *Thieves;*"[13] while their despoilers are spoken of as men whose consciences were so "beaten with the Word" that their only thought was "to abolish idolatry, the places and monuments thereof."[14]

---

[6] Knox: "History," p. 143. [7] Ibid. [8] Ibid. [9] Grub: "Ecclesiastical History of Scotland," Vol. II., p. 69. [10] McCrie: "Life of John Knox" (sixth edition), p. 156. [11] Knox: "History," p. 143.

The example set by the Protestants of Perth spread to Cupar in Fife, and the people of that place, "by general consent, either broke the images or threw them out of the church, and thus," says the Protestant narrator, "cleansed their temple."[15]

The Queen Regent was naturally deeply incensed by such proceedings, and particularly by the demolition of the Charterhouse, with its royal tombs. She threatened to take extreme measures to punish the ringleaders, and they, on their part, fortified the city against any attack from the royal troops. To the Regent, the loyal lords and the prelates and clergy they despatched letters justifying their conduct. The insolent tone of these epistles, which clearly declared their resolve to take up arms in defense of their cause, judged in the light of after events, indicates the confidence they reposed in the substantial help of England. Particularly insulting was the superscription of the address to the clergy: "To the generation of Antichrist, the pestilent prelates and their shavelings within Scotland, the congregation of Christ Jesus within the same saith——" Protestant historians, such as Bishop Keith and Fraser Tytler, are forced to lament the anti-Christian spirit which pervades this disgraceful letter.

The Regent had prepared to lead an army against the rebels, whose forces had been increased by the arrival of the Earl of Glencairn with about three thousand men, when an arrangement was come to between the opposing parties through the efforts of the Earl of Argyll and Lord James Stuart (afterwards Earl of Moray),[16] both of them deeply implicated in the Protestant cause, though ostensibly on the side of the queen. The reforming party evacuated Perth, and the Regent took possession of the city, and, to Knox's indignation, "began straight to make provision for their

---

[12] Knox: "History," p. 143. [13] Ibid. [14] Ibid. [15] Buchanan: "History of Scotland," Vol. II., p. 249. [16] Through inadvertence this nobleman was erroneously styled in a previous article Lord James *Murray*. He was raised to the earldom at a later date by Queen Mary.

Mass,"[17] as a public restoration of that Catholic worship which the inhabitants had virtually abolished.

The Protestant side was further strengthened by the defection at this time of the Lord James and the Earl of Argyll, who openly espoused the reformed doctrines and took a leading part henceforth in the proceedings of the Congregation. Emboldened by success, the Protestants repeated in other towns the sacrileges already witnessed at Perth. After Knox had preached at Crail and Anstruther, the mob proceeded to wreck both those churches. After another sermon at St. Andrews, on the casting out of the buyers and sellers from the temple, the Franciscan and Dominican friaries were laid in ruins, and the work of demolition was commenced in the glorious Cathedral by the wholesale destruction of everything holy or beautiful.[18] It was almost immediately after this "reforming" of St. Andrews that the noble Benedictine abbey of Lindores was attacked. In a letter to a female friend, Mrs. Anne Locke, Knox thus refers to the event: "The abbey of Lindores, a place of black monks, distant from St. Andrews twelve miles, we reformed, their altars overthrew we, their idols, vestments of idolatry and Mass books we burnt in their presence, and commanded them to cast away their monkish habits."[19]

The Cistercian monastery of Balmerino shared the same fate. Not even Scone, the historic abbey which had witnessed for centuries the unction and coronation of Scottish sovereigns, was destined to escape the fury of the so-called reformers. The Lords of the Congregation had already informed the Bishop of Moray, its Commendatory Abbot, that his only chance of saving the abbey from destruction lay in joining the Protestant party. Before he could reply to this communication a mob from Dundee and Perth attacked the buildings, and in spite of the attempt of Argyll and Lord James to stay the work of devastation, the noble pile was reduced to a heap of blackened ruins. The churches and monasteries of Stirling and Linlithgow and the abbey of Cambuskenneth were next overthrown, and the mob marched on to Edinburgh, sacking and destroying every church and religious house in the city, even the royal abbey of Holyrood itself, and ending by taking forcible possession of the Mint.

It is worthy of note that by this time Knox had no scruple in identifying himself with the iconoclasts. After complaining that the Provost of Edinburgh, Lord Seton, "had taken upon him the protection and defense of the Black and Gray Friars," constraining "the most honest of the town to watch those monsters, to their great grief and trouble," he goes on to relate with evident satisfaction the destruction of their property by the "poor, who had made havoc," he says, "of all such things as were movable in those places before our coming, and left nothing but bare walls; yea, not so much as door or window; whereby we were the lesser troubled in putting order to such places."[20] The extract already given concerning Lindores is another proof of his sympathy with the action of the "rascal multitude," upon whose shoulders some writers have vainly endeavored to shift the whole burden of responsibility. It must, moreover, be borne in mind that the "Beggar's Warning,"[21] which had so accurately prophesied the fate of the religious houses, was not the work of any illiterate person, a fact which implicates some at least of the leaders of the movement in the sacrileges which were the result.

---

[17] Knox: "History," p. 151. [18] Although contemporary writers do not mention the demolition of the Cathedral at this time, Grub says that it is "a tradition of very general reception" that the destruction commenced then. Hist., Vol. II., p. 71 (note.) [19] McCrie: "Life of Knox," Appendix, No. VII.

Events in Edinburgh called forth a strong protest from the Queen Regent in the form of a royal proclamation declaring the Congregation and all who favored them to be rebels. The document stated in clear terms that the conduct of the Protestant party gave evidence that not religion or anything connected with it, but rather the desire for the subversion of all authority, was at the root of their actions; this was proved by their constant communication with agents from England, and by the recent seizure of the instruments of coinage. In conclusion, the members of the Congregation were commanded to leave Edinburgh without delay. The reformers answered by a letter to the Regent, in which they declared their single aim to be the glory of God and abolition of idolatry. This communication they followed up by sending two representatives to the queen to explain more fully their desires and hopes. Besides asking for liberty in the practice of their religion, they expressed a wish that the French soldiers who had been taken by the Regent into her service, and who had aroused the deep dislike of all, should be dismissed to their own country. A second proclamation from Mary, declaring that none should be molested who conducted themselves as peaceable and loyal subjects, had the effect of weakening for a time the Protestant party by drawing many to the queen's side.

The mention, by the Regent, of English factions, and, by the Congregation, of French mercenaries, necessitates some few words of explanation regarding the part taken by the two countries in Scottish affairs at this period. The Queen of Scots, wedded to the young king, Francis II., and at this time residing in France, was naturally an object of interest to the princes of the house of Guise, her mother's relatives; their efforts were consequently directed to the strengthening of the power of the Scottish queen and her representative, the Queen Regent. To this end they despatched to Scotland several bodies of French soldiers, whose presence was a constant source of chagrin to the reformers. Later on a French bishop was sent to the Regent as legate of Pope Paul IV., and in his train came several distinguished French theologians, whose efforts were directed towards the reconciliation of backsliders from the Faith. The legate took care to establish Catholic rites once more in the collegiate church of St. Giles, Edinburgh, and the labors of his companions were rewarded by the bringing back of many renegades and the strengthening of waverers. Thus it was evident that French support meant the upholding of Catholicity, and this it was that irritated the Protestant party.

---

[20] Knox: "History," p. 156. [21] A summary of this extraordinary effusion was given in a previous paper; it may be found in the April number of this *Review*, p. 363.

Elizabeth of England had kept an anxious eye on Scottish affairs since her accession. She hated Knox for his political opinions, and disliked the Calvinistic principles of the reformers generally. Yet it was her policy to break the power of the Guises, who favored the right of the young Queen of Scots to the throne of England and stigmatized Elizabeth as base-born. The easiest way of striking at them, without breaking peace with France, was through Scotland. This was why, when France became active in helping the Regent, the Queen of England resolved to assist the opposing party.

Knox had already constituted himself political agent in the matter, and his letters may still be seen among the State Papers[22] begging for help against the French in money and men; many of these are written under the assumed name of Sinclair (that of his mother's family), for the reformer evidently recognized the incongruity of a minister of the "true church" persuading intrigue and bloodshed. It was many months before Elizabeth could be induced to enter into any definite agreement with the Congregation. When at length she resolved to act, it was only on condition that there should be no mention in the treaty of anything concerning religion; it was to be purely a political arrangement, intended to rescue Scotland from French interference. Part of the scheme was the deposition of the Regent and the appointment of the Duke of Chatelherault, the head of the house of Hamilton, or his son, the Earl of Arran, in her place. Both these men favored the Protestant party, and as they were next heirs, after Queen Mary, to the throne of Scotland, there seemed some hope of changing the succession, and thereby rendering Elizabeth's position secure. The conduct of the leading reformers in this matter is reprehended by even Protestant historians. "This transaction," says one, "presents us with a somewhat mortifying view of the early reformers in this country, when we find that after all the solemn warnings denounced against trusting too exclusively to an arm of flesh, Knox, who then acted as secretary to the council of the congregation in the west, and Balnaves, who filled the same situation in the council established at Glasgow, consented to purchase the coöperation of mere human power by omitting all allusion to that cause of religious reformation which they had so repeatedly represented as the paramount object for which they had taken up arms and were ready to sacrifice their lives."[23]

---

[22] State Papers, Scotland, Elizabeth, Vol. I.. Nos. 65, 88-90, 97, etc. The reader who is desirous of learning more of the moral character of Knox will find much information thereon in these letters.

Elizabeth's policy, says another writer, "was in itself wicked and unjust, and though apparently successful, was fraught with evils which produced results fatal to the happiness and well-being of both kingdoms."[24] If this can be maintained from a Protestant point of view, it becomes still more apparent when regarded in a Catholic light. It is quite certain that but for English help the Reformation would never have been brought about in Scotland. With Elizabeth's powerful aid a revolution was set on foot and maintained until the jealous Queen of England had gained her end in the overthrow of her rival, Mary Stuart. Her consent to join the cause of the Congregation came just when help was most needed. Emboldened by fresh recruits to their ranks, the Protestant party had had the audacity to address a document to the Regent informing her that she was deprived of authority, as she had failed to carry out the wishes of the young queen. This act of rebellion had alienated many of their followers, the French soldiers had proved too strong for them and they had been forced to quit Edinburgh "amid the shouts and insults of a great proportion of the citizens."[25] Without extraneous help their cause would have resulted in complete failure, and the Regent's party would have gained a permanent ascendancy.

The Treaty of Berwick between the Duke of Norfolk, representing England, and Lord James Stuart, on the Scottish side, was signed on February 27, 1560, and a few months later an English army eight thousand strong entered Scotland and a fleet of fourteen ships attacked Leith. The Congregation meanwhile resumed their old work of plundering and demolishing sacred edifices. The Abbeys of Paisley, Kilwinning and Dumfermline had already suffered during the previous autumn; now it was the turn of the more northern sanctuaries. Aberdeen was visited by the barons of the Mearns and the Dominican and Carmelite Friaries destroyed. The houses of the Franciscans and Trinitarians were fortunately protected by the zeal and devotion of the citizens from a like fate, and the noble cathedral of St. Machar was saved through the vigorous action of the Earl of Huntly.

---

[23] Fraser Tytler: "History of Scotland," Vol. III., p. 116. [24] Grub: "Ecclesiastical History of Scotland," Vol. II., p. 74. [25] Fraser Tytler: "History of Scotland," Vol. III., p. 114.

While the country was thus a prey to foreign invaders and sacrilegious rebels, the Queen Regent lay down to die. Her health, long failing, had been still more weakened by grief and anxiety at the unhappy state of Scotland. From her sick-bed in Edinburgh Castle she sent an urgent message to the leaders of the Congregation, asking them to visit her. In pathetic words she bemoaned the evils that had fallen upon the country, and besought the nobles to strive earnestly to procure peace and to rally around their young queen. Then, bursting into tears, she asked pardon of all whom she had offended, declaring that she heartily forgave all who had offended her and prayed to God to pardon them. In the judgment of a writer who had no sympathy for the queen's religious opinions, "the pathetic scene of her last farewell to her foes" is "an incident which for Christian meekness has no parallel in history."[26] Those who witnessed it were deeply touched. The queen expired on the following day, June 10, 1560. She had foreseen the difficulties which would be made about her burial as a Catholic sovereign, and had begged to be interred in the Benedictine Abbey of Rheims, of which her sister was abbess. As she had expected, the preachers forbade "the use of any superstitious rites in that realm, which God Himself had begun to purge,"[27] and it was only after several months' delay that the coffin containing her remains was conveyed secretly to France and deposited in the resting-place she had chosen. The death of Mary of Guise aroused, as an old chronicler declares, "the great griefe and lamentation of the whole number of the estates and people of the realme."[28] "This," observes Miss Strickland, in her life of the queen, "could not have been the case if she had been the unfeminine monster described by Knox. But," she continues, "the accusations brought by Knox against this Princess are seldom borne out by facts, while they afford abundant proof of the indomitable nature of his prejudice, which neither her forgiveness of those who had offended her nor her dying appeal for pardon to those whom she had offended could soften."[29]

---

[26] Miss Strickland: "Queens of England," Vol. II., p. 266. [27] M. S. Calderwood (British Museum) vide Fraser Tytler: "History of Scotland," Vol. III., p. 121. [28] Holinshed: "Chronicles," Vol. V., p. 603 (ed. 1808.)

The misery produced throughout Scotland by protracted warfare moved all parties to strive for peace, and in less than a month after the Regent's death hostilities were brought to an end by the signing of a treaty at Edinburgh by commissioners sent from France and England. The French representatives had received instructions to ignore the Treaty of Berwick as an act of rebellion, but by the astuteness of Cecil they were won over to concessions which secured the interests of the reformers, without any direct reference to the alliance of the latter with England. Elizabeth still maintained the attitude she had assumed at first, and allowed no reference to be made in the treaty to the religious disputes between the parties. Nevertheless the Protestants gained their end in another way. Among the articles was one relating to the proximate assembling of a Parliament, which should have the same power and validity as though it had been formally summoned by the king and queen. It was upon this clause that they based their hopes of the success of their reform. That they were well satisfied with the treaty is evident from the flattering terms in which they expressed their gratitude to the English queen for the part she had played in the affair. They had good reason for congratulation, for, as Tytler says, the treaty which they had just secured "led to the full establishment of the Reformation," and was "intimately connected with the subsequent course of events."[30]

Now that fortune seemed to smile upon the Congregation and its undertakings, many timid or doubtful proselytes were encouraged to join the ranks of the reformers. Among these were even some of the prelates and several of the clergy. Whether their motives were as pure as Knox would have us believe is open to doubt. It is significant that some of them were rewarded by prominent positions in the Protestant ministry, which now began to be organized with more regular method. Preachers were appointed for the chief towns, Knox himself undertaking the charge of Edinburgh. In his new capacity the arch-reformer presided with his usual anti-Catholic ardor at a solemn service in St. Giles' Church to offer thanks for the Treaty of Edinburgh.

Like all the other clauses of the treaty, that referring to the proposed Parliament was inserted subject to the approval of Francis and Mary, sovereigns of France and Scotland; yet, although their sanction had not been given (and it is clear that it never was), the Congregation boldly pushed on their project. So early a date had been fixed for the assembly that there was barely time for the royal assent to reach Scotland beforehand had their majesties been willing to grant it. This was doubtless premeditated, to judge from after events. On August 1 the Parliament met, the number of representatives being unusually large. This was owing to the presence of a large gathering of lesser barons, who had joined the reformers and who claimed the right to sit and vote. This right was not unanimously or immediately accorded;[31] for nearly a century scarcely more than one or two had made use of their privilege, and then only by virtue of a special writ. The treaty provided that all should sit "who are in use to be present;" the expression was held by some to militate against the right of these lesser barons. "It might well be deemed somewhat unusual," says Keith, "for a hundred of them to jump all at once into the Parliament, especially in such a juncture as the present."[32]

---

[29] Strickland: loc. cit. [30] Fraser Tytler: "History of Scotland," Vol. III., p. 124.

But the right of the lesser barons was not the chief question under discussion at the opening of the assembly. Many of the members maintained that until the assent of the sovereigns had been given no Parliament could legally be held, and they urged delay. It was to the interest of the reforming party, however, to carry matters through as rapidly as possible; it would even seem that strategem had been employed, for the French king informed the English ambassador as late as August 9 that he had not yet seen the Treaty of Edinburgh, or even heard from the commissioners.[33] The dispute took eight days to settle, when the majority of votes decided in favor of continuing the sittings.

Although many ecclesiastics were present, a large proportion of them were mere titulary dignitaries, who were notably on the side of reform. It is to be regretted that the true faith should have had so few representatives. Several of the Catholic bishops and abbots and their supporters among the nobility had declined to attend. The Earl of Huntly, the Chancellor and leading Catholic noble, excused himself on the plea of ill-health. In his absence William Maitland, of Lethington, was appointed president. The Lords of the Articles, who had to introduce the various measures, were chosen by the temporal lords from among such prelates as were known to favor the new opinions. The Catholic-minded ecclesiastics present protested against a mode of procedure so unfair, but their protest was disregarded.

---

[31] It is noteworthy that Randolph thought well to enclose in a letter to Cecil a copy of the petition of the lesser barons to be allowed their privilege. State Papers, Elizabeth, Vol. V., No. 8. [32] Keith: "Affairs of Church and State," p. 147. [33] French correspondence in State Paper office, quoted by Fraser Tytler: "History," Vol. III., p. 126 (note.)

One of the first proceedings was the presentation of a petition entitled: "The Barons, Gentlemen, Burgesses and other true subjects of this realm, professing the Lord Jesus within the same, to the nobility and states of parliament presently assembled within the said realm, desire grace, mercy and peace from God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, with the increase of His Holy Spirit."[34] The document went on to recount the ardent desires of the petitioners for "a godly reformation of abuses," especially with regard to the doctrines of the Roman Church, which were asserted to contain "many pestiferous errors." The petitioners craved the abolition of idolatry, the reformation of the clergy, the renunciation of the "usurped authority" of "that Man of Sin (who) falsely claimeth to himself the titles of 'The Vicar of Christ, the successor of Peter, the head of the Church, that he cannot err, that all power is granted unto him,'" etc.,[35] with much more to the same effect—the whole being couched in such violent and intemperate language that a Protestant historian declares that it is "difficult to read (it) without emotions of sorrow and pity."[36]

The petitioners were asked to lay before Parliament a summary of the precise doctrines they desired to establish, and four days later—so well prepared were they—a document was presented entitled: "The Confession of the Faith professed and believed by the Protestants within the Realm of Scotland."[37] The Lords of the Articles, according to custom, first examined and approved of it, and on the 17th of August it was read before the whole assembly, previous to submitting it to the votes. There was very little discussion upon the subject; the majority of the members present were heart and soul with the movement, and the small Catholic minority kept persistent silence.

It must be noticed here that in this procedure the reformers were again flagrantly violating the terms of the Treaty of Edinburgh. The last article of that treaty distinctly affirmed that the question of religious changes was to be discussed by specially chosen commissioners, and their decisions were to be submitted for approval to the king and queen. Yet not only had the leaders of the Congregation hurried on the Parliament without waiting for the royal assent, but the very men who, by their management of the commissioners from France, had fraudulently averted their own condemnation as rebels, actually dared to pose as lawgivers to the whole realm, and that in a matter so sacred as the worship of God.

---

[34] Knox: "History," p. 219. [35] Knox: "History," p. 220. [36] Fraser Tytler: "History," Vol. III., p. 128. [37] Knox: loc. cit.

The silence of the Catholic prelates, which he attributes to anxiety as to their temporal possessions, is severely censured by one historian. "They were probably right," says Grub, "in attending Parliament, notwithstanding the doubts as to its lawfulness, but, being there, they were bound to defend to the utmost the faith which they professed and the institution which it was their solemn duty to maintain. It might not be easy for them to determine what precise line of conduct they should adopt, but under no circumstances could their silence be justified. It encouraged their enemies and entirely disheartened their friends among the laity."[38]

There is, however, another view of the case. It is clear from documents afterwards found among the archives of the Scots College in Paris that the bishops had from the first relied upon the settlement of the religious question by a properly constituted Parliament, assembled by royal authority. When this hope was frustrated by the hasty convocation of the Parliament of August 1, without sanction from the crown, and the "Confession of Faith" was brought forward to receive its assent, they seemed to have considered it more prudent and dignified to hold their peace. They probably hardly realized the serious nature of the crisis, and felt little doubt that all would be put right again when the sovereigns had been acquainted with what had been done. Archbishop Hamilton, in one of the documents referred to, thus expresses himself on the subject: "I neither can nor will think that our sovereign will let all this country be oppressed wrongously by subjects; but I will not judge till I see the uttermost."[39] In the same letter, addressed to the Archbishop of Glasgow, who was then in Paris, he gives his reason for writing, as follows: "I must make this little billet to your lordship more that remembrance be not lost between us *than for any matters of importance*."[40] The words in Italics are worthy of note, as the letter is dated on the very day after the "Confession" had been accepted by the Protestant majority in Parliament.

To us who look at the event in the light of subsequent history, the adoption of the "Confession" is the destruction of the Catholic Faith and the setting up of Protestantism in its place by the highest authorities then in power. It had less significance to contemporaries, for Bishop Lesley, in his history, has thought it unworthy of notice. There seems no difficulty, therefore, in supposing that the bishops were actuated by similar motives in keeping silence at the discussion.

---

[38] Grub: "Ecclesiastical History of Scotland," Vol. II., p. 85. [39] Keith: "Affairs of Church and State," pp. 485-88. [40] Ibid.

But though they made no protest as to the matter comprising the "Confession," they were forced to a decision when it was a question of voting for or against it as the standard of faith for the realm. And here also we may detect the same attitude of aloofness. The Primate and the Bishops of Dunkeld and Dunblane stated their willingness to reform abuses, but considered that study and deliberation were necessary before the passing of so sweeping a measure as that in question. In spite of the sarcastic invitation of the Earl Marischal calling upon them to refute the doctrines if they could, the prelates maintained the position they had taken up. They alone, with the Abbot of Kilwinning, as representatives of the spiritual lords, and the Earls of Cassillis, Caithness and Athole, and Lords Somerville and Borthwick among the temporal lords, voted against the measure. The new profession of faith was accordingly accepted in Parliament by an overwhelming majority.

Although the new doctrines were thus established by law, as far as Parliament could do so, further means were necessary to complete the work begun. Accordingly, on the 24th of August, three more Acts were passed. The first abolished for ever the authority and jurisdiction of the Pope within the realm of Scotland; the second repealed all former acts contrary to God's Word and the Confession of Faith lately established; the third ordained that no one in future should be permitted to administer the Sacraments without a special license, and threatened all who should say or hear Mass with confiscation of their goods for the first offense, banishment for the second and death for the third.

The crowning work of this unauthorized assembly was a final violation of the very Treaty of Edinburgh to which it owed its existence. In accordance with the terms of the treaty, several prelates applied for the restoration of property which had been lost during the war. Their petitions were ignored till the very last day of the session, when they were set aside on the plea that no one appeared in support of them. The Parliament further enacted that all leases of Church lands granted since March 6, 1558, by the Archbishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow, the Bishops of Murray, Dunkeld and Dunblane, the Abbots of Dunfermline and Crossraguel, the Priors of Whithern and Pluscardyn and other opponents of the Congregation, should be null and void.

Now that the articles of faith professed by the reformers had been imposed upon the country, the next duty was to legislate for the discipline to be followed in the practice of the new form of religion. Accordingly certain persons were deputed to draw up the "Book of Discipline;" amongst them were Knox and Winram, the apostate sub-prior of St. Andrews; the latter is thought to have taken an important part in the compilation of the Catholic catechism known as Archbishop Hamilton's some eight years earlier. The Book of Discipline was submitted to a convention of the nobility at Edinburgh in January, 1561. It was by no means unanimously welcomed. "Some," says Knox, "approved of it, and willed the same to have been set forth by a law; others . . . grudged, insomuch that the name of the book of discipline became odious unto them. . . . The cause we have before declared; some were licentious, some had greedily gripped the possessions of the Church, and others thought that they would not lack their part of Christ's coat."[41] Although the Book was not formally sanctioned by the convention, yet many of the leaders subscribed their names to it, adding a proviso that all prelates and beneficed persons who had joined the Congregation should enjoy their ecclesiastical revenues for their lifetime. It is needless to say that as the "Confession" had swept away every vestige of the old Catholic faith, so the Book of Discipline entirely overthrew Catholic ritual and practice—putting an end to all feast days, even the festival of Easter, and retaining Sunday alone as a day of religious worship and abolishing five of the seven Sacraments.

The Congregation took care that the new laws should not remain a dead letter. In December, 1560, the ministers and commissioners of the reformed religion met at Edinburgh. In one of their assemblies it was decided to petition Parliament to punish as idolaters certain persons who still persisted in celebrating or hearing Mass. Among the offenders were the Earls of Eglinton and Cassillis, the Abbot of Crossraguel and the Prior of Whithern. It was stated that Mass continued to be openly said in the churches of Maybole, Girvan, Kirk-Oswald and Dailly—all in Ayrshire. In May of the following year another Assembly of the reformers met at Edinburgh. The members drew up a complaint to the privy council with regard to the suppression of idolatry—their usual term for the Mass—and all its monuments, mentioning also some other grievances. The Lords of the Council, Knox tells us, agreed to their requests, and the result of this promise was soon seen. The Parliament, which reassembled in the same month, passed an act for demolishing all remaining abbeys and monasteries. The work was entrusted to Lord James Stuart, titular Prior of St. Andrews, and to the Earls of Arran, Argyll and Glencairn. The beautiful Abbey of Paisley met its fate at this time; the Primate, who was its Commendator, barely escaped with his life. Kilwinning, Crossraguel and other houses were also destroyed, and every church in the kingdom speedily became the scene of devastation and sacrilege. Bells, holy vessels, books, vestments were wantonly carried off, and such as were valueless to the spoilers ruthlessly destroyed.

---

[41] Knox: "History," p. 232

The youthful Francis II., the husband of Mary Queen of Scots, died on the 6th of December, 1560. The ties that bound Mary to France being thus severed, her return to her native land began to be proposed. The Prior of the Knights of St. John, who had been despatched to France to give an account of the transactions following the Treaty of Edinburgh, and who arrived about September, had been received with courtesy by Francis and Mary, but they had refused to ratify the treaty, and the Cardinal of Lorraine at the same time had spoken in plain terms of disapprobation to the English ambassador regarding Elizabeth's share in the matter.

Now, however, it was felt by the Catholic party that the queen's return to Scotland would have the effect of drawing many to her allegiance who had objected to French supremacy under the rule of her mother. In February, 1561, therefore, commissioners arrived from France with a message from the young queen, announcing her speedy return and empowering the Duke of Chatelherault and others to assemble a Parliament.

The two parties in the state now vied with each other in being the first to offer to their sovereign the profession of their devoted service. John Lesley, Official of Aberdeen, afterwards Bishop of Ross and Mary's faithful adherent, was sent to France by the Earls of Huntly, Sutherland, Crawford and Athole and the other Catholic leaders and prelates, on a mission to the queen. The Lord James, as the representative of the Protestant party, was requested to present to her the allegiance of the Congregation. Lesley arrived first and was granted an interview. On the part of the Catholic lords he warned the queen against her half-brother, Lord James, who was even then at the court of Elizabeth, and advised her to take care that he should be detained in France until her own safe arrival in Scotland. He begged Mary to effect her landing at Aberdeen, where her faithful Catholic subjects would provide her with an army twenty thousand strong to escort her to the capital. Mary, however, mistrusted Huntly, and was, moreover, desirous of offending no party; so, though kind and gracious to Lesley, she did not accept his proposals.

Lord James Stuart arrived next day. He was received by the young queen with much affection. His urgent request that she should confirm the Treaty of Edinburgh was, however, firmly refused. There is good reason to suspect that Elizabeth had prompted him in this measure, for Lord James made known the result of his interview without delay to the English ambassador, who sent on the news to the English queen, and the State Papers give evidence of Elizabeth's indignation at the refusal of Mary to ratify the treaty.[42] Mary embarked at Calais on the 14th of August, 1561, and successfully avoided the English cruisers sent out by Elizabeth to intercept her, arriving at Leith six days later.

A warm welcome awaited her from the people, who flocked to Holyrood Palace in crowds to testify their loyalty. Their attitude towards their Catholic queen tended to foster the belief which Mary had always entertained, that her presence would do much to set religious troubles at rest, and that in course of time the Catholic Church would regain her sway over Scotland. But events proved the contrary. On the first Sunday after her arrival she prepared to assist at Mass in her private chapel, together with her Catholic attendants. When the news spread abroad a furious mob, led by one of the reformers, the Master of Lindsay, invaded the court of the palace and threatened death to the "idolatrous priest." It was only by the presence and authority of Lord James, who personally guarded the celebrant till the service was over, that violence was prevented.

The queen's resolution to maintain for her own household the benefit of Catholic rites was a sore point with the reformers. Some of the nobles maintained her right to the practice of her religion, but Knox and the ministers were furious. Yet, although the latter party asked advice of Calvin himself, no measures were taken at that period to disturb the queen in her religious practices. Knox's fiery zeal found vent in vehement sermons against idolatry. Mary, with undaunted courage, summoned the reformer to her presence, and more than once granted him a long interview, when religious questions were discussed between them. No permanent benefit resulted, and Knox continued to the end to cherish with regard to the queen the feelings of the bitterest animosity.

It soon became evident that the Congregation was too strong to be easily put down. Mary, with all her good will, never succeeded in obtaining more than toleration for herself and her attendants, and the time came when even this was denied her—when the Chapel Royal at Holyrood was stripped of its altars and images and an imprisoned queen, deserted by her Catholic household, was forbidden the services of even a confessor.

---

[42] State Papers, Scotland, Eliz., Vol. VI., Nos. 51, 57.

The queen's position from the first was one of extraordinary difficulty and danger. Elizabeth of England, her jealous rival, was always watching for an opportunity to deprive Mary of her crown and prevent the succession of a Catholic dynasty in either kingdom; her spies were all on the alert to gain any advantage for their mistress. Mary herself, only nineteen years of age and unaccustomed to rule, stood in need of reliable councillors. By her side, prompting all her actions, was her wily half-brother, pretending to watch her interests with affectionate solicitude; yet all the while he was her greatest and most powerful adversary. Ranged against her openly were the majority of the nobles, seeking to bring her round to their supposed religious convictions in order to maintain their unjustly gotten gains. A feeble minority only were really loyal, and among these the Earl of Huntly and his house were alienated through the machinations of Lord James Stuart.

Mary's fall was due entirely to the ambition of this unworthy relative, who was in the pay of Elizabeth all along. He had power and influence enough in the beginning to have made the queen's authority felt; but his own aggrandizement was paramount. His scheming tended all along to gain the kingly power for himself at the expense of his half-sister's liberty or even life, if need be. History shows this clearly. As early at 1559 a secret mission was despatched from Paris to Scotland to investigate his motives, for the Queen Regent feared even then that he was aiming at the crown. In 1560 Cecil was able to write of him to Elizabeth that he was "not unlike to be a king soon."[43] When the time arrived for Mary's return to Scotland, he made a point of visiting Elizabeth on his way, and when at her court, as Fr. Stevenson points out, "he told her privately, as we learn from Camden, that if she had any regard either for the interests of religion or her own safety, she ought to intercept his sister during her homeward voyage."[44] It was neither his fault nor Elizabeth's, as we know, that the attempt was unsuccessful, and that Mary was not prevented from ever setting her foot on Scottish soil again. When the queen was in the hands of her rebellious subjects, Stuart, who had become through his successful scheming Earl of Moray, threw off all disguise and openly proclaimed that he was heir to the throne, for he could prove that he had been born in wedlock. When at last he had become Regent—a post which he had coveted even before Mary's return from France and had unsuccessfully solicited from her—he led the army which was the means of her utter defeat and subsequent cruel fate.

---

[43] State Papers, Elizabeth, Scot., Vol. IV., No. 17. [44] Stevenson: "Mary Stuart," p. 236.

It is not to be wondered at that, under such circumstances, Mary Stuart should have failed to carry out the darling wish of her heart and restore the true faith to Scotland. The murder of Riccio, of which Moray was the instigator, had more than one motive. Jealousy at the secretary's influence with the queen was one; but another and more powerful reason was the intercourse which, through Riccio's means, Mary was able to keep up with continental courts, and thus keep in touch with Catholic affairs; this led to the fear of Catholic interference and even the restoration of religion. In connection with this subject Knox informs us that after Riccio's death twelve wooden altars were "found ready in the chapel of the Palace of Holyrood house which should have been erected in St. Giles' Church."[45] This is a proof that Mary was always ready and anxious to do her duty as a loyal daughter of the Church to bring back to her realm the blessings of religion, and that Riccio was anxious to help her.

The Sovereign Pontiff, Pius IV., recognized and appreciated this disposition of the queen's. He had sent her the Golden Rose in 1560, soon after her widowhood. He urged her to send an ambassador from Scotland to the Council of Trent in 1562, but such an act would have cost her the crown and perhaps even her life, and she was quite unable to comply. Her letter stating this was read to the assembled fathers, and was received with expressions of the greatest admiration of her staunch Catholic spirit. In the same year, 1562, the Pope sent to Mary a trusty Nuncio, Fr. Nicholas Floris,[46] a Jesuit, to confirm her, if necessary, in her attachment to the Church and assist her with his advice; he was the bearer of a letter from the Pope to Mary. The few bishops who remained faithful to the Church feared to hold intercourse with the Nuncio, and only the Primate dared to receive him into his house, and that on condition that he was disguised.

The Nuncio's report to the General of the Jesuits of the state of Scotland at the time gives a terrible picture of the misery into which the realm had been plunged by the reformers. Some of the monasteries had been utterly destroyed, others were in ruins, churches, altars and sanctuaries were profaned. No religious rite was allowed to be performed, no Sacraments were publicly administered with Catholic ceremonial, no Mass could be publicly said except in the queen's private chapel. Many of the clergy had abjured the faith and married. The Protestant ministers, if not apostate priests or monks, were ignorant laymen of low rank, whose preaching consisted of the blasphemous denunciation of the Mass and virulent declamation against the Pope. The queen possessed her title only, but no power; scarcely twenty years old, destitute of all human counsel and support, she could do nothing for religion or for the country, as the chief offices of the state were in the hands of Protestants and the few Catholic nobles were kept away from court by the tyranny and violence of the former. The few faithful bishops for the most part were lacking in the qualities necessary for defense against the enemy, the Catholic preachers had neither courage nor ability for discussion with the heretics, such religious as were living were in strict hiding and secular priests did not dare to appear in ecclesiastical dress.[47]

---

[45] Knox: "History," p. 330. [46] He is often spoken of as Goudanus; he was a native of Gouda, in Holland.

The reference to Catholic controversialists in this report would have been somewhat unfair had it been made a year later. An able and energetic champion of the faith, Ninian Winzet, who had been deprived of his mastership of the grammar school of Linlithgow because he refused to conform to Protestantism, was already beginning to trouble the reformers by his skill in discussion. The numerous controversial treatises which he wrote later on have never been successfully refuted by Protestants, and they won for their author at the time the reward of exile for the faith—his opponents having recourse to violence when argument failed them. Winzet barely escaped their attack and fled to the continent. He became a priest, and eventually Abbot of the Scottish Abbey of Ratisbon.

Another courageous disputant was Abbot Quintin Kennedy, Benedictine Abbot of Crossraguel, who wrote and spoke with boldness and ability in favor of Catholic doctrines, and stirred up much bitterness of feeling in his regard amongst the Protestants. He was, however, at an advanced age when he stood forth as champion of the Catholic cause, and died in 1564. "Had all the Scottish prelates," remarks Grub, "possessed the learning and the virtues of the last consecrated Abbot of Crossraguel, the reformation of the Church might have been effected in a very different manner."[48]

From the report of Goudanus as to the state of Scotland at the time he visited the country, it is evident that there was little, if any, hope of the revival of Catholicity among the people as a nation. The toleration which had been shown to the queen was not destined to last. Her unworthy husband, Lord Darnley, a Catholic in name merely, was too weak to be any support to her, and became eventually the tool of her enemies. When her only child was born his baptism was deferred for some months, owing to the opposition of the Congregation to the use of the Catholic rite. It was the last time, indeed, when it was eventually administered, that the public and solemn ceremonial of the Church was seen in Scotland.

---

[47] *Vide* Forbes-Leith : "Narratives of Scottish Catholics," pp. 72-74. [48] Grub : "Ecclesiastica History of Scotland," Vol. II., p. 127.

Moray and his associates brought their schemes to a climax at last, in the imprisonment of the queen, after Darnley had been removed by a violent death; henceforth Mary and the infant prince were completely in the power of the reformers. After more than one attempt to destroy her by poison,[49] the queen was forced, by the threat of instant death should she refuse, to sign her abdication. The effort she made to free herself from her adversaries by the help of the small party of her supporters met with a disastrous defeat at Langside in 1568, and led to her long captivity under Elizabeth, and her tragic end upon the scaffold.

Archbishop Hamilton, the last Catholic Primate, had long been the object of the reformers' special hatred on account of his staunch adherence to the old religion. At Easter, 1563, he, together with several others of the clergy, had suffered imprisonment for celebrating Mass and hearing confessions. After regaining his liberty he became one of the leading supporters of Queen Mary, and it was he who baptized the infant Prince James in 1566. After the forced abdication of the queen, the Archbishop was seized by his enemies, hurried through the mockery of a trial, and hanged at Stirling, dressed in his pontifical vestments. He had been accused of complicity in the assassination of the Regent Moray; but the only crime proved against him, as he himself asserted, was his fidelity to God and the queen. He met his fate on April 5, 1571.

Knox, that "Father of the Scottish Reformation," before his death, in 1572, was able to glory in the fact that the last Catholic sovereign and the last Catholic Archbishop of St. Andrews had been moved out of the path of what he was pleased to designate so frequently "the true Church of God." Henceforth the completion of the Reformation was but the work of time.

Enough has been said to show that the real nature of the movement known as the Scottish Reformation was political rather than religious. It remains for another article to trace out the part taken therein by the nation at large; as hitherto our attention has been mainly directed to the attitude of the clergy and the higher orders in Scotland towards the overthrow of the Catholic Church.

DOM MICHAEL BARRETT, O. S. B.

Fort Augustus, Scotland.

---

[49] *Vide* Nau: "Memorials of the Reign of Mary Stewart," edited by Stevenson, pp. 55, 63, etc

Scientific Chronicle.

ATLAS OF VARIABLE STARS.

On the occasion of the dedication of the Yerkes Observatory of the University of Chicago, Rev. J. G. Hagen, S. J., the director of the Georgetown College Observatory, announced in a speech immediately preceding the dedication ceremonies that through the kindness of Miss Catherine Wolfe Bruce he was able to publish his atlas of variable stars, on which he had been working for seven years. The publisher, F. L. Dames, Berlin, estimated that the deficit in the printing expenses, after the possible sale of such a work had been taken into account, would be $1,750. This amount had to be met before the work could appear. Through the kind mediation of Professor E. C. Pickering, director of the Harvard College Observatory, Miss Bruce gave the required sum and the atlas went to press. At the same meeting at which Father Hagen made the announcement of Miss Bruce's generous donation, Professor Pickering took occasion to say that his appreciation of the "Atlas of Variable Stars" was best shown by the action he had taken in its behalf, and the appreciation of Miss Bruce of the same was as well shown by her generous gift. He concluded by remarking that when the atlas came out astronomers would wonder how they had got along without it.

A short description of the purpose and scope of the atlas may be welcome to our readers. The purpose of the work is to assist in the determination of the fluctuations in brightness of those stars whose brightness is not constant. This determination is carried out practically by comparing the variable star with stars of constant brightness which are brighter and fainter than the variable in its successive stages. The determination can be made most accurately when these stars of constant brightness, or comparison-stars, do not differ much from the variable, and hence when the range of brightness of the variable is considerable several comparison-stars must be employed and their relative brightness *inter se* must be determined. When the variable has been thus observed many times from brightest to faintest and back again to brightest, the observer is able to determine the range of brightness, the period or length of time within which the variation takes place and the peculiarities of the variation.

To employ his time best the observer should be able to pick out quickly and with certainty from the stars seen that one on which his attention is to be fixed and the stars with which it is to be compared or with which it has been compared in former observations. Hence the atlas consists of charts of the sky in the neighborhood of each variable, on which the variable is so indicated as to be easily identified in the sky by comparing it with the chart and which contain a sufficient number of stars whose position and brightness are such as to make them serviceable as comparison-stars. Each chart is accompanied by a catalogue of all the stars on it and their relative brightnesses from Father Hagen's observations.

The atlas will contain only the known variable stars. While the discovery of new variables is always welcome, yet the thorough study of those already known is of more importance. When a greater amount of knowledge has been gained we shall be able to formulate theories as to the causes of the variation of light in the different classes of variables as has already been done for one type. There is no branch of astronomy in which the amateur, with moderate instrumental equipment, can so easily produce results of scientific value as in the observation of variables, provided his efforts are not mere desultory star-gazing, but are carried on with a certain degree of regularity and persistence.

The whole work is divided into five series, of which the first three are devoted to those variable stars which at their faintest are below the tenth magnitude and hence invisible in a telescope of three inches aperture, the fourth to those stars whose variations can be followed by the use of a three-inch telescope, and the fifth to those for which the naked eye or an opera glass suffices. The first series, which deals with variables below the tenth magnitude, at minimum and lying between the declinations 0 and —25 degrees, appeared in March of last year. The series contained forty-four charts and their accompanying catalogues, with all the explanations necessary for the thorough understanding of the charts and catalogues. Shortly after the appearance of the first series it was evident that the proceeds from the subscription list, even together with Miss Bruce's contribution, would fail to cover the cost of the work. Then it was that Miss Bruce added to her first gift the sum of $1,400.

The second series is now out and the appreciation shown for the first is repeated with even greater emphasis on the appearance of the second. On the publication of the second series Miss Bruce sent $630 through Professor Pickering, of Harvard, to the publisher to pay for the expense of printing. In announcing this fact Professor Pickering writes to Father Hagen: "I congratulate you upon the good progress you are making in your excellent work. We are going to use your charts for selection of standards for faint stellar magnitude in a work of coöperation in which it is expected that the

Yerkes 40-inch, the Virginia 26-inch, the Princeton 23-inch and the Harvard 15-inch telescopes will take part."

Professor C. A. Young, of Princeton, writes: "Your atlas seems to me to be one of the most important and well finished pieces of astronomical work that has ever been done in that line." At the reception of the New York Academy of Sciences in April Professor J. K. Rees, director of the Observatory of Columbia University, New York, took great pleasure in exhibiting the second volume of the atlas. A British officer, Colonel E. E. Marckwick, of the Ordnance Department, writes: "You must allow me to congratulate you on the excellence of the maps you have published of the vicinities of variable stars. They are indeed beautiful—nay, more, exquisite. . . . I have lately taken up the work of the post of director of the variable star section of the British Astronomical Association, and such maps at present would be of the greatest use. Failing such I have had to prepare charts of the vicinity of each variable on our working list for the guidance of those amateurs who are working in this direction. I thus know what a deal of labor is involved in settling which shall be the comparison stars, and then deciding on their magnitudes."

Dr. Ernest Hartwig, director of the Observatory at Bamberg, who is acknowledged as the leading European authority on variable stars, writes in the *Vierteljahrsschrift der Astronomischen Gesellschaft*: "As the Bonn star-charts in their day removed at once the difficulties of finding one's way among the telescopic stars when observing comets, planets and the like, difficulties which the younger generation can scarcely understand, so likewise do these charts, with one stroke, sweep away the great difficulty hitherto existing, for even experienced observers in the identification of and the determination of the variation of the light of the variable. Many who no doubt would gladly devote their time to the observation of variable stars, an occupation yielding no less pleasure than profit, will be prevented from acquiring this beautiful work on account of its high price. The price is high, not for single charts, but on account of the great number of charts in the work. The work, however, will, perhaps slowly at first, become without doubt, in the course of time, an indispensable constituent of the library of every astronomical observatory, just as has happened in the case of the Bonn charts."

This is great praise, coming as it does from such an authority, and will no doubt be appreciated by our readers, who perhaps may not have heard of such a work going forth from one of our American Catholic colleges. That the publication is so far advanced at the present time is, no doubt, due to the kind interest of Professor

Pickering and to the generous support of Miss Bruce. This should be an object lesson to many of our wealthy Catholics who could be of assistance to many investigators in our Catholic colleges throughout the country and enable them to bring to light much that would contribute to the advancement of science and reflect credit on our colleges.

We regret to announce the death of Miss Bruce, who has been such a generous patron of science in this country.

THE TOTAL SOLAR ECLIPSE OF MAY 28, 1900.

This eclipse, of which we spoke in our last Chronicle, is now a matter of history. The scientific results obtained are not collated, discussed and prepared for publication, but some general observations on the character of the eclipse will be of interest to the many who had an opportunity of viewing it only in its partial phases.

From all the reports received from the different stations along the path of totality the weather was most favorable. Although the work at these different stations was distributed so as to include observations on the corona, the prominences, the shadow bands, a search for intramercurial planets, comets and the like, still the great object of interest was the corona. This was a magnificent sight. So long as any of the sun's disc remained uncovered the characteristic effects of the total eclipse were wanting. But in a fraction of a second, so quickly that one was hardly prepared for it, the last direct ray from the sun was quenched by the black disc of the moon and immediately a great pearly halo sprang forth around this black disc and streamed away in moving pendants. This was the corona. This was visible as long as we were within the base of the great cone of darkness which followed the moon in its transit across the face of the sun. On all sides the horizon gleamed with a rim of brilliant light. This was from the air and land which outside the great round shadow was exposed to the light of the sun. In general character the corona during this eclipse resembled the corona as observed in the eclipses of 1878 and 1889. Both of these years as well as the present year were years of minimum sun spots. These facts seem to show a close connection between the sun spots and the corona.

While at almost all the stations a sharp lookout was kept for the shadow bands, still the reports are not all as favorable as one would wish. This is due probably to the fact that the bands were not as distinct as at previous eclipses. Instead of being pronounced parallel bands of shadow and brightness they appeared more like the reflection of rippled water projected upon a screen. At Barnesville, Ga., Dr. Aiken, of Savannah, devised an ingenious way of photographing the shadow bands. As yet nothing has been heard of the success attending this experiment. If successful, Dr. Aiken will be the first to succeed in this delicate work.

The spectroscopic and photographic work, judging from what has been given out in the daily papers, has been most successful and has revealed some new facts. From a report in the *Baltimore Sun* of the results obtained by the Johns Hopkins observers we learn that the spectrum obtained at Pinehurst, N. C., shows four strong ultra-violet coronal lines which have never been seen before. It was also shown, from the polariscope work of the same party, that the light from the corona was polarized or sunlight reflected, perhaps from meteoric matter; the light from the prominences, however, is their own and not reflected light. Another important report comes from Professor George E. Hale, who was at Wadesboro, N. C. He writes that he obtained for the first time evidences of heat from the corona.

The writer formed one of a party that went to Virginia Beach, Va., to observe the eclipse. The party was under the direction of Rev. John Hagen, S. J., director of the Georgetown College Observatory, and Rev. John Hedrick, professor of astronomy at Woodstock College. Rev. Joseph Algué, S. J., director of the Manila Observatory, was in the party. There were besides Rev. G. Zwack, S. J., of the Georgetown Observatory, and Professor George Coyle, S. J., of Woodstock. As the observations were not in the specific line of work of the observatories represented, there was no elaborate preparation for observation. The observers were, however, thoroughly repaid by the observations made.

Similar satisfactory reports come from other observers, and considering the favorable conditions under which the eclipse was viewed we may expect a decided advance in our knowledge of the sun when the results will have been carefully studied and published.

THE LEVEL OF LAKE NICARAGUA.

In our last Chronicle we referred to the assumed change in the level of Lake Nicaragua. The arguments for such a change were put forward by Professor Angelo Heilprin in the *Scientific American*. Such a statement could not, of course, go unchallenged by the friends of the Nicaragua Canal project. In the *National Geographic Magazine* Mr. C. Willard Hayes replies to Professor Heilprin.

In rebuttal Mr. Hayes tries to demonstrate on physiographic grounds that the assumed abasement of level could not have taken place. He assigns three causes which singly or in combination might bring about a change in the altitude of the lake: 1. A depression of the whole of this portion of the isthmus without warping. 2. A depression of the lake basin by warping, the sea margins remaining constant. 3. A cutting down of the lake outlet.

The first supposition is easily disposed of by the known stability of the coast line on both the Atlantic and the Pacific sides. "A depression of 20 feet of any occupied portion of the coast could not possibly escape notice." This is admitted by all.

"As there is everywhere a nice adjustment of shore features to present conditions," and no evidence of drowned shores or raised ancient beaches, Mr. Hayes dismisses the second hypothesis. Moreover, such a subsidence, according to Mr. Hayes, would have reached the coast, which is only twelve miles away.

The third supposition Mr. Hayes thinks is removed from the region of possibility from the fact that the San Juan river "meanders through an alluvial plain just covered by the streams when in flood;" that is having the character of "a growing flood-plain," it represents a former extension of the lake silted up by tributary streams, and proves conclusively that the present relations have held for a considerable time.

The disposition of the first supposition we have already referred to. As to the second supposition, Mr. Hayes relies on the presence of drowned shores and raised beaches to prove its falsity, but every geologist knows that the negative testimony of their absence is most illusory. In other words, their absence proves nothing. With regard to the third supposition, namely, that the lake bottom became an exposed alluvial plain, it must be said that this could happen in three ways: either by silting up or by the lowering of the lake, or by the shrinkage of the waters. Mr. Hayes seems to take the first way without advancing any proof for it.

In the *Scientific American* supplement for May 19 Professor Heilprin replies to the article of Mr. Hayes and brings forward a new set of arguments, based on the rainfall, evaporation and outflow of the lake, furnished in the report of the Walker Commission of 1897-99, showing that there has been a shrinkage during the last twenty years.

In the discussion of the subject so far the evidence seems to be so strongly in favor of the theory of the shrinkage of the lake that it is still a serious objection to the acceptance of the Nicaraguan route for an inter-oceanic canal.

A NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS.

Although our office of Standard Weights and Measures, with its inadequate facilities and meager appropriation, has done excellent work, still it could not compete with similar offices in foreign countries. This is unfortunate, seeing that the United States does more than any other nation to develop the resources of the country and to advance science. The annual appropriation in this country for these purposes amounts to $8,000,000. Hence it is that our Department of Agriculture, our Geological Survey and the like surpass anything of the kind in European countries. Little, however, has been done for physics and chemistry as applied to the arts. The portion of this large appropriation going to the office of Standard Weights and Measures was $10,400. In Germany there is a national physical laboratory conducted at an annual expense of $80,000, while the German Bureau of Weights and Measures receives annually $36,000. For like purposes Great Britain spends every year $62,000; Austria, $46,000, and Russia, $17,500.

The increased application of physics and chemistry to the arts and manufacture necessitates the existence of accurate standards imposed by some authoritative method of verification acceptable to all users of said measurement. If such a source of verification does not exist it soon ceases to be a standard. This fact has urged upon the Secretary of the Treasury the importance of enlarging the scope of the present office of Standard Weights and Measures. For this purpose an amendment was added to the sundry civil bills providing for an office to be known as the National Standardizing Bureau. The functions of this bureau, as declared in the amendment, are as follows: It will have the custody of the Government standards, and the office of comparing the standards used in scientific investigations, engineering, manufacturing, commercial and educational institutions with those adopted by the Government; the construction, when necessary, of standards or their multiples and sub-divisions; the testing and calibration of standard measuring apparatus; the settlement of discussions which arise about standards; and, finally, the determination of physical constants and the properties of materials when such data are important for scientific or manufacturing interests and cannot be obtained elsewhere.

Such a bureau will be of great help to both the scientific and industrial interests of the country, and we hope soon to see it in full operation with all the facilities asked for it by the Secretary of the Treasury.

A SUBSTITUTE FOR CELLULOID.

The action of sulphuric acid on paper, or paper pulp, has long been known. The sulphuric acid acting on the cellulose changes it into amyloid. The amyloid with an excess of water gives a gelatinous precipitate that serves to unite the fibers and forms a transparent sheet resembling parchment. This new formation has not, however, the suppleness of genuine parchment.

On this same principle the new substitute for celluloid is made.

To prepare this new substitute, called *cellulithe*, an exclusively mechanical process is principally employed. Paper pulp is beaten for an extremely long time, anywhere between 40 and 150 hours, depending on the nature of the material used and the speed of rotation of the cylinder that does the work. When a homogeneous liquid, resembling mucilage, from which every trace of fiber has disappeared, is obtained, the process of beating is stopped. To this liquid the name of "milk of cellulose" has been given.

If a colored compound is desired, coloring matter is added at this stage of the process. On account of the beating, the milk of cellulose contains a quantity of air, which is now driven off by boiling. The process of boiling and filtering takes about two hours. The filtered material is received in a perforated vessel and the water which it still contains is either evaporated slowly in the open air or driven off rapidly in an oven, heated to about 40 degrees C. The mixture settles down into a paste which slowly becomes as hard as horn and like it in appearance. Like horn also, this compound can be worked in all desired shapes and can be used for all the numerous purposes for which celluloid is used to-day. It, moreover, is free from the objectionable feature of celluloid, namely, its ready inflammability. This new compound will evidently find a large sphere of usefulness, for, judging from the cheapness of the material from which it is made and the simplicity of the process of manufacture, it can be produced at a very reasonable price.

LOCATING AN OBSTRUCTION.

Many of our readers are familiar with the fact that the mail in several of our large cities is distributed from the central post office to the branch offices by means of small cylindrical carriers about six inches in diameter propelled through cast-iron pipes by means of air pressure. Occasionally the carrier is caught in the tube, and it is a nice problem to determine the position of the carrier so as to avoid the tearing up of too much of the street.

Such an accident happened in Philadelphia some time ago, and the following ingenious method of locating the place of the carrier was devised by Mr. Batcheller, the engineer of the Pneumatic Tube Company: A pistol was fired at one end of the tube and its report was echoed back from the obstruction. One end of the tube was capped and had a rubber hose connection with a diaphragm, to which a stylus was attached. The pistol was fired in a hole near the capped end of the tube. To reduce the violence of the first direct wave from the explosion the rubber tube was partly closed by a stop-cock. On the discharge of the pistol the diaphragm was moved by the sound wave and the stylus recorded the movement on a recording cylinder, on which the time was also marked. The hose cock was then fully opened, and when the sound wave had traveled to the carrier and was reflected back the diaphragm was again moved and another record made. Noting the lapse of time between the direct and reflected waves and dividing it by two the time it took the sound to reach the obstruction was found, and multiplying this time by the velocity of sound the distance of the carrier from the end of the tube was determined. Breaking ground at the calculated distance the carrier was found almost at the spot determined by experiment and calculation.

DENIS T. O'SULLIVAN, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

Book Reviews.

Studies in Church History. By *Rev. Reuben Parsons, D. D.* Vol. VI. Part II. Nineteenth Century concluded. Large 8vo., pp. 722, including Topical Index to the whole work. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

This volume completes Doctor Parsons' great work on Church history. He has successfully brought to a close the difficult task which he set for himself in the beginning, and he is worthy of great honor for his labors. He has given to the English speaking student something which he never had before, but which he needed very much, a work which treats exhaustively and almost exclusively of controverted points of Church history. Such a work is highly interesting, not only to Catholics and Protestants, but to those who have no religious belief. The history of the Church is closely interwoven with the history of men and nations, and she bears such close relations to them that it is impossible to understand them without knowing her.

We cannot hope to learn the history of the Church from profane histories. Those who write them are generally incapable of understanding her, and through ignorance or prejudice they give us distorted views that are sadly misleading. Even if they are competent and honest they could not do justice to so vast a subject in such limited space. If we turn to Church historians proper we shall find that they give us two classes of works: One, an exhaustive treatise in some foreign language which very few persons can purchase and read, and which at best is a work of reference to be used at rare intervals to verify facts gathered from other sources; the other, a manual of Church history which is so general and so brief as to be useful only as a bird's-eye view which prepares the way for more careful study.

What was really wanted was a work on Church history which would deal at length with the great controverted questions which separate Catholics and Protestants and scandalize the unbeliever. Doctor Parsons saw this need and resolved to supply it. A less courageous man would have hesitated and declined. All history is difficult, but this branch of it is the most difficult. It would seem to be a hopeless task to try to reconcile conflicting authorities in regard to so many questions that have separated men perhaps for centuries. And it is hopeless, if one should expect to do it perfectly. Until all men shall be able to bury their prejudices, and to hold the scale of judgment with a steady hand without inclining to either side, no matter which way the scale may turn, they shall differ in regard to questions of history. This is equivalent to saying that they shall always differ. Such perfection of judgment is not to be hoped for. Even where it does exist many other qualities are required to make it available. Much learning is necessary to fit a man for the gathering of authorities. Much patience also to enable him to persevere in spite of the many obstacles that he shall surely find in his path. With this combination, good results should follow. The historian who is well booked, who is in love with his work, who desires only the truth, who is willing to make great sacrifices that the truth may be known, and who has a cool, fair judgment, as far as imperfect man can possess such a quality, ought to write history well. Dr. Parsons is that kind of a man. These six large volumes which deal with the important questions of Church history from the beginning until the present time are a monument to his learning, zeal and industry. They are invaluable for the great majority of students, both lay and cleric, who have neither the time nor the facility to study history at the fountain head. Such persons must trust some one, and they cannot follow a safer guide than Doctor Parsons.

Not the least valuable feature of the whole work is that it is written from a Catholic standpoint. Some men imagine that in order to be fair they must cease to be Catholic. They are so anxious to win the approval of Protestant and unbelieving readers that they acknowledge evils that never existed or exaggerate them until they lose their true proportions. We do not believe that it is possible for a Catholic to write from any other standpoint than the Catholic without detracting seriously from the value of his work. A Catholic has no good reason to fear the truth, but he need not be untruthful to prove it. No one knows this better than a priest, but he need not abstract from his Catholicity or his priesthood in order to prove it to the world.

Doctor Parsons does not make this mistake, and he is to be commended. He is a historian, but he is also a Catholic priest, and he writes history from a Catholic standpoint, and therefore he writes true history.

FORSCHUNGEN ZUR CHRISTLICHEN LITTERATUR UND DOGMENGESCHICHTE. Herausgegeben von *Dr. A. Ehrhard* und *Dr. J. P. Kirsch*. Mainz, Verlag von Franz Kirchheim.

We extend a cordial welcome to this new serial, which has made its appearance from the press of Kirchheim in the historic See of St. Boniface. Its scope is clearly defined in its title, "Researches in the History of Christian Literature and Dogma." Its aim, therefore, will be to combat Rationalism and heresy with their own weapons. The favorite weapon of attack against the Church employed by non-Catholic writers has been precisely the method of "historical inquiry." Their endeavor has been to determine at what period, and by whom, certain new dogmas were added to the "primitive simplicity" of the Christian faith. Against this theory of "accretion" the Catholic theologian opposes the doctrine of a living, active, developing, but always identical Apostolic creed. The idea of establishing a Catholic organ for the special study of Catholic literature and dogma had been separately entertained by two distinguished German divines, Dr. Ehrhard, professor of Church history in the University of Vienna, and Dr. Kirsch, the eminent patrologist and archæologist of Freiburg, in Switzerland. By a lucky chance, these two divines met and interchanged views at the Catholic Scientific Congress, held in Freiburg in 1897, and the consequence has been the founding of the new organ under their joint direction. Their names will serve as an all-sufficient guarantee of the thorough orthodoxy and efficiency of the publications which are to follow. To set the pace, Dr. Kirsch has already presented the public with the first monograph, under the title of "The Doctrine of the Communion of Saints in Christian Antiquity," which we have no hesitation in pronouncing the most exhaustive treatise on this fundamental subject which has yet appeared. We express the hope that some one will be found to translate it into English without delay. Other monographs are announced as in various stages of preparation for the press. It is the intention to issue, on the average, four each year.

JULIEN L'APOSTAT, par *Paul Allard*. Tome premier. La Société au IV. siècle. La jeunesse de Julien. Julien Cesar. Un volume in-8o. Prix : 6 fr. Librairie Victor Lecoffre, rue Bonaparte, 90, Paris.

Although above fifteen centuries have passed since the Emperor Julian made his futile attempt to check the triumphant progress of Christianity, it still remains as difficult to treat his career *nec amore et sine odio* as during the days of his despotism. The reason is that the antagonism between the principles which he sought to establish and the principles which he strove to eradicate continues as active and bitter as ever. For with Julian the struggle against "The Nazarene" was not one of brute force, as had been the case with earlier persecutors, but of statecraft and worldly wisdom. Hence he remains the immortal hero of anti-Christian writers of the school of Gibbon. On the other hand, the dread detestation in which he was held by the followers of Christ has been incorporated indissolubly in his historic appelation of "The Apostate." The distinguished author of the biography, the first volume of which lies before us, protests that he employs the usual opprobrious epithet in his title merely for the purpose of identifying the subject of his work, but without any wish to give a polemical color to the book. This life of Julian forms a fitting crown to the previous volumes of M. Allard on the subject of the early persecutions, and the studies and researches which he made in preparation for that valuable work enable him to take that comprehensive survey of the condition of society and religion in the Roman Empire in the fourth century, which occupies a full half of the present volume. To some impatient readers this preliminary essay may appear too diffuse and remote from the immediate subject under consideration; but, as M. Allard justly contends, "without a precise and detailed acquaintance with the epoch in which he lived, it would be difficult to understand rightly Julian's attempt to roll back the tide or to estimate the peculiar character of the ephemeral reaction with which his name is associated."

The volume is divided into four books, sub-divided into chapters. Book First treats of paganism in the middle of the fourth century and gives a bird's-eye view of the condition of the expiring cults in the various provinces of the Empire. Book Second unfolds the social condition of the different classes of the population, as well Christian as pagan. Then follows the narrative, in the two remaining books, of Julian's career until the year 360, when he usurped the imperial diadem. As the hero during this portion of his life most carefully dissembled his religious views, and, on the other hand, was unexcelled as a civil and military commander, there is but little to censure in his developing career, and M. Allard tells his story with fullest sympathy. We await with impatience the appearance of the concluding volume, which will treat of Julian's wretched ending; and we sincerely hope that this valuable contribution to the history of the Church will be speedily made accessible to English readers.

THE JESUIT RELATIONS AND ALLIED DOCUMENTS. Edited by Reuben Gold Thwaites, secretary of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Vol. LXV. Lower Canada, Mississippi Valley—1696-1702. 8 vo., pp. 273. Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Company.

It is a remarkable characteristic of the Jesuit relations that they are always interesting. One might think that so long a narrative or series of narratives would lose its interest after the perusal of one or two volumes, but it is not so. Each succeeding volume is as intensely interesting as those that have preceded it. This is due to the constant change of scene, to the introduction of new characters into the narrative, to the variety of persons that are constantly appearing and disappearing, and to the constant recurrence of intensely exciting incidents that produce pictures which surpass in color the imagination of the novelist. But the chief characteristic of the work, the one that renders it most valuable, and that enhances the value of all its other good qualities, is its truthfulness. No one ever thinks of questioning the veracity of the writer. His character, the simplicity of the narrative, the circumstances under which it was penned, and the end which the writer had in view, all vouch for its absolute truthfulness.

How much men of the world might learn from a work of this kind! How much of sacrifice, how much of faith, how much of confidence in a Divine Providence, without whose knowledge not even one sparrow can fall! How much also of wisdom there is here for our rulers! The greed, the lust, the general depravity of the paid agents of governments who were sent to carry civilization to distant lands and savage peoples, and who taught them new forms of vice, have their counterpart in our own day, under every powerful, conquering government. Our governors might learn many useful lessons by reading the Jesuit Relations, and they might save themselves from many serious blunders, but they won't do it. Pride of intellect is a very sad affliction, and it causes an enormous amount of misery.

These books will be placed on the shelves of libraries, where they will remain untouched and uncalled for except by the discriminating few and the real student of history who is searching for the truth. Very few men want to know the truth. Most persons want to make things fit to their preconceived notions of the truth, which self-interest induces them to hold tenaciously in spite of all evidence to the contrary.

For the true student of history and the earnest searcher after truth here is a mine of gold and gems.

Ecclesiastical Dictionary. Containing in concise form information upon Ecclesiastical, Biblical, Archæological and Historical Subjects. By *Rev. John Thein.* Large 8vo., pp. 749. Half morocco, $5.00. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Until the year 1883 there was no Catholic Dictionary in the English language. Before that time all English works of a similar character were by Protestant authors, and while many of them were distinguished for learning and research in other respects, they were ignorant or vicious concerning Catholic subjects. We had many excellent works of the kind in other languages, but they were generally too extensive and costly for the average reader, besides being useless for the English speaking public. When Rev. William E. Addis and Mr. Thomas Arnold announced that they would supply the long-felt want of an English Catholic Dictionary, every one rejoiced.

Cardinal Manning commended the undertaking in warm terms. Cardinal Newman said that he had begun such a work himself, many years before, because the need of it was so pressing. When it came from the press, in 1883, it sprang into favor at once, and it has held the field alone since that time. It has passed through many editions both here and in England, and on the whole it is a very excellent work. It is not complete, and it was not intended to be. No dictionary or encylopedia is. No work of reference answers every demand that is made upon it, and he is a young student indeed who expects such perfection. Its treatment of some subjects was questioned, but we are not concerned with them at present. We know that on the whole it has been a very useful book, and has answered our needs in the great majority of cases.

We have said thus much by way of introduction to the new Catholic Dictionary, because we expect that those who have used the older book will want to know in what respects the new one differs from it. It is not our purpose to compare them, but to state the points of difference.

The new book is much fuller as to the number of subjects, having more than three thousand headings, whereas the old book has less than seven hundred. It is not nearly so profuse or exhaustive in its treatment as a rule, and hence it is far less satisfying. Indeed, in most cases the treatment is very brief. The language and explanations are not so clear in the later work as in the earlier, in some instances being quite halty and obscure. It is, nevertheless, a very valuable contribution to Catholic literature, and it will have, we believe, a large sale. It is excellently made. The arrangement, the paper, the type and the binding are all most commendable.

ST. FRANCIS OF SALES. By *A. De Margerie*. Translated by Margaret Maitland. With Preface by G. Tyrrell, S. J. 12mo, pp. xv., 206. Received from Benziger Brothers, New York.

It is not long since this new series of "Lives of the Saints" was begun, and yet they have appeared with such regularity that already the list embraces eight names. Some fault has been found with them by persons who do not understand the plan of action, but those who have followed the series from the beginning, and who started out with a clear understanding of the end which the editors proposed, see that the scheme is being carried on in an admirable manner. In these very convenient little volumes we have true historical portraits of the great servants of God. They are not compilations of the pious words and actions only which are attributed to the saint, and which are built often on private tradition, but they place the whole man or woman before us as the person really lived. They show the relations which the saint bore to the persons and events of the time and place in which he lived, and therefore they furnish us with a true portrait. They are not complete finished portraits, and they differ from the more lengthy treatise as picture differs from picture, but they are complete sketches.

The other kind of biography, which is made up entirely of the pious words and actions of the subject, occupies a field peculiarly its own, and accomplishes a great deal of good when rightly understood. It shows us the perfection to which man can attain, even in this life, by the grace of God, but it may at the same time deter us from striving after such perfection unless we remember that the picture is only one-sided, and that the saints were human, and failed many times, and committed errors of judgment that some historians might call by harsher names.

The two kinds of biography, then, are good, and do not conflict with each other. Many persons will read the present series that would be repelled by more highly colored treatises. The series continues under the general editorship of M. Henri Joly, formerly Professor at the Sorbonne and at the College de France, and the English translations are revised by Rev. Father Tyrrell, S. J., who contributes a preface to each volume.

THE TESTAMENT OF IGNATIUS LOYOLA. Being "Sundry Acts of Our Father Ignatius, Taken from the Saint's own Lips by Luis Gonzales." Translated by E. M. Rix, with Preface by George Tyrrell, S. J. 12mo., pp. 230. St. Louis: B. Herder.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF ST. IGNATIUS. Edited by J. F. X. O'Conor, S. J. 12mo, pp. 166, illustrated. New York: Benziger Brothers.

It is very rarely that two different editions of the same book are published at the same time. It is the case with these two volumes. They are different translations of the same work.

The one which bears the Herder imprint is an English book. It has been translated by E. M. Rix, with a preface by Father Tyrrell, S. J., and historical notes and bibliography by Father Thurston, S. J. An amusing incident in connection with this bibliographical appendix is that in the table of contents it is called a "Biographical Appendix."

The other edition, which has been made by Benziger Brothers, is a different translation by some one not announced. It is edited by Father O'Conor, S. J., and is made up of the simple narrative without note or comment.

The work, though brief, is very valuable. Indeed, the Bollandists considered it the most valuable record of this illustrious saint. It is the groundwork of all the great lives of St. Ignatius that have been written, and without it we cannot understand him well.

The two editions should not conflict at all, because they appeal to two different classes of persons. The Herder book, being fuller and because of the valuable historical notes that accompany the text, will appeal more to the literary man and student; while the Benziger edition, being briefer, will satisfy the wants of the casual reader. It is beautifully made, and it is a delight to the eye as well as to the mind. The paper is heavy with a rich creamy surface; the type is large, clear-cut and generously spaced; and the illustrations are well executed and artistic. Even the cover is attractive, except in one particular. We mention it with the hope that the publisher will not do anything like it again. In the centre of the outside front cover there is a gaudy gold design, and in the middle of it a paper medallion of St. Ignatius. They are not artistic.

History of the Catholic Church in the New England States. By Very Rev. William Byrne, D. D., William A. Leahy, A. B., Rev. James H. O'Donnell, Rev. John E. Finen, Rev. J. J. McCoy, Rev. A. Dowling, Edmund J. A. Young and Right Rev. John S. Michaud, D. D. 2 vols., large 8vo., pp. xv.-707 and xv.-896. Boston: The Hurd & Everts Co.

In these magnificent volumes we have the histories of the Church in Boston, Providence, Portland, Manchester, Hartford, Burlington and Springfield, written by men especially chosen for the purpose. It is a very important work; it is done in the ideal way. Any general history of the Church in this country must necessarily be made up of scraps of history, if it is to be made by one man. The longest life would be too short to enable a man to gather together the material that is scattered over this vast half-continent, unless he was particularly fitted for the work and unless he had untiring energy, with unlimited means and no other occupation. Such men are not found in every generation, and even when they do rise, it is not the best way to make the history of disconnected dioceses.

It is far preferable to have the history of each diocese written by its own historian, and then have them put together to form one complete history. Or, better still, as in the present instance, to have the histories of all the dioceses in an ecclesiastical province or in a geographical section written at the same time and published in a uniform manner.

If each ecclesiastical province in the country would do what has been done in New England, and would take these volumes as their standard, following them in type, paper, size, illustrations and binding, we should have a grand history of the Church in the United States.

The Church in New England has been signally favored. From a literary point of view, as well as from the mechanical, here is a book to be proud of. The type-work and illustrations are unusually good, and altogether the work will be a lasting monument to those who conceived it and brought it to completion.

CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY: GOD. Being a Contribution to the Philosophy of Theism. By *Rev John T. Driscoll, S. T. L.*, author of "Christian Philosophy: a Treatise on the Human Soul." 12mo, pp. xvi., 342. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The author gives this account of the occasion which suggested and brought forth the present volume: "In 1890 a translation of Father Hettinger's Apology by Father Bowden, of the Oratory, appeared under the title of Natural Religion. The great reputation of the writer drew attention to the work. Many criticisms appeared, and of especial interest was an article on 'Reason Alone—A Reply to Father Sebastian Bowden,' in the *Fortnightly Review*, November, 1890, by W. H. Mallock. The importance of the problem was brought clearly to mind. Convinced that the existence of God was a certainty—how present this truth to the mind of the present day? This volume is the fruit of the thought and study."

Father Driscoll has adopted the comparative method in this work, because of the favorable reception which was given to his former treatise on the Human Soul, in which that method was used. Although the subject is heavy and abstruse in some parts, he has tried to render the reading as easy as possible by introducing illustrations and references to modern literature and by relegating doubts and controversies to foot notes. The author's plan is to take the idea of God as a fact of consciousness, and without stopping to enquire how the idea came to the individual mind, to ask rather, are we justified in holding the idea, and what is its content? It will be seen at once that this line of thought is a departure from that followed in most treatises on the same subject. The plan is carried with the same thoroughness and faithfulness which characterized Father Driscoll's former book, and those who study the subject under his direction will be well taught.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS DECALOGALIS ET SACRAMENTALIS. Auctore clarissimo *P. Patritio Sporer*, Ord. FF. Min. Novis curis edidit P. F. Irenæus Bierbaum, Ord. FF. Min. Tomus II. Paderbornæ, 1900. Ex Typographia Bonifaciana. PP. vii., 948. Price, marks, 7.80.

A recent moral theologian of note speaks of Sporer as highly esteemed for solidity of doctrine and practicality—*ob doctrinam plerumque solidam praxique accomodatam a plerisque magni æstimatus.* (Génicot: "Theol. Mor. Institutiones," Vol. II., p. 770, third edition.) This is a qualification of St. Liguori's estimate of Sporer as *plus quam par benignus in selegendis sententiis.* It coincides substantially with Fr. Lehmkuhl's verdict: "*Sporer generatim solide et erudite scripsit.*" To these merits Fr. Hurter's estimate adds that of perspicuity; *solide, erudite et perspicue conscripta* is his characterization of the present work. It were superfluous to add further commendation to the approbations of these eminent authorities in moral theology. It is a significant tribute to the merit of Sporer's theology that after a lapse of almost two centuries it should revive its youth in a new edition, and that the editor should find little to add or subtract in order to bring the work into adjustment with present requirements. The present volume contains the theological doctrine falling under the second five precepts of the decalogue. The gravest subjects are here treated, those namely which concern justice and injustice in their manifold species, restitution, ownership, contracts. It is a pleasure to note that the editor has done his best to facilitate the study of these perplexing subjects, by the orderly disposition of the material, whilst the publishers have seconded his efforts by the aid which typography can furnish.

BLICAL TREASURY OF THE CATHECHISM. Compiled and arranged by *Rev. Thomas E. Cox.* Second Edition. 12mo, pp. 415. New York: Wm. H. Young & Co.

One of the objections brought against the Baltimore Catechism is that it does not give quotations from the Sacred Scriptures to prove its answers. Many persons consider this omission a serious mistake. Father Fox brings forward the remedy in the volume before us. In it he reprints every question and answer in the Baltimore Catechism, and after each answer the texts of Scripture are quoted that prove or confirm the doctrine of the Catechism. By a system of cross references repetition is prevented when the same texts are to be used more than once.

It is claimed for the Biblical Treasury that it will be of great service to priests in preparing their sermons; that the seminarian will find in it abundant Scriptural proof for his theological theses; that the catechist may obtain from it thoughts to enliven every lesson, and that the catechumen and convert may learn from it convincing testimony for the truths of Catholic faith.

The author has worked with a generous hand, and has gathered together a wealth of riches. The book bears evidence of careful compiling on every page, and it will do all that the author claims for it. It is well made and so arranged that it can be used with the smallest possible loss of time.

WETZER UND WELTE'S KIRCHEN LEXIKON. Zweite Auflage. Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis.

The revision of this great Lexicon, which has been in course of publication for fourteen years, is at length within easy distance of completion. The latest number, just received, deals with the letter V, and ends with the word *Verführung*. Within a few months, therefore, the great Catholic Lexicon will stand before us complete in twelve stately volumes, condensing the whole mass of Catholic lore, in all its departments, with such accuracy and comprehensiveness as to constitute an entire theological library in itself. Each article is the work of an expert, generally of world-wide fame, and represents the last word which contemporary science has to say on the subject under consideration. Herder's Lexicon is an honor to the Catholic Church and places Germany far in the van in the march of Catholic progress.

COMPENDIUM JURIS CANONICI, Quod in Usum Suorum Auditorum Scripsit *Andreas B. Meehan, D. D.* Rochester, 1899.

In the modest compass of 429 pages, the professor of canon law in St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, has given an outline of the principles and details of Church legislation which will be of interest and instruction far beyond the walls of his class room. He is generally accurate and judicial in his statements, and devoid of that captious spirit which has brought his department of theology into bad repute in many quarters. His Latin is clear and good. Referring to page 149, the canonical age for the reception of the priesthood, according to the Council of Trent, is the beginning of the twenty-*fifth* year. We hope to see the book adopted in all our seminaries.

ZUR CODIFICATION DES CANONISCHEN RECHTS. Denkschrift von *H. Laemmer*. 224 pages. 8o. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder, 1899. Price, $1.95 net.

Among the tokens of affection received by the venerable Bishop of Ermeland on the occasion of the golden jubilee of his priesthood, no doubt the most acceptable, as it will be the most enduring, was this excellent treatise of Laemmer on the important subject of the codification of the laws of the Catholic Church. The necessity, magnitude and difficulty of the gigantic task, and the efforts hitherto made toward the execution of it, are stated with a precision and erudition worthy of one who has aptly been styled "the Nestor of Catholic canonists."

Biblische Studien. Herausgegeben von *Professor Dr. O. Bardenhewer* in München. Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis.

These "Biblical Studies" consist of valuable monographs by eminent Catholic professors under the editorial direction of Professor Bardenhewer, of Munich. The impulse to the work was given by the encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. on the Holy Scriptures, in 1893, and since its inception four volumes have appeared, each containing four separate dissertations, all masterpieces in their kind. The latest to appear is designated as opening the fifth volume of the series. It is entitled "An Excursion Through the Biblical Flora," and is the work of Rev. Leopold Fouck, S. J. Like Solomon in his last discourse on the same subject, the learned author treats of every tree and shrub, "from the cedar that is in Libanus, unto the hyssop that cometh out of the wall."

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Light of Life: Set forth in Sermons. By the *Right Rev. John Cuthbert Hedley, O. S. B.*, Bishop of Newport. 12mo, pp. 383. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The Franciscans in Arizona. By *Rev. Zephyrin Englehardt, O. F. M.*, with a map and numerous illustrations. 8vo. Printed and published at the Holy Childhood Indian School, Harbor Springs, Michigan.

Clement of Rome, and Other Tales of the Early Church. By *Rev. John Freeland.* 12mo, pp. 187, London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Scripture Manuals for Catholic Schools (arranged with a view to the Oxford and Cambridge local examinations). Edited by the Rev. Sydney F. Smith, S. J. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. By *Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S. J.* 12mo, boards, pp. 254. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Theologiæ Moralis Institutiones quao in Collegio Lovaniensi Societatis Jesu tradebat Edwardus Génicot. Duo volumena, 8vo, pp. 678—872. Lovanii: Typis et Sumptibus Pollennis et Centerick. (For sale by Benziger Brothers.)

Sermons for Every Sunday in the Year. By *Rev. B. J. Baycroft, A. M.* 8vo, pp. 351. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

The Life of St. Mary Magdalen de Pazzi. Compiled by Rev. Placido Fabrini. Translated and published by Rev. Antonio Isoleri, Missionary Apostolic. Large 8vo, pp. 469, illustrated.

General Introduction to the Study of the Sacred Scriptures. By *Rev. Francis E. Gigot, S. S.* 8vo, pp. 605. New York: Benziger Brothers.

History of the Passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Explained by Rev. James Groenings, S. J. 8vo, pp. 315. St. Louis: B. Herder.

The Soldier of Christ; or, Talks Before Confirmation. By *Mother Mary Loyola*, of the Bar Convent, York. Edited by Father Thurston, S. J. 8vo, pp. 420. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXV.—OCTOBER, 1900—No. 100.

A COMMISSION ON THE GREEK ORDINAL IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

WHILST lately in Rome awaiting the conclusion of some business in one of the Congregations I obtained permission to make researches in the archives of Propaganda. Amongst the great mass of papers which passed under my eyes during the weeks I was able to devote to the work one set of documents proved of special interest to me, as they threw considerable light upon the state of theological opinion on the question of "the tradition of instruments" in the Sacrament of Orders in the early part of the seventeenth century.

As all students know, there has long been a great difference of opinion as to what is the essential matter of the diaconate and priesthood. It has been assumed, and is very commonly asserted, that from the rise of scholasticism, and certainly since the Council of Florence and the "Instructio ad Armenos" of Pope Eugenius IV. up to very recent times no one in the Latin Church questioned the ordinary teaching of theologians that the essential matter of orders was the "tradition of instruments," *i. e.*, for the diaconate the giving of the Book of the Gospels, for the priesthood of the chalice, etc., to the candidate. Further it is asserted that inasmuch as this was practically the universal and official opinion of the authorities of the Latin Church, many questions as to the validity of the Sacrament of Orders were determined in the light of this assumed prin-

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1899, by Benjamin H. Whittaker, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

ciple—questions which might have been decided in a very different manner had other and, as it is now believed, sounder views as to the matter of the sacrament prevailed. It is now unnecessary, of course, to say that this assumption made by some writers that the tradition of instruments was practically accepted by all theologians from the thirteenth century downward as the essential matter of the Sacrament of Orders, is as a fact not borne out by an examination of their works. These prove beyond doubt that teachers in theological schools, and above all the authorities of the Latin Church, were always aware that there was another opinion, and that certainly from the sixteenth century in any decision on the question of the validity of orders what is called the scholastic view had no undue weight.

The documents I came across in the Propaganda archives fully confirm this opinion as to the full knowledge of the Roman theologians on this matter in the early seventeenth century. The Congregation de Propaganda Fide was established in 1622, and in the early years of its existence much of its resources and a great deal of its energy was occupied in the printing and publishing of books which would be useful for the work of spreading and defending the faith. For this purpose a press was established and types to print in the Oriental languages were prepared, and in the volumes of the "Acta" appear constant notes from which the history of the Propaganda press might be written. In 1636 a question was raised as to the publication by the Congregation of a new edition of the Greek "Euchologium," or book of the Greek services and rites. On March 4 of that year Cardinal Barberini, then Prefect of the Propaganda, pointed out the need of preparing an edition of the Greek liturgy for the Oriental churches in general and for those who followed the Greek rites in Italy in particular. It would appear from his statement that the editions of the "Euchologium" which existed, and notably that printed in Venice "post annum 1557," were considered to be faulty and required careful correction, and a Commission was thereupon appointed by the Pope to thoroughly examine the whole question.

This Commission came together for its first meeting on April 24, 1636, and so seriously did it fulfil its mission that it only terminated its labors in 1640, having held some sixty-five sessions. During those meetings the whole book of Greek rites was taken, part by part, and the matter and form of the sacraments as well as the ritual for the celebration of Holy Mass was fully gone into. At the commencement it was agreed that to insure full consideration one member of the Commission should be appointed to act as exponent. He was specially to study the matter for discussion, and was apparently to take the side adverse to the existing Greek ritual. Father Vincent

Richardus, a Theatine, was asked to take this position, and in the various meetings which followed his censura formed the groundwork of all the debates.

The fact of this Commission having sat in the seventeenth century was, of course, well known by the Preface of Morinus in his great work "De Sacris Ecclesiæ Ordinibus," which in one sense may be said to have been the outcome of studies undertaken as a member of this Commission. Morinus dedicates his work to the president, Cardinal Barberini, and says that he was called to Rome in 1639 by the Cardinal and a few days later was summoned to take part in "a Commission appointed by Pope Urban VIII. to consider the Greek Euchologium." When he first took his place at the sittings, he says, the inquiry into the validity of the rite of Greek ordinations had begun, and he seems to imply that it was through his exertions, or mainly through the light he was enabled to throw on the subject, that the Commission was saved from making a great mistake in this matter. "It appeared to me," he writes, "not quite safe to settle a question of such moment on the teaching of the scholastics alone." In his view the members had no sufficient knowledge of Greek or of the Greeks, "nor had it entered into their minds to inquire what, how many and of what nature the Greek forms of ordination were." It will be seen that in this opinion about his brother commissioners Morinus was hardly fair, although no doubt the arguments and knowledge of the learned French Oratorian had great weight with them. He was not, however, able to remain to the end of the meetings, for after having been nine months in Rome he was suddenly recalled by Cardinal Richelieu to Paris. "Why I was called back," he says, "I know not, but the order of such a man could not be disobeyed." The interest created in his mind by the discussions, however, continued after his return. The matter constantly occupied his attention and finally took the form of the volume prepared for publication in 1655, in which he set himself to prove that what "many of the scholastics" had taught to be the essential form of orders were in the old rituals conspicuous by their absence.

From the "Acta" of this Roman Commission, to which I now call attention, I believe for the first time, it appears that even before Morinus came to Rome the fathers were fully aware of the difficulties as to the scholastic view about the matter and form of the Sacrament of Orders, which indeed the mere examination of the "Euchologium" must have brought out. We are not concerned with the early discussions of the Commission, but early in 1639—in the thirty-fourth session—the question of the sub-diaconate was formally raised by the Theatine, Father Vincent Richardus. The point was clearly stated by the ponente: in the ordination of sub-deacon could the old form of the Euchologium be kept, since it ordered mere imposition of hands, whereas according to the Latin rite the order was conferred by the tradition of the chalice without any such imposition? He quoted the Council of Florence, or rather Eugenius IV.'s "ad Armenos," which he considered settled the question absolutely by declaring the tradition of instruments to be the essential matter of the sacrament. The ponente consequently strongly advocated the substitution of this for the mere imposition of hands found in the "Euchologium."

A certain Cistercian, Abbot Hilarion, another member of the Commission, although admitting that the important question of the tradition of instruments should be most carefully examined, was himself of opinion that it was not necessary or essential and that the matter of the sacrament was clearly the imposition of hands as found in the Greek Ordinals. As proof that the orders conferred without "the instruments" had been regarded as right and valid, he quoted Clement VIII. in his instruction "Super ritibus Italo-Græcorum" (August 31, 1595), in which the Pope dealt expressly with the orders of those "ordinati ab Episcopis schismaticis" according to Greek forms, and assumes throughout their unquestionable validity.

At this meeting Cardinal Barberini spoke "at length and expounded the ground of both opinions. As a practical conclusion he advocated the thorough examination of the question, because if the Commission were to advise that the 'tradition of instruments' should be insisted upon it was greatly to be feared that such a decision would be attacked not only by the Greeks, but by many of the Latins" who did not believe in their necessity.

It is obvious from the above that at this period in the sittings of the Commission the fathers were fully alive to the importance of the questions at issue in regard to the matter and form of orders, and it was only after two more sessions, in which the discussion was continued, that the members determined, in order to sift the matter to the bottom, to obtain the assistance and advice of other skilled authorities. On July 9, 1639, consequently, three new names were added to the Commission. One was Father Anthony Hickey,[1] an Irish Franciscan, of St. Isidore's, Rome, and another the well-known French Oratorian, Morinus. On August 14 the new members for the first time took their seats on the Commission, which was then holding its thirty-seventh session. The question being debated was, as Marinus indeed tells us in his Preface, the subject of the

---

[1] Father Hickey was doubtless proposed by Father Luke Waddington, who was at this time constantly consulted by the Propaganda officials. Father Hickey's portrait is painted on the walls of the "Hall of the Theses" in S. Isadore's with the following inscription: "Ad modum R. Pater Fr. Antonius Hignælus, Emeritus S. Theologiæ Professor: Totius Ordinis Definitor Generalis: Vir in omni scientiarum genere conspicuus; studio totus et orationi deditus: Diversorum author operum: Vita ac morum gravitate exemplarissimus.

Greek ordinations, and the discussion of the sub-diaconate was again resumed by the ponente, Father Vincentius Richardus. He, as usual, took the position of uncompromising hostility to the Greek forms, and in his role of *advocatus diaboli* maintained (1) that in the Euchologium there was not sufficient matter and form, (2) that there was no tradition of instruments which rendered it essentially defective, and (3) that the words used did not sufficiently signify the power of the order bestowed. Further, that the form of words made use of was "*deprecativa et non efficiunt quod significant, neque significant quod efficiunt.*" Moreover, he could not accept the view held by some authorities that the essential matter of orders was "the imposition of hands," for it appeared to him to be distinctly against the Councils, the ancient practice of the Roman Church and practically condemned by the words of Pope Eugenius IV. in his Instruction to the Armenians. In this opinion he was followed by one other member of the Commission, who also added that in his opinion there was no real distinction made in the Euchologium between the subdiaconate and the diaconate.

The other five members, including Cardinal Barberini, Father Anthony Hickey and Morinus, held that the Greek form was certainly sufficient, and that no change should be made in it. They gave their reasons with some minuteness, and they briefly amount to the claim that the imposition of hands was the only essential and necessary matter of the sacrament. They refer to the authority of the learned Greek, Arcudius, whose work on this very question had not long before been published in Rome, with the approval of Roman theologians and at the command of Pope Paul V., and their arguments are mainly drawn from the sixth book of the learned treatise. They maintained that this authority fully proves *(late probat)* that the Greek rites never had any other matter than "the imposition of hands," and that in primitive times there could have been no "tradition of instruments" since to take the case of the diaconate, the book of the Gospels could not have been given, or anything equivalent to it, by the Apostles in their ordinations.

The principle that Morinus advocated in the examination of the Greek liturgy, as he tells us in the Preface of his work, was that if the Greek rites before and after the schism were shown to be the same, then there could be no doubt that the Euchologium contained all the essential rites of ordination. If, on the other hand, it was found that changes had been introduced, it would be necessary to examine the nature of these introductions, or omissions, and to discover the intention which had prompted the changes. For this purpose Morinus obtained copies of the Greek ritual, certainly going back beyond the days of the schism, and satisfied himself that the "Euchologium" then being examined was in its forms practically identical with these.[2]

Moreover, the upholders of the sufficiency of the Greek rites pointed out that although it was well known that the Oriental church had never made use of any other form of orders than the imposition of hands and prayer, still the validity of the ordination of Eastern churches had never been called into question by the Latins: neither at Lyons nor at Florence had any doubt been thrown upon the reality of these orders, nor the slightest hint thrown out that the Oriental forms were invalid. On the contrary, the Greeks had always been accepted as true priests and honored as true bishops. Further, in 1254 Pope Innocent IV., in his letter to a legate who had been sent to Cyprus to end disputes which had arisen between the Latin and the Greek bishops in the island, went carefully into the question of the Greek rites. In regard to the orders conferred by the Greek bishops he merely desired that the three minor orders, not specifically given in the Greek ordinals, should be added "according to the custom of the Roman Church," and in clearly admitting the validity of the orders in general, says nothing about the necessity of any tradition of instruments. This position of Pope Innocent IV. in regard to the Greek forms of ordination was, moreover, in full accord with his previous teaching in the schools. As the canonist, Sinibaldi, he had maintained that imposition of hands accompanied only by some form to specify the order, such as *Esto Sacerdos*, would be sufficient for the valid bestowal of sacred orders.

The Commissioners, in order to show that their view, that the tradition of instruments was not necessary, was a novel teaching, referred to the authorities adduced by the learned Arcudius and to the even more recent teaching of Hallier, a professor at the Sorbonne, who whilst urging in practice the necessity of bestowing the chalice, etc., on the priest with the accompanying form, as signifying clearly the sacrificial character of the priesthood, still held that there could be no doubt whatever that imposition of hands was the necessary and essential matter of the sacrament. To the authority of Hallier the fathers of the Commission added the weight of "other more recent teachers," such, for example, as the admitted theses maintained in the theological faculty of Paris in 1633, 1639 and 1640. These are referred to by Dom Hugo Medaro in his edition of St. Gregory's "Sacramentary," and are amply sufficient to indicate that the trend of the then theological opinion was in favor of the view held by the majority of the Commission.

---

[2] On his return to Paris Morinus told Goar, the Dominican, who was then engaged in editing the Greek ritual books of two copies he had seen in Rome, better than those he had for the basis of his edition.

In summing up their arguments in favor of the Greek traditional forms, the fathers maintained that "the Sacrament of Orders was instituted by Christ our Lord in such a way that the consecration of ministers was effected by certain words, or symbols, or external signs by which the ministry to which the candidate was to be ordained was signified. The determination of specific symbol or sign, however, was left to the will of the Church. The one thing which at all times appeared as a part of the ordination services both in the Greek and Latin Churches was imposition of hands accompanied with prayer. Whilst the Latins had added to the ancient forms the tradition of instruments to emphasize the character of the order more clearly, the Eastern churches had left them as they were, and there could be no sort of reason why they should now be added to make them like the Western forms.

The majority of the Commissioners met the assertion of the ponente that at the Council of Florence Eugenius IV. had settled the question once for all by a denial that the "Instructio ad Armenos" really taught what it was suggested it did, namely, that the matter and form of the Sacrament of Orders was the tradition of instruments accompanied by the usual form of words and nothing more. "The Council of Florence," they say, "did not exclude, but rather assumed, the existence of the Greek rites and merely gave to the Armenians the more perfect forms which the Latins made use of in conferring the Sacrament of Orders." In other words: Eugenius IV. only intended in this "Instructio" to state what, in addition to the imposition of hands, which the Armenians already made use of, the Latins required *de facto*. It was on the one hand obvious that the Council of Florence and the Pope fully and completely acknowledged as valid the orders of the Greeks, and on the other that when asked to state the Latin forms it was only reasonable that the Pontiff should give the additional rite of the tradition of instruments, upon which the teaching of the scholastics had insisted so strongly. It cannot be conceived as possible that Eugenius IV. could have intended to suggest that the orders as given by the Greeks were invalid, seeing that both he and the fathers of the Council of Florence admitted their validity. Neither is it likely that his words were intended to imply that there was no need of any imposition of hands since it formed an integral part of the existing Latin rite. This is all the more certain since the Pope and his successors, as the fathers of the Commission point out, most certainly continued to accept the orders bestowed by the Greek Church without any tradition of instruments. Taken by itself, it is possible to misunderstand the "Instructio ad Armenos," but its terms must be interpreted by the circumstances of the times when it was given and by the way in which the people of the time understood its meaning. The action of the Popes in regard to Greek ordinations leaves no real doubt as to the meaning to be attached to the direction. If, for the sake of argument, it be admitted that the Pope did intend to lay down as certain the narrow scholastic opinion that the tradition of instruments only was the essential matter of orders, it is still open to disagree with this opinion. In practice the Pope did not himself maintain such a view, as the mere fact of his accepting orders conferred without this proves beyond any possibility of cavil or doubt. If it was Pope Eugenius' opinion (which it is almost impossible to believe), then we may hold, as the fathers of this Commission say: "It was a practical instruction to the Armenians, and no dogmatic definition on the nature of the sacrament." *(In prœdicta instructione definitionem de fide non conteneri.)*

So far as the Commission was concerned this discussion seems practically to have decided their opinion on the question of the tradition of instruments, the sense of the members being clearly that the imposition of hands was the essential matter of the Sacrament of Orders. When in the next session, held on August 28, 1639, the rite of ordination to the priesthood was taken into consideration the point was raised only in the general statement of the objections and difficulties at the conclusion. The point here proposed to the Commissioners as the first difficulty was whether the second imposition of hands with its accompanying form: *"Accipe spiritum sanctum quorum remisserites peccata,"* which was not to be found in the "Euchologium," was not essential as conveying the powers of the keys to the priest, which Our Lord had bestowed on his Apostles after the Resurrection. Several members of the Commission argued against the necessity and adduced many strong reasons to support their contention. The fact that, although in the Greek forms there never was any such second imposition of hands, and that nevertheless no one had called in question the validity of their orders, was insisted upon. One of the Commission pointed out that theologians like Sotus and Valentia held that the Greek rite implicitly contained the whole of the Latin forms. "In this latter," he said, "the second imposition of hands was added at a late period to explain the nature of the sacerdotal powers more clearly." There were not two forms, but one, and it was certain that this and many other additions had been made by the Latins at comparatively late times in order to emphasize more clearly the nature of the sacrament. This he concluded was obviously the case, since in the most ancient Roman form of orders there was only mention of imposition of hands with prayer and nothing more.

Father Anthony Hickey, the Irish Franciscan, took the same view most strongly, saying that it was not open to doubt that orders in primitive years were always given by the imposition of hands and prayer. He suggested that as in process of time the sacrificial character of the Christian priesthood came to be expressed very definitely by the tradition of the chalice and with its accompanying words, it became almost necessary to introduce something so as to emphasize the ministerial side of the priestly office and the power of the keys. In the Greek forms, as indeed in the oldest Western forms, both were sufficiently expressed in the same form.

The discussion was continued through several sessions, some of the members allowing that they were doubtful about the point at issue; but Morinus expressed himself as clear that the second imposition, etc., was quite a late introduction in the Western Church, and certainly not to be found in any of the ancient Greek or Oriental liturgies. Besides this point, upon which all the argument appears to have been on the one side, the question whether a deprecatory form, such as that in the Euchologium: "May Divine Grace make thee, N, now a deacon, into a priest," was raised and its validity similarly maintained by Morinus and others, who laid stress upon the fact that all the Greek forms from ancient times had always been of this kind and had nevertheless always been acknowledged by the Roman Church.

Before the close of the arguments on this matter, in March, 1640, Morinus had been recalled to France, but his departure does not appear to have changed the views of the Commission. In March, April and May at the meetings a considerable portion of the time was taken up in resuming the discussion on the necessity of the tradition of instruments. Throughout one thing appears clearly: that all fully admitted the fact that this was not an ancient part of the rite, but a comparatively modern introduction, and that what had always existed from the days of the Apostles was imposition of hands and prayer, as then found in the Greek Euchologium. One of the fathers—Antonius Marulus—who had joined the Commission shortly before the close of the discussion, at great length summed up the historical argument by adducing examples of the admission of the imposition of hands as the essential matter of the sacrament during the nine previous centuries. In the course of the argument, too, various theologians were quoted, amongst others the Jesuit Martin Becanus, who taught definitely at the end of the sixteenth century that "Orders are bestowed by the imposition of hands and the word of the ordaining Bishop;"[3] that "there must be imposition of hands is absolutely certain and has never yet been questioned by any one," and that "the imposition of hands would appear to be the essential matter of this sacrament instituted by Christ; the tradition of instruments, on the other hand, would seem to be accidental only and introduced by the Church."

---

[3] His "Summa" was published in 1619.

The position taken by the Commission generally would appear, then, to be the following: Just as Pope Benedict XV. considered that in the Greek sub-diaconate all the minor orders were implicitly contained, so the Latin rite had by its introduction of the tradition of instruments and the second imposition of hands only amplified and more clearly expressed what was actually contained in the simple imposition of hands and the accompanying words of the Greek rite and the earliest Latin forms. The latter had not really changed the form, but had merely expanded and extended it to give it great significance.

This attitude of mind was mainly formed, as we have seen, upon the work of Arcudius. This learned Greek priest, a native of Cyprus, after having done much to help in the settlement of the Oriental difficulties, died at the Greek College in Rome, in 1634, two years before the meeting of this Commission. In 1619 he had published his folio volume on the agreement between the Greek and Latin Churches in matters of doctrine, etc. In this work, when treating the question of orders, besides showing that the Greek priesthood, etc., had always been acknowledged by the Latins, although given without any tradition of instruments, he claims to prove that even among the scholastics he finds evidence of the principle that imposition of hands was the essential matter of the sacrament in spite of their common teaching. He bases this declaration on St. Bonaventure's opinion, who in his Commentary on the fourth "Book of the Sentences" says: "In sacred orders, since a high and excellent power is therein conveyed, imposition of hands is used, and not mere tradition of instruments, for the hand is the organ of organs in which in an especial way the power of action resides. Hence in the primitive Church, where only the two orders (of deacon and priest) were explicitly given, ordinations were conferred in this way."

Again: "To what has been objected on this: that orders, as we have them, are given by the bestowal of the Book or chalice, we reply that as the (virtue of) every instrument is in the giving of it by the hand, so where there is no such tradition of instruments their import is signified by the imposition of hands alone. Hence . . . in the primitive Church all the orders, which in process of time were made distinct and more explicit both as to words and signs and persons, were conveyed by the imposition of hands. . . .

"It is to be understood that there was always some word to express the fact that such or such a power was bestowed; but only in two sacraments did Our Lord Himself determine the special form of words. In the case of the rest, though some words are necessary, the actual form was not determined, but any words expressing the sense, in as far as it is *de ratione sacramenti,* are sufficient, so long as he who uses them does not intend to introduce any heresy. Now, of course, it is necessary to keep the forms appointed and approved by the Church . . . It is untrue to say that in the primitive Church there were none but *holy* orders; the rest were implicitly given in the imposition of hands.

In some notes on this portion of St. Bonaventure's teaching the editors of the recent edition say: "Many of his contemporaries, taking a more strict view than St. Bonaventure, maintained that the character of orders was bestowed by the tradition of instruments with the accompanying words. This is most frequently understood of all orders, even the priesthood, which is given by the bestowal of the chalice with wine and the paten with bread, and the diaconate, conveyed by the Book of the Gospels. This is even said in plain terms in the decree *pro Armenis.* But, on the other hand, the friend of St. Bonaventure, Peter Tarantesius (afterwards Pope Innocent V.), excepted the diaconate and the priesthood, which he asserted were given by the imposition of hands." The same opinion has been constantly maintained in the Church, either practically by the full recognition of Greek orders, or by the teaching of some theologians, at all times. The Council of Trent refrained from settling this question on the ground that the fathers had not met to arrange disputes between theologians; but when treating of the Sacrament of Orders the Council implicitly supports the view maintained by Arcudius, since it speaks of sub-deacons being ordained by the bestowal of the cruets and of "priests *rite ordinate per impositionem manuum presbyterii.*" Moreover, we know from the history of the Council that the question was formally raised in the session held in 1562. The Cardinal of Lorraine at first desired that it should be distinctly stated that the matter of the sacrament of the priesthood was the imposition of hands, but subsequently "he considered that where what is necessary for the Sacrament of Orders is given it would be better not to designate specifically the matter and form; not that these did not exist, but because in this sacrament they could not easily be determined. On the other hand, he would like to see some mention made of the imposition of hands, since it was named so frequently in the Old and New Testaments. His opinion on this point met with universal approval, although finally, in order not to define positively that imposition of hands was the essential part of the sacrament, the more general expression "words and signs" was determined upon to state the component parts of the Sacrament of

Sacred Orders. Still the imposition of hands was not wholly passed over in silence, since in the decree itself the words of St. Paul to Timothy: "*Admoneo te ut resuscites gratiam Dei, quæ est in te per impositionem manuum mearum*" are quoted.

It must, of course, be borne in mind that the Council of Trent had already taught distinctly (Sess. 21, c. ii.) that although "in dispensing the sacraments" the Church might appoint or change what was proper to their administration according to times and places, this power did not, of course, extend to their substance as determined by Our Lord. *(Salva earum substantia.)*

It is upon this teaching that many theologians of the seventeenth century, and in particular Morinus and other fathers of the Commission which sat upon the Greek "Euchologium" based their arguments, maintaining that imposition of hands was the essential matter of the Sacrament of Orders. In the West they say, in effect, the earliest forms of ordination prove that imposition of hands only was used, just as we find in the Greek Church at the present day, and since "the essential matter of the sacraments is immutable, as the Council of Trent declares," whatever the Church may subsequently order to be added by way of expansion or explanation, the essential matter of the Sacrament of Orders must remain to-day what it was in the first ages, the imposition of hands.

F. A. GASQUET, O. S. B.

London.

LORD RUSSELL OF KILLOWEN.

THE death of Charles Lord Russell of Killowen on the 18th of August is a loss not merely to his family, not merely to friends and acquaintances, however large the circle may be; it is a loss to the United Kingdom in general and that part of it called Ireland in particular which will not be repaired in our time. One circumstance we mention before passing to graver interests is that he had given promise, given earnest of the promise of successful legislation concerning a class of commercial dishonesty which had escaped the attention of previous law reformers, at least in a clear, searching and scientific manner. Whatever legislation of that kind there had been was only incidental to other legislation, and its main effect was illustrative or declaratory. The considerable efforts at Law Reform identified with the names of Lord Westbury and Earl Cairns were confined to practice and procedure. A mischief in the very midst of commercial activity was untouched except so far as the spirit of provisions of the bankruptcy code suggested a danger to adventurous promoters or agents, and except so far as recognized principles in the Chancery side of the High Court of Justice might lay hold of persons in a fiduciary position taking advantage of the confidence reposed in them. This mischief Lord Russell began to deal with; and if his mantle have not fallen on some disciple, we fear the continuance of successful fraud.

It has been said the distinguished career of Lord Russell is an argument against Home Rule; that the separation of Irish and English interests would deprive able and ambitious Irishmen of the wider field open to them under the existing arrangement. There is nothing in the point except an assumption which in one form or another runs though the whole policy of centralization. The assumption is that imperial interests are exclusively English and that the local interests of Ireland are in conflict with imperial interests. The scheme for Home Rule recognizes the place of Ireland in the Empire and her representatives as part of it. Even Lord Rosebery's suggestion of a policy in the phrase "predominant partner" is nominally, at least, in advance of the principle couched under the assumption just spoken of. It implies some rights of partnership in the subordinate member of the firm. Even in pre-Union times, when the Irish legislature was a sovereign and at the lowest view a quasi-international body—it was very jealous of its style and title—the King, Lords and Commons of Ireland—even in pre-Union times the field of imperial labor was open to Irishmen, and many became distinguished in policy and arms. We may mention Lord Moisa, afterwards Marquess of Hastings, and Mr. Burke as Irishmen who rendered considerable services to imperial policy; but for our part, indeed, we should prefer an adequate career for our own gifted countrymen at home if the choice were to lie between the fields of local and imperial labor. But no such election is necessary, for under Home Rule certain Irishmen will sit in both houses of the imperial Parliament, and thereby gain opportunities for service and distinction more surely guaranteed than under the present arrangement, which imposes difficulties upon them only to be overcome by transcendent ability or by conspicuous faithlessness. The deeper and more enduring aspect of the question of conflict of interests between Ireland and England—the latter an impudent and despotic synonym for the term Empire—shall appear in our attempt to put before the reader our estimate of Charles Russell.

The great cases—except one—in which he was counsel cannot be dealt with in this paper. It may be sufficient to say that his income was set down at £25,000 a year. This at the common-law bar, we believe, has never been surpassed if equaled. Even the thirteenth juryman, as Scarlett[1] used to be called, does not seem to have reached that figure. Some may have attained it at the equity bar; some possibly at the Parliamentary bar. At the latter Mr. Hope-Scott was credited with £20,000 a year, and we have always heard it said that he stood highest. We may mention a remarkable consensus of opinion with regard to Russell's power of cross-examination. This question was asked in a newspaper some years ago: Who was the ablest cross-examiner? From all parts of England correspondents wrote their opinion, and Russell may be said to have been elected by plebiscite. Now when one knows what an instrument of the Nisi Prius lawyer the power of cross-examination is, we must perceive that with such an expression of opinion he could not be left out of an important case. A good speech to evidence is all right, but without the power to test witnesses, solicitors and clients alike attach little value or comparatively little value to the making of a speech. We shall give some instances. Mr. Whiteside, afterwards Lord Chief Justice of Ireland, was one of the last of the race of giant orators, yet he was never allowed to handle a difficult witness. We were told long ago of a solicitor that he would bring Whiteside into a great case for the purpose of addressing the jury, but he would take care also to employ him in a case going on at the same time in an adjoining court. To this other court he would get Whiteside called when it was necessary to let a good cross-examiner at an important witness in the first one. Mr. Whiteside, not knowing the secret, thought such drawing of him from one court to another was a compliment; he was in such demand as it were. Sure we are of this, that he was never paid a special fee to stay all the time in one court, as poor Butt used to be, and as a great ally of our own, Mr. Francis McDonough, used to be.

We have implied that Russell's success as an advocate is not the measure of his greatness. Even in the short period he was on the bench he is admitted to have given proofs of qualities equal to those of the greatest of the long and illustrious line of Chiefs of the Queen's Bench.[2] This is no ordinary praise. Men of every variety of power and accomplishment filled the great place since the Conquest; we believe there is hardly more than one man since the time of that Gascoyne, whose name is familiar to the readers of Shakespeare, down to the last occupant but was distinguished as a scholar, a lawyer or statesman, and sometimes as all three. Perhaps the one exception is that lawyer who presided at the Court of High Commission which tried Charles I., but it may be said for him, take it as its value, that he has the unqualified praise of Milton for his scholarship and law, so that the premier Bench as it was when there were three common-law courts may be said to have had chiefs of unique distinction all through since the reign of Henry IV. and very great men amongst its chiefs anterior to that reign.

---

[1] Lord Abinger. We have an idea that £13,000 a year was his professional income.

[2] Though John Bradshaw, the Lord President of the Court of Regicides, is not ordinarily included in the list of Chiefs of the King's Bench, still his position was the same.

But not even in his mastery as an advocate or a judge, or both, can we form the standard of Russell's amazing clearness of intellect in grasping complicated facts and ability in imparting with clearness his possession of them. His speech at the Parnell Commission is not merely that of a great advocate—and it is that in the highest sense—but it is the speech of a statesman rising above all others save his own countryman, Edmund Burke. In that inquiry his other qualities as an advocate found full scope. His discussions from time to time on the admissibility of evidence were models of rational test and inference directed to restriction where an act of Parliament had fixed the issues to be tried. A more incredible outrage on common decency and sense was only once committed, and that was when the King was ordered to be tried for treason against himself. Even "the lurdan Parliament,"[3] famous for the absurdities of its legislation, never dreamt of being legislators and pleaders at the same time, never thought of creating political offenses and appointing a special tribunal to try them, thought not of settling the pleadings and directing the issues for both sides. This is what the dreadful Unionist Government of 1886 and the few years succeeding accomplished; and the wonder is not at the one-sided report as we have it, but that so much justice was reached by the able and honorable men who presided, in spite of the clogs upon their feet. There seems to be no improvement in the spirit of the party. A recent incident indicates that a bewildering recklessness, if not worse, still governs it. If the conversation alleged by Dr. Clark, a Scotch member, to have taken place between himself and Mr. Chamberlain with reference to certain matters before the war in South Africa be correctly reported, the Colonial Secretary stands in the invidious position of impeaching the loyalty of Lord Russell. We do not think it necessary to vindicate that great judge from the aspersions of the right honorable gentleman. We will only offer a contrast—while a son of the noble and learned lord was fighting for his Queen and country, the Chamberlain family were only making money by the war, making money by the supply of munitions for the war under contracts exceptionally favorable to themselves. No, there is no need to defend Lord Russell; his character can be trusted to his brethren of the Bar, to his colleagues of the Bench, to the affectionate gratitude of the English people, for whose interests he sacrificed weeks going from platform to platform when his moments were literally to be counted by guineas. He has in his life left an example admirable indeed for those qualities which fire the ardor of the young and generous and win the homage even of the aged and cautious, even of those chilled to appreciation of the higher impulses of our nature. But this is not his greatest praise. At a time when political faith is regarded as a superstition, when the hucksters of party are inspiring influences, when Tadpole and Taper and not their statesmen lead the Liberal party, when Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Rhodes and the De Beers Company govern the party in power, when the voice of justice is no longer hearkened to and the demands of liberty and reason silenced by the bludgeons and revolvers of Mr. Balfour's mobs, the life of Russell is a redeeming example; and we hope its influence will recall the people of England to the policy of the great chief who almost emancipated them from the thraldom of the classes.

---

[3] Parliamentum indoctum is the historic name, which is translated in old English as above.

Mr. Chamberlain's arraignment of the honor and loyalty of the Lord Chief Justice, though of no value where fair play has influence, no value because proceeding from the impartial betrayer of every man and party that trusted him, is full of ill-omened possibilities when the Ministers are the same, their allies the same as when Charles Russell broke down the gigantic conspiracy against the Irish people in the persons of their leaders. Edmund Burke declared to the tyrannical government which taxed America and ruled Ireland by the worst species of martial law—an armed, licentious and ferocious class allowed a free hand over a defenseless people—Burke told that government that it could not indict a nation. The impossibility seemed to have been effected by the party of Mr. Chamberlain and Pigott; but though the indictment was framed and prosecuting counsel appeared in exceptional strength from the allied forces in England and their henchmen of the Bar of Ireland, though from purlieus and prisons the social outcast and the felon emerged to give the testimony which would supply means of continued profligacy to the one and secure liberty to the other, the conspiracy was shattered to atoms by Russell's unbounded energy and courage. This success is the first motive for the hatred of the Colonial Secretary; the second is that Lord Russell tried and sentenced the ringleaders in the Jameson Raid. The secret complicity of Mr. Chamberlain in that extraordinary violation of public law was, we think, never doubted even by his friends. The proofs have not been given, but the suspicion which attached to his conduct, pregnant enough in all conscience, is raised to certainty if the statements of Dr. Clark can be relied upon. Nothing but the vindictiveness of a disappointed man could have found in the charge of the

Lord Chief Justice to the jury ground for the impeachment of his loyalty. We do not deny the ability of Mr. Chamberlain, but he seems eaten up by a restless vanity which his admirers call ambition and a love of experimental policies which he and they mistake for statesmanship. The strong sense of a great constitutional judge interpreting statutes passed to preserve amity with friendly States in accordance with the meaning of the words and the policy embodied in them was the offense given to the Colonial Secretary. The presumption which prompted him to call members of Parliament to account could not very well urge even him to an attack on the Chief Justice and his rulings. If made during the prosecutions Lord Russell would have laid him by the heels for contempt of court; if made since the trial, it would have afforded Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour a justification for his dismissal, against which the entire gang of Liberal Unionists, from the Duke of Devonshire to Mr. Jesse Collings, would protest in vain. The dignity and interest of the Empire were, in the opinion of Ministers, involved in the selection of Russell to represent it on the Venezuelan arbitration.

And now we turn from this paltry episode to the thought of what Mr. Gladstone accomplished in the one act of appointing Russell Attorney General. It is impossible to do justice to the courage of that great man who in making the appointment placed himself on a plane far above the traditions by which bigotry was consecrated in England. When he raised that Irishman to the Attorney Generalship he effected a revolution as though no effect remained from the enactments of evil days, as though the intolerance, the calculated opinion, the national turn of thought, the exclusiveness of habit, the privileges resting on descent and education had vanished into the darkness of the past and all the influences which had gone to form the Englishman since the Reformation and the social system of which he was a part had been lifted off by a magician's wand. That Charles Russell was worthy of the high distinction every one admitted then, every one will say now, except the colleague who plotted against Mr. Gladstone, his former leader, as he plots against Lord Salisbury, his leader, now.

Though we refrain from particular allusion to many of the lesser things which cling to the memory of Russell and which in obituary notices have found place as indicating some trait of character, some quality of power, some degree of the esteem in which he was held, we are tempted to mention a curious fact or fiction which seems to mark him off from all the public men of the day. True or false, it affords testimony of the opinion which prevailed in England that Russell's high character was a protection for those who trusted him. When men of different parties meet they are usually guarded by the presence of some persons who may be appealed to in subsequent disputes. The honor of public men is one thing, but considerations of interest are another. Memory is treacherous, party feeling strong, the medium through which things are seen varying. Now the incident we refer to, known as the "strange" dinner party, is an exception to meetings of the kind. No precaution was taken; Russell simply had as his guests Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Parnell and Lord Randolph Churchill. The story is told as if he had a power to bring into harmony men of the most diverse opinions or bring them together without any of them fearing a trap. It was a most important triumvirate; for there was the old man eloquent, whom the Radicals looked up to as the statesman whose policy would secure the rights of all classes at home and the respect of foreign powers by a firm and dignified attitude of peace; there was the man who embodied the wrongs of Ireland and the man who was the hope of wise Toryism. If this story be not true, it still is a recognition of the high estimate which the English people had of Russell as a man unselfishly faithful to their best interests. Until Mr. Chamberlain implied that Lord Russell could prostitute his office to his ambition, drag his ermine in the dust in order to win a victory for his political allies, no one had ever thought of attributing to him an unworthy motive. We shall by and by offer a point to show a sacrificing love of Ireland not even thought of.

Public men cannot escape criticism. It is not always that they receive justice from contemporary opinion, but it does sometimes happen that the purity of a character is so clear that the base who mine in the dark alone are active to overthrow it. It was not suspected that the man—this Catholic and Irishman—selected by the Unionist Government to represent England in the Venezuelan treaty was resting in tranquillity on the surface while Mr. Chamberlain was sapping the ground beneath. It is impossible for him who has not observed the ways of the Colonial Secretary to judge of the danger to Russell lying in the possibilities of Mr. Chamberlain's ever obtaining supreme power.

A structure compacted from plausible mendacities and religious and national hate would conceivably lash the English public into a fury such as possessed their ancestors in the days of the Popish Plot, which in a less degree spent itself in the Gordon riots, which found expression in the Ecclesiastical Titles Act and which made the lives of Irishmen unsafe in England and subjected their country to a draggonade when the phrase "Parnellism and Crime" was a household word from Berwick to the Land's End. If time and circumstance favored Mr. Chamberlain, there is nothing rash in thinking that Russell would have been removed from his office under an obloquy for the time recalling the infamy of Scroggs and of Jeffries; that a broken heart would bring him to the grave; that his family instead of finding, as now, a consolation for their sorrow in universal sympathy, would be driven to seek in another land the toleration of pity, and then, as usual in such cases, would come the tardy, ineffectual acknowledgment of injustice by which Englishmen fancy they repair the most odious and most cruel wrongs.

Passing in review the period when Russell practised as an attorney and solicitor in Ireland until as a Lord Chief Justice and a peer he represented England in international tribunals, we behold what appear to be the evidences of a vast change in the conditions of society. At the same time we must be on our guard lest we take casual phenomena for the effect of profound principles. His appointment has this value with regard to the sentiment of the English people, it is a break in the continuity of evil precedents. The authority of Protestant exclusion from the two offices which, even more than the Lord Chancellorship, mark the triumph of English Reformation principles is impaired. The Attorney General was the officer specially charged with the duty of asserting the legal aspect of Protestantism, all that it meant of insular pride and independence of foreign codes; the Lord Chief the functionary to declare as law the triumph of English over Latin principles of jurisprudence. There was to be no going back to external decrees and foreign interpretation; the self-sufficiency of the English intellect and will in the realms of law and order was to be maintained henceforth, even more than in the domains of theology. Protestantism in England came to be looked upon, despite the high pretensions of the Tudors and the Stuarts, as the spirit of the Bill of Rights. It was a sort of air in which trial by jury, habeas corpus, popular representation, taxation by consent, Ministerial responsibility, and so on, were born and nourished. To pass into this atmosphere as a potent spirit, controlling its forces as though he were an intelligence native to the very air, was the fortune of Charles Russell—to our mind a more striking success than that which put Benjamin Disraeli at the head of the landed interest of England and made him head of the British Empire as the representative of the landed interest.

These are the broad aspects of Lord Russell's rise, but they do not tell the qualities of the man in their full significance. A few words and we shall, we think, prove to the American reader that his life is wonderful as a fairy tale. We have only to state the facts to obtain the English reader's recognition of the marvel. Knowing as we do his start in life, we have no hesitation in saying that if we had been in some way cut off from surrounding intercourse while possessing an exact knowledge of political and social life in England, the parties, the interests, the prejudices that react on individual dispositions, we have no hesitation in saying that reading a biography of Russell, presenting the steps of his advancement only, would carry with us the authority of one of Victor Hugo's nightmares of fiction.

He had begun life in the lower branch of the legal profession in Ireland. He might have obtained a leading practice in Petty Sessions and Quarter Sessions and been the Catholic rival of the Orange champion, John Rea. His name would not have passed beyond the limits of these little local courts, for nothing would have induced a man of his excellent good sense to imitate the eccentricities which carried the name of Rea over the country as that of the bravo of irreconciliables, whether Orange or Fenian. His services to the Liberal party in local politics might have been rewarded with a Sessional Crown Solicitorship, in which office it would be his province to instruct counsel for the Crown in the few cases that might be sufficiently important for their services in Petty Sessions and to prosecute in person the larcenies and common assaults which constitute the criminal jurisdiction of Quarter Sessions. He might rise to the dignity of country solicitor for a few landlords, whose boxes with their names inscribed in large white letters ranged on shelves in his office would have an imposing effect on the small shop-keeper and farmer, his ordinary clients. It would be a respectable but an obscure life.

But he must have been born with a silver spoon of more than ordinary dimensions. He went to England like so many of his countrymen of ability and ambition, instancing the prediction of Grattan in one of his anti-Union speeches that the fall of Ireland would draw to the capital of the country to be enriched by her fall every Irishman conscious of great gifts and the energy to employ them well. It is difficult to see at the first how this young Belfast attorney expected to brush aside the obstacles to his career. He was unknown in the classes which might be useful to him in the country of his adoption. We think the few Catholics of landed estate in England would prefer any one to an Irishman. English Protestants of the landed or the commercial interest would cherish their prejudices against the Irish Catholic adventurer. In those days one of the ablest men at the common law Bar of England was Mr. Sergeant Shee, an Irish Catholic. For years and years he was passed over when vacancies occurred upon the Bench. The good old maxim: "No Irish Catholic need apply" governed Ministerial patronage over the Bench of England. The Irish Catholic might be sent to India or to some other dependency of the Crown, but the Bench of England should be kept sacred from the Pope. It was an ostentatious loyalty to the Protestant sentiment on the part of official Liberals. Shee's success at the Bar is easily explained. He was a man of large private means, of exceptional ability and knowledge of law when he got the chance.

His wealth secured the chance; he could wait, he could make friends and become a sergeant when that degree possessed a monopoly of leadership in the Common Pleas, and when the degree was to be obtained by the simple expenditure of considerably over seven hundred guineas. Shee, notwithstanding political services in Parliament to the Whigs, was, as we have said, passed over year after year and could not have been raised to the Bench until at long last the generous indignation of his professional brethren compelled the Lord Chancellor to recognize his merits. This is how things stood when Russell went to the English Bar. With all the advantages which Shee possessed at his start, he only obtained a puisne judgeship. This was a kind of ermined insignificance, a small concession.

With this before him as an object lesson of bigoted unfairness, one must see that Russell possessed unbounded confidence in himself when he left settled chances at home for hardly one in England. It is a condition of success to have this faith in one's powers, but it does not always command success. There are opportunities which must be laid hold of, and it happens that to some the opportunity never offers itself or comes and passes like a shooting star. Russell was at or near the age which the greatest master in the knowledge of men fixed as the period when the practical intellect attains its full maturity. However, it was an undertaking, loaded as he was in various ways, which might cause fear or anxiety to the boldest spirit. A young man, married and waiting for the briefs without an assured income, is in the most trying position one can well conceive. What is he to do while waiting? The etiquette of the Bar is an iron fence which shuts him off from ways of earning support open to other professions. He is separated from the public by the lower branch of the profession. Literature may be an aid, but the writing barrister who does not publish law books or who is not a law reporter is suspected by the attorneys. The publication of a volume of poems was fatal to one man we remember; the suspicion of writing a novel was disastrous to another.

A good book on practice is unquestionably the best recommendation to the solicitors, but this means enormous labor and long waiting for results. Solicitors will respect a man who writes a treatise on some branch of law, but they may fight shy of him as a specialist in opinion without the gifts of a court lawyer until he has proved he possesses them. Their favorite, certainly, is the reporter, but so far as we can judge Russell did not try this exacting and laborious part of legal training. We are glad of it. He was spared the strain which has been too strong for many a young man whose university career had been a succession of triumphs and whose life in society seemed to fulfil the promise of the past. Reporters have become great advocates and great judges; but how many withering in their environment have lost a man's life and have become an embodiment of collected cases, principles, distinctions and *obiter dicta!* The pride of his class fellows, the darling of society, when the vivacity and hopefulness of manhood in its earliest prime was as a reflection of the promise given by the sun of a high summer day, when the glory of the world of sky and wood, lake and mountain are coming into light, sinks as the years pass into a learned scribe, parchment-faced, stooped, bloodless, the clothing of ten thousand cases. His delight is now the unwinding of a knotty point, his wildest dissipation the effort to distinguish a case in process of development from a current of authority which seems to rule it, to bring under a line of cases one in appearance outside the principle. It is a terrible fate to see what looks like a man a sort of animated mummy of technicalities, yet possessing a special memory vast and well ordered in its possessions as a government library, a penetration in its own walk beyond the insight of mere science men to detect, discover, group. Reporters are useful for all that we have said; they are to be honored, these victims of Juggernaut. They are really the makers of judge-made law, in which we live and move and have our being.

Possibly Russell's intense vitality, like that of the great reporters who became the Chiefs who preceded him on the King's Bench, his indomitable will and his sympathy with the life around him might have saved him from the fate we have sketched. We understand that, with or without the knowledge of the attorneys, he employed literature as an aid. All the same, we have the very best of reasons for knowing that he was in considerable practice as a junior three years after his call to the Bar. When we hear of the ordinary case of a man not touching a brief for eight or ten years we find his career an agreeable exception. Mr. Labouchere, who knew him well, informs us that he was not very generally known until after he was fifteen or sixteen years at the Bar; but this is really not incompatible with a large and lucrative practice for years before the date.

The flashes of repartee, the drolleries of combination which have come from him are racy enough of the soil he sprang from to lead us to hope that one or other of the group nearest him will supply a biography with the good things, the epigrams, the Johnsonian moods to relieve the shadows or tone the sunrays of a soul curiously compact of passion, tenderness, daring and pride. He was Irish from top to toe. It is with a sort of amazement we have read opinions that he could not have been a distinguished success in Parliament. The Bar, we admit, is not the best training school for the House of Commons. Mr. Burke in one of his famous passages explains how it happens that the acuteness, the persuasive power, the command of the resources of rhetoric which obtain forensic triumphs are accompanied with a certain narrowing of the mind due to the application of principles to particular instances of rights rather than to classes of rights and the obscuring of broad, fundamental principles by making them subject to artificial limitations. That this is generally true there seems no reason to doubt, but we have clear and distinct evidence of the strength and largeness of Russell's political philosophy,[4] to which we shall devote some attention if we have space.

We hope, however, that some of those forming his family by blood or affinity, and nowhere could we search for persons more competent, will give the public a biography picturing him in all the moods of feeling and ways of fancy and exercises of power in his home, in society, at the Bar, on the Bench, in Parliament. Epigrams there would be, running fires of sarcasm, airy or scorching, anecdotical resurrections of lifeless stories endowed with a new soul to the surprise and delight of listeners such as we find in the biographies of many great lawyers,and which seem in some way to be revelations of the whole man instead of the sunlit ripple on the surface below which solemn and awful things peradventure lie.

He was all along, despite the claims of that "laborious life" to which he alluded in a passage of great power and pathos in the speech before the Parnell Commission, in the midst of those who would recall with love and pride these phases of his nature or rather scintillations going forth in the exuberance of his nature.

A singularly great and noble one was his, eloquent of his country in all his peculiarities and powers, a product he was of her genius and history. Not an Ulsterman merely, as a writer has said, but a child of the whole land and the memorials studding it. The abbey, the ruined castle, the rath, the storied river and the glen populous with beings the imagination delights in, the romance of certain spots where pride and violence, chivalry and wrong, love and hate played parts that still survive in thought, the old tumble-down town with its fragment of a wall, a stage where crowns were staked and lost, all wrote themselves upon his heart and helped in the shaping of the man for deeds of high emprise. Some one of the gifted group that had been nearest to him should take up the story of his life and tell us all about him: the hidden springs of that noble eloquence, indomitable will, fiery courage, calm strength, fidelity fixed as the deeply rooted mountains. Such a "life" would be more to us than all the masterpieces of biography.

---

[4] We find that Mr. Labouchere, no mean authority, entertains this view.

We have been a little long perhaps in speaking of things around rather than in his life; yet they, too, have their use. When a great man has gone from amongst us we look here and there for all the influences that shaped him to be a world-walker through obstructions, as one might say in high Carlylese, or troubled him to action, or led him to the academy or portico, thence to return with the honey of such hives. And sure we are that the domestic, and all but domestic circle of Russell, his family inheritance of cultivation in what is best and the romance and horror of his country's tragedy all had their measure in equipping him for a war with giants. Yet not without interest is it that he pitched his tent after his call to the Bar in that town of England nearest to Ireland, as we may say with substantial if not verbal accuracy. He began practice at the Liverpool Bar, as many others from the Emerald Isle had done and do. There is a considerable Irish population there, men in business worth a plum or two;[5] and conceivably the nephew of the President of Maynooth would be a *persona grata* to them. But then the attorneys: these gentlemen like to look before them to be sure of their man, as it were. It is said his first brief came from Yates & Son. It is something, if true, for this respectable family to remember with pride. The prior of the firm, a clever man actively engaged in municipal affairs, saw something above the common in the young Irishman. We have said something already of the shyness of solicitors in giving business to an unknown or untried man. They will not do it even at the request of a client unless it is a matter in which the young counsel can do no harm. At the same time we know the chance comes strangely and suddenly, very like what is read in novels, but true, as we know, for all that. It is the tide in the affairs of men. It is worth the rest of life; all depends upon it. Let the aspirant take it, grasp it with both hands, as William the Conqueror did England; as Jacob wrestled let the young man wrestle, fight desperately to win, or if losing, fight desperately to the last, unmindful of judicial frown, opponents' sneer, the mild surprise of the unbriefed around him listening with half-understanding ears. If one make £20,000 a year in good time after that chance for thirty years or so, and in a profession which gives a peasant's son equality with the highest man's son, it is worth holding to for all that one may prize in life. We take it Russell's opportunity came in a more prosaic way—good reports of amazing industry, his presence in the Liverpool library, as Mr. Yates, senior, noticed, whenever possible, and so on.

---

[5] Plum—£100,000.

The more striking way of success may be as follows: A reporter is in his seat, a case is called, counsel is absent, the solicitor is in despair. He turns to the reporter and asks him to appear, endorsing a back sheet for a brief. It may be that that reporter becomes his standing counsel forever after—having shown abundant law and readiness at disadvantage—and that a rush of business from other sources compels him to resign the reportership. Thenceforth he sees the woolsack in his waking thoughts and sits upon it in his dreams—Speaker of the House of Lords and second peer in precedence after the Princes of the Blood, the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury being first, of course, in a country of whose Faith the reigning majesty is Defender.

We have seen it stated since the death of Charles Russell that his reading in general literature was not wide and his classical attainments were not high. We have considerable doubt of the correctness of this view, or impression, whichever it may be. It was at one time the fashion to illustrate great speeches at the Bar and in the House of Commons with passages from the Latin poets and from Cicero or Tacitus. For all that Mr. Gladstone was the only man in recent times who adhered to the usage in Parliament; we think Judge Keogh the only man at the Bar. The important thing is, have there been orators whose speeches bear the impress of classical culture? We mean do their style and thought bear the classic spirit and substance? There are only two of whom this can be said, Mr. Burke and Lord Brougham. The first was an English Cicero, greater incomparably than his master; the second an English Demosthenes vastly inferior to his master. Yet the influence of classical and polite literature has gone into the efforts of all the orators, just as it affects the style of any well-bred man, whether he writes a gossiping letter to an acquaintance or frames a state paper in severe sentences. We think there are passages of supreme dignity, power and pathos in Russell's speech before the Parnell Commission. It was said of a certain orator that his speeches were more florid than those of Demosthenes, less so than those of Cicero. The same may be said of any fairly eloquent speech that has been delivered since Cicero. Yet we venture to say there are passages in the speech just mentioned approaching the fierce austerity of Demosthenes; there are passages approaching the richness of diction, and exuberance of fancy which flame like a conflagration in Cicero.

In fact, there was an Olympian environment around Lord Russell all his life—from his infancy until he reached the great place that shall know him no more. The reputation of Dr. Russell, once the President of Maynooth, is of a character not easily estimated out of Ireland or England. He united with an intimate knowledge of the living literature of Europe in every department of cultivation a mastery over those stern and high studies which peculiarly belonged to his profession. To illustrate the point: Suppose an Oxford divine's acquaintance with the Greek and Latin Fathers and all that can be known of Church history for the first five or six centuries, suppose in addition a remarkable knowledge of the ecclesiastical and secular history of England in their reciprocal relations, and we have a man of exceptional erudition. Now, in addition to knowledge of this kind, Dr. Russell, of Maynooth, possessed an intimate acquaintance with the entire literature of Germany, France and England.

In speaking of him we are reminded of a remarkable contrast between the manner in which an Irish Secretary spoke of him and the way Mr. Chamberlain spoke of his nephew. Sir Robert Peel[6] was known at one time as an official surpassing the worst traditions of the Irish office in his contempt for Irish Catholic opinion. In the House of Commons he had occasion to refer to Dr. Russell. It was not merely an encomium he pronounced; he acted as if any statement from Dr. Russell should dispose of a controversy in which he was concerned. Place by the side of this Mr. Chamberlain's reference to Lord Russell in the conversation with Dr. Clark. There is some difficulty in writing with patience. Lord Russell had taken the oath of allegiance and the official oath to do justice. He enjoyed the dignity of the peerage, which was always supposed to carry with it such a sense of honor and of public duty that the Lords on a trial before them in which the life of a peer was involved gave their verdict not upon their oath, but upon their honor. It may be said Dr. Clark's statement has not yet been corroborated. We reply it has not yet been contradicted, and we venture to say the matter will not be allowed to rest there. If the Radicals of England have one particle of gratitude for the services of Mr. Gladstone to the cause of liberty and reason, if they will only remember that it was by blow after blow delivered by him to that House whose existence can only be justified by its hatred of the people's rights he obtained for the masses the place in the constitution which they now enjoy, they are bound to render it forever again impossible that Mr. Chamberlain should make his private piques the policy of the Empire.

However, as we have been saying, there was in a manner an Olympian environment around Russell which made his life all along as much in touch with intellectual exertion and the employment of literary work as if he were a young man belonging to the reading set in an university. We therefore doubt the opinion which denied the extent and quality of his cultivation, nor in doing so are we oblivious of the distinctions of the writer who expressed the opinion. Mr. T. P. O'Connor is himself a man of letters, of admitted ability and of a singular penetration into the solidity of another's attainments. As a rule he would not be imposed upon by the dexterity which makes a large show with comparatively little capital, he would readily enough get below the summer warmth of the surface in pursuit of depths where the treasures should live; and if he immediately struck bottom the public would enjoy a feast and the victim criticized hear something not altogether to his satisfaction. But it is simply impossible that some speeches of Russel could have been spoken by any but a reading man. We have not noticed in the obituaries the divorce suit brought against his wife by French Brewster; and yet the speech delivered at that trial for the poise and beauty of the sentences, the Shakespeare coloring of the home, the truth with which the domestic affections take form as motives preserving the purity of a woman's life and giving strength to her will seems to rank as one of the finished efforts of our day. The difference between the great Bar speeches of the present time and of antiquity is not quite so much in the evidences of thought and reflection appearing in these and expressed in language most carefully chosen. To a large extent the ancients wrote essays which they got by heart and pronounced with all the adventitious aids of the trained elocutionist. The difference seems to be that the modern barrister speaks to the jury only; the ancient one spoke to posterity.

---

[6] Not the great Sir Robert Peel.

We have spoken of the difficulties before an Irish Catholic at the English Bar. When Russel began they were almost insuperable. Let us be understood. We do not mean that Irish Catholics at that time were absolutely shut out from business, but the business given to them was of an ordinary kind that is simply local and for the most part not involving intricacies of law or large interests. Consequently it could never lead to distinction. Now in Russel's case it was the ante-room to a practice at *Nisi Prius* hardly if ever equaled and to the great places of Attorney General and Lord Chief Justice. This is the highest praise we can give him. There have been and there are[7] Irish Catholics of great ability and legal knowledge at the very local Bar where Russell began. They are never heard of outside their circuit, unless now and then one or other of them is brought up to London on an appeal in a case fought by him in the court below. But this may mean very little.

Again, there was a prejudice against Irishmen who were not Catholics. We are strongly of opinion that such Irishmen owed a good deal of assistance to the press, so largely manned by their countrymen. Irish Catholics in the press would be naturally inclined to do a good turn to their Protestant countrymen in the land of the Saxon. It is curious how Irish they are in London, Orange and Green alike. Unfortunately for social and national prejudice, unfortunately for the policy of the *Times*, newspapers could not do without what that insufferable and cowardly snob Thackeray called the Irish army of the press. Well, to these gentlemen whose lines were not always cast in pleasant places Earl Cairns and other Irish Protestants had reason to be thankful for a report or a significant paragraph in their days of struggle. But to help an Irish Protestant in this way was an easy task in comparison to that of lending a hand to an Irish Catholic. Some one at the top would not like the name, so all would end in a quarrel over copy.

---

[7] We have heard that some of these—one certainly—is making £2,500 a year at the Liverpool Bar. The gentleman we have in view is a member of Parliament.

If then, as a sympathetic writer said in the *Daily Mail*, we think the lesson of Russell's life teaches how much is due to Ireland's being one country with England—an English county as it were—in possessing so vast a field to ability, energy and ambition, we retort that such qualities would command success independently of the legislative relations of the two countries, and that nothing but the possession of them in the highest degree would command success even in the existing relations. Suppose we had Earl Cairns or Lord Russell on the Irish wool sack to initiate or sustain imperative measures of social and political reform conceived in a spirit of profound enlightenment, adopted to the genius of the people, informed by their history in all the aspects of terror, injustice, violence and fraud which had been sent forth as forces to divide in order that strangers should rule and directed by a sympathy which would make their work enduring, can any one say that for such results the mere elevation of Cairns and Russell in England would be an adequate compensation to Ireland?

For the fitness of both these men to the task of making Ireland a nation—we like the phrase, though it was one of those relied upon to sustain the charge of treason against Mr. Parnell; we like the phrase, yet we are not a traitor; it was made immortal by those orators who watched over the last days of Ireland as a nation, men faithful to her fortunes, faithful in her fall—of the fitness, we say, of Cairns and Russell for such work we have no doubt whatever. As for the first we say with full conviction that his interests, bounded by the four seas of Ireland, his heart stirred by those social amenities which in old days made English residents in Ireland more Irish than the Irish themselves, would have infused into him the spirit of Molyneux, of Swift, of Lucas, the spirit which in Grattan vivifies, illuminates and disenthrals the land. But in England Cairns was the servant of his own ambition, the lacquey of the Orange Lodge. So much for the Union as opening a career to Irishmen.

But to him who is the subject of this paper we can turn with no merely speculative mind. He was our own. The last of the Irish bards, happily still alive in honored age,[8] imagines the bard of his fancy saying in an ode what will forever echo in every Irish heart:

> Owen Roe! Our own O'Neil,

And as Owen Roe is ours, so Russell is; he has a place with the first in the deep heart of the country. Having before us the report of the inquiry by the Parnell Commission, we can only come to one conclusion, that we can never know more than a part of Russell's greatness. It is mainly, indeed, as a political philospher and statesman that the speech in that trial exhibits him to us, but the whole proceedings show him simply as a transcendent advocate, greater in each quality of a great advocate than any one of those men who owed their greatness to the exceptional endowment of a special quality.

He was an advocate indeed, and a great one; but the forensic patron of a client was lost in the protector of a people. Looking at him we see no hired counsel, no briefed gladiator, no Colonel Blood to cut throats in his employer's service; on the other hand, no half-hearted English Liberal, waiting on events while affording his dignified patronage to "incriminated" Irish leaders for so many guineas on his brief, so many guineas each day as refresher, so many each day as consultation fee. We have a particular man in our mind. Owing to this trial the barrister in question owes that influence in the Liberal party which enabled him to betray the policy of Mr. Gladstone for the political aggrandisement of a gentleman to whom Doncaster or Epsom would offer a field for the exercise of his talents more suitable than the House of Lords. This counsel seems to us to have entered on this appalling investigation with the light heart of an Englishman who would take care to gain no matter what face turned up in the dropping of the coin. He would not compromise himself, while at the same time he would be well paid and would hold a prominent place in the sensation of the hour. For all that he did his work well as time went on; but we fearlessly attribute his loyalty to his cause, his apparent conviction of its justice to the magnificent ascendency of Russell, dominating counsel with him, dominating counsel opposed to him, dominating a prejudiced public filling the court—nay, by that ascendency almost arresting the draggonade in Ireland.

These are grave words, but we do not shrink from their expression with reference to the misrepresented circumstances of the time. Malignant influences led to charges irresistible in the judgment of most men in Britain. They were tried by a tribunal created by the Ministry which hoped to profit by them. It was a game in which the accusers and their allies thought they held all the trumps.

---

[8] Aubrey de Vere.

The courage of Russell then, overthrowing witness after witness hired against his country, raised his colleagues to the true conception of the issue. It was the Irish nation in the Imperial Parliament that was on trial. It was not the defense of certain men libelled by the *Times*—O'Connell would have thought a libel by the *Times* proof that he had been faithful to the interests of Ireland; any honorable Irishman would regard praise by the *Times* as the judicial punishment of some abnormal wickedness, some enormous sacrilege he had committed, the secret of which was hardly known to himself. No, this was not the issue; it was the impeachment of a rule that had long lain heavily on his people. The agents of that rule through all their classes were then employed in perpetuating it by an unprecedented conspiracy against the Irish representation. The events since should not be allowed to curtain the tragedy.

It is of consequence to England that the dreadful story should be told again. It is due to Charles Russell that the attempt to wreck a sacred cause was defeated. Mr. Gladstone's policy was to bind Ireland and England in a union of hearts. Bitter memories were to sleep, old prejudices to be put away and Irishmen to join with Englishmen in consolidating the Empire and advancing the reign of law and liberty over the world. To prevent this the Irish landlord came, the agent, the bailiff, the rent warner, fresh from the burning homes of the peasantry, the policeman with hands red with the blood of defenseless men and women, the spy and informer from America, whose countless perjuries were the dice with which he played, the spy and informer from Ireland, the incarnation of a lie and the forger whose documents were to link the whole mass of testimony into a chain of inexorable logic.

From the guilt of this conspiracy few men then on the government side can be considered wholly free. The same men rule the Empire now as if that conspiracy had succeeded. Charles Russell is a great loss, but if from his grave he arraigns, as he did at the Parnell Commission, the men who dragged the honor of England in the dust, if gratitude for his services rouse the English people against the enemies of Ireland and sends them once more on Mr. Gladstone's road of justice, the sting shall be taken from death, he will live in the memory of his race. We hope for this consummation. Charles Russell was as faithful to those sound principles which would enlarge the rights and liberties of the English masses as to the fortunes of his native country. The policy of Mr. Gladstone meant not alone justice to Ireland, but equal rights to Englishmen. His aim was to make all men politically equal, so that an opportunity to work out individual and social elevation should be within reach of the poor man's son. The privileges which hedge round those who toil not were in his expectations to be no bar to humble merit. The lever for this was the granting of a quasi-autonomy to Ireland. No more able ally he had for this policy than Russell. No more effectual blow in advancing it than when Russell put in the same eternal pillory the Ministers of the day, the syndicate or corporation called the *Times*, Beach[9] and Pigott.

In adopting as a Liberal the policy of Home Rule, Russell flung on the table the great stake of his career. If he had ever looked forward as the result of exceptional eminence at the Bar to attaining the place of Attorney General, experienced men would have thought he flung the hope of it aside when he took up this policy. To identify himself with the national policy of Ireland a Catholic expecting to be Attorney General must have fancied that the settlement securing the succession of the House of Hanover was a myth, the Revolution an interesting fiction. This is really the attitude of mind of the average Englishman. Russell could not have been ignorant of this. We can fairly conclude that he deliberately closed the gate on his own career for the sake of Ireland. Thinking seriously of all this, we can only stand in awe before the greatness of Gladstone, putting under his feet the insolence and pride and prejudice of generations of Englishmen, crystalizing in that one appointment his belief in the justice and wisdom of his policy. It was the extreme test of its righteousness that the Catholic was not helot, the Irishman no stranger in the British Empire.

We had intended to illustrate the marvelous duel between the great counsel and the spy Beach, the cross-examination which reduced to pulp the wretched Pigott, to say a word or two about the speech which saved the fortunes of Ireland in that darkest hour, but however interesting we cannot essay the last. It would be well worth the best exertions of the painter in words or in colors to put before us the scene in Probate Court No. 1 on the 22d of October, 1888, when the Commission entered on its labors. Since Burke opened the impeachment of Hastings there was no such scene in England. When as Manager for the Commons of Great Britain in Parliament assembled our great countryman impeached the proconsul of India in the name of all venerated influences, in the name of Divine laws and of human codes reflections of the Divine, there listened beneath the roof of Irish oak the most august tribunal, the most brilliant audience in the world. Yet it was only a pageant—suggestive of vast imperial power indeed—but a holiday performance with the trappings and majesty of justice over a corpse galvanized into temporary life by the genius of Burke. Except in his speech we see nothing of the marvelous history of India, mysterious, wonderful, infinitely varied, principalities and powers going back to the dawn of time, a village life unchanged for thousands of years, courts that were old before the Norman came to England, religions whose source was hidden in the foundations of the world. This great scene lives on canvas and on the pictured page, but affords not one tithe of the instruction one would derive from a word picture or a painting of the first day of the Parnell Commission.

---

[9] Le Caron was the traveling name of this spy.

The elements of Irish society were there in the flesh, anachronisms of far centuried life pulsating with the hopes and passions of the nineteenth century all welded into a kind of hetrogeneous homogeneity the like of which had never been seen will never again be seen. Each element has a significance of social change, each would be to the philosopher an illustration of a phase of political existence concerning which theory or inference was the extent of his knowledge. There were peasants in a costume worn before the Danes came to Ireland, worn when the City of the Tribes was still a great emporium for the trade of France and Spain and its walls a bulwark against Norman barons and Celtic chiefs, peasants who had not yet shaken off their belief that the landlord owned their lives as absolutely as when their ancestors fought or died at the bidding of chief or baron. There were yeomen instinct with the spirit of the eighteenth century when they and their landlords smuggled, distilled, fought and stood shoulder to shoulder against the King's writ; but now in some dim way trying to think the thoughts of freemen and articulate the language cf any justice save the landlord's will. There were squires of the same century in all but dress, any one of whom could have sat for a picture of Lord Eyres as we know him in Mr. Lecky's great work, casting insolent glances round the court, scowling when some priest made his way with bent face through the press, whispering each other with ferocious scorn or encouragement as some shame-faced peasant was pushed forward to perjure himself for their benefit. Here and there in green uniform the terrible gendarmerie—confident, collected, threatening, as in some Petty Sessions Court at home—mingled themselves among the witnesses.

This was a large part of the assemblage—disentombed tragedies of Irish history—for the rest, a hostile court. We say it with respect, for the act constituting the court rendered it impossible for the Commissioners to be otherwise, a prejudiced public, and so we have a subject for the exercise of the highest idealizing skill in the grouping and characterization of verbal painting like that in which Macaulay puts before us the trial of the great delinquent Hastings.

There would be in such a picture a place for one or two figures expressive of the union of hearts aimed at by the great leader whose adoption of the cause of Ireland was the essential reason of the trial; there would be a place for Mrs. Gladstone, who watched the fortunes of Ireland as Sir Richard Webster and Sir Charles Russell fought from day to day.

Le Caron or Beach turned inside out—a monster of perfidious cunning—made men begin to think that a cause buttressed by such support stood self-condemned. The wave of public feeling began to turn, and with the fall and flight of Pigott the tide rushed on with resistless power. Sir Charles was morally triumphant along the whole line. The result was felt in the House of Commons. The Tories sat cowed on their benches, while the Liberals sat like men maddened at the thought that they had been deceived into countenancing the systematic falsehood of their opponents and its fruit in the atrocities of the then regime in Ireland. Mr. Gladstone was in the House, he rose to speak in language made possible by Russell's advocacy and concluded in words that may serve as a memorial of the great advocate: "You may deprive of its grace and of its freedom the act which you are asked to do, but avert that act you cannot. To prevent its consummation is utterly beyond your power. It seems to approach at an accelerated pace. Coming slowly or coming quickly, it is surely coming. And you yourselves, many of you, see in the handwriting on the wall the signs of the coming doom."

George McDermott, C. S. P.

New York.

SAINT FRANCIS OF ASSISI AND THE RELIGIOUS REVIVAL IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

At a time like the present, when the Church is in the throe of a new development in history, and when with the dawn of the twentieth century she has to face a new world of ideas in life, social, intellectual and political, it is instructive to look back over her past history and seek an intelligent guidance from the lives of those who have already contributed to the Church's greatness. "It is only a fool who learns from his own experience; a wise man learns from the experience of others," is a reported saying of the

German Bismarck. The study of the lives of the men who have made a people great is a wise precaution, especially at periods of quick development and necessary unrest such as we live in to-day. The movements which in the past have shaken the Church and finally brought to her new life, leave an indelible mark upon Catholic character which it would be fatuous to ignore at any subsequent period in history. For example, in the further development of Catholic thought which will mark the immediate future Catholics cannot afford to ignore the work already accomplished by the Christian Neo-Platonists and the Scholastics. The notion, not unfrequently broached in these days, that Catholic theology should now cast scholasticism behind it as a thing forever done with and useless, is historically untenable; a community cannot get rid of its history in that fashion any more than a man can get rid of his past life with all its moulding influences. So, too, in regard to the interior and mystical life of the Church there has been, and still is, a continuous development; a tradition, constantly unfolding from the days of the Catacombs to the present: the Holy Spirit working in the Church for the fuller realization of the Christian life.

This constant movement of life goes on universally in the Church, affecting the lives of the humblest members who are at all earnestly concerned with their religion, but it manifests itself typically in certain individuals, the spiritual giants of our race, who by the intensity of their character give point and body to the vague instincts and undefined convictions of the multitude.

Thus a St. Augustine becomes the centre of a widely scattered group of thinkers and apologists who think as he thinks, but have not his clear perception nor his power of expression; and a great intellectual movement thus becomes identified with his name. In his writings, too, the excelling genius of the movement will naturally be found.

Now, in the development of the moral life of the Church there is one period which for some time past has attracted the most sympathetic interest of students of Church history, both outside the Church and within; though it must be acknowledged that as in much else concerning Catholicism, so in this, the impetus came from outside. In the life of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries students have discovered one of the finest presentments of Catholicism, both moral and intellectual, but especially moral. It is the period when Catholic piety manifested itself in a most intense realization of Christ's earthly life and in chivalrous devotion to His sacred humanity: the age of the Crusades and of the Crib. It is to be noticed that at a period marked by strenuous speculation in the Christian schools, tending to a cold rationalism, there blossomed forth this intense devotion to the earthly, concrete Christ—the Man-God of the Gospels and of Tradition—and that the moral reformation which saved Christendom in the thirteenth century was chiefly connected with this development of piety.

Of this movement the classical expression is St. Francis of Assisi, the moral and social reformer, whom Pope Innocent III. saw in vision upholding the tottering walls of the Church. And the interest aroused in the history of the movement has resulted in a vast quantity of literature dealing with the life of the saint and his influence on his contemporaries. Not the least valuable result of this literary activity has been the republishing of the ancient "legends" or memoirs of St. Francis, written by his own friends and companions. For centuries these precious documents, unique in the history of Catholic literature, were hidden away and almost forgotten. About half a century after the death of St. Francis discussions arose among the members of his order as to the interpretation of the rule which he had given them. The more zealous members appealed to the "legends" in support of their contention against those who were anxious for relaxation. The authorities in the order desired to put an end to division by compromise; but this the "zealots," as the upholders of the primitive austerity were called, would not hear of. In order to overcome their opposition it was decreed that the "legends" should be destroyed—a drastic measure which it is difficult to condone. Fortunately some copies were preserved. The most ancient of the "legends"—the "First Legend by Thomas of Celano"—was published by the Bollandists, as was also a fragment of the "Legend by the Three Companions," which is a compilation of personal recollections by the saint's three most intimate friends. In 1806 the "Second Legend by Thomas of Celano," a supplement to the "First Legend," was again given to the world by a learned Franciscan friar.

This "Second Legend" threw light upon several doubtful points in the received "lives" of the saint and gave rise to a more critical study of the sources already recovered. But it was reserved for the last two or three decades of years to see the outburst of a world-wide interest in the study of early Franciscan literature. As already noticed the impetus to this study came in great measure from outside the Church, and it is only just to acknowledge the debt we Catholics owe to non-Catholic efforts. And to no one is greater praise due than to M. Paul Sabatier, whose "Life of St. Francis of Assisi," published in 1894 and translated into most European languages, has done much to make the saint and the mediæval revival connected with his name known to the world. M. Sabatier's work had many defects arising from a somewhat distorted view of the action of the Papacy in regard to the Franciscan movement; but he was able to make St. Francis live in the imagination. He did still better work in editing the long-lost "Mirror of Perfection: The Blessed Francis," the greater portion of which was written by Fra Leone, the saint's most cherished companion. M. Sabatier is now engaged in preparing other primitive Franciscan documents for publication. Not less valuable have been the labors of two friars of the order, Padre Marcellino da Civezza and Padre Teofilo Domenichelli, who lately edited the entire text of the "Legend by the Three Companions," the most delightful of all the "legends."

The value of these discoveries in confirming the popular cultus of the saint cannot be exaggerated. We can now see Francis as he appeared to those who knew him most intimately, and the result of this increased knowledge is to deepen our reverence and love for his name. "Those that loved him before may love him better now. We knew him saintly and human. We find him more human and saintly than we knew. The more clearly we see his features, the more clearly may we trace their likeness to those of the Man of Sorrows. It is the likeness of close kindred, the mystic likeness that once seemed a peril and has always been a glory to the Church of Christ."[1] Yes, in these original documents Francis stands out with a glory brighter than ever. His features, faithfully limned by his own companions and personal disciples, are more Christlike than we find them in any of the later biographies. These have generally drawn the saint as they conceived he should have lived: by deepening the shadows here and heightening the colors there, they have often caricatured and even falsified the saint's true features. The Francis of the later biographies is like an ancient masterpiece of art restored by inferior hands. But in the primitive "legends" we have the real Francis. To be sure, he is ever the hero and the saint and no common man in the mind of the writers; but then he really was a hero and a saint. With charming simplicity they relate what they heard and saw. There is no attempt to criticize, for they are disciples of a great master and they write with the candor of faith. They do not think to hide his human infirmities or temptations; these do not detract from his moral grandeur. They evidently do not think him the less a saint because he was more a man. To them he was verily a prophet sent by God to form a "chosen people" whom God had called out of the midst of religious laxity and degeneration, to bear witness to the true character of the Gospel; another Abraham, father of a mighty spiritual race that should endure unto the end of time. No less than prophet and patriarch was Francis to them, and with delightful simplicity they found parallels in Scripture to apply to the saint and his religious family. The Chapel of the Portiuncula is another Jacob's stone; the promise of God to Abraham is repeated to Francis; the followers of Francis are the new Israel. But in Francis the Old Law is transfigured and becomes the New. He bears the character not of Abraham nor of Moses, but of Christ. Assisi is as Bethlehem, Alverna as Calvary, Umbria as Galilee. In the company of Francis they seemed to themselves to walk with Jesus in the far-off Holy Land.

---

[1] Preface to the "Mirror of Perfection," by Sebastian Evans.

How all this worked out in daily life may be read in the "Legend by the Three Companions," of which the following extracts are a specimen:

"The Blessed Francis, being already filled with the grace of the Holy Spirit, called unto him his six brethren (this was, of course, in the very earliest years of the movement) and spoke to them of the things that would happen to them, saying: 'Let us consider, my brothers, our calling, wherein God has mercifully called us, not for our own salvation only, but for the salvation of many others; that going forth into the world we may exhort other men, more by example than by word, to do penance for their sins and be mindful of the commandments of God. Fear not because you seem weak and foolish, but without faltering preach simply penance, and put your trust in God Who conquers the world, because by His Spirit He speaks in you and through you, for the exhortation of all men, that they may be converted unto Him and observe His commandments. And you will find some men believing, gentle and kind, who will with joy receive both you and your words. But many others you will find unbelieving, proud, and blasphemous, who will resist you contumeliously, both you and the words you will speak to them. Therefore lay it up in your hearts to bear all things humbly and with patience.' Now when the brothers had heard these words they began to fear. To whom the saint said: 'Fear not, for after no long while many will come to you, learned and noble, and with you they will preach to kings and princes and many peoples, and many will be converted to the Lord Who will multiply and increase His family throughout the world.' And when he had said these things and blessed them, the men of God devoutly went forth, observing what he had taught them."

This was the first missionary journey of Francis' disciples. They went two and two, after the fashion of the Gospel, in various directions; nor were they long in experiencing the various receptions foretold by the saint. Some received them with the reverence and affection due to holy men; others took them to be tramps and assaulted them, pelting them with mud and even stripping their clothes from their backs. Such treatment must have been peculiarly trying to men of sensitive temperament like Fra Bernardo, the saint's first disciple. But they bore all patiently, "according to the Gospel, praying fervently and solicitously for their persecutors." At the end of their missionary period they all returned to Portiuncula, outside Assisi, and says the Legend: "No sooner did they meet each other again than they were filled with such joy and sweetness as to forget altogether the injuries of perverse men." The Legend then gives us a glimpse of what we may call the friars' home-life.

"Every day they gave themselves to prayer and manual labour that they might altogether flee idleness, the enemy of the soul.[2] They rose in the middle of the night and prayed most devoutly with sighs and tears. They loved each other with an intimate affection, and each served the other and cared for him as a mother loves and cares for her only son. So great was the charity which burned in their hearts that each one would have deemed it an easy thing to give his life, not only for the love of Christ, but for the salvation of the soul of his brother, and even to save his body. Thus it happened one day, when two of the brethren went out, that a madman met them and began to throw stones at them. Whereupon one brother, seeing that the stones were hitting the other, at once threw himself in the way, willing that he himself should be hit rather than the other, so great was their mutual love. Thus were they prepared to give their very lives for each other.

"So grounded were they in humility and charity that each reverenced the other as his father and lord, and those who were superiors or who were in any way distinguished above the others, appeared only the more humble and unassuming. Moreover, they were all anxious to obey, and were so ready to carry out the will of him who commanded that they never thought to distinguish between just and unjust precepts; because whatever was commanded they took to be in accordance with the will of God. Hence it was easy and sweet for them to obey. They put from them all carnal desires. They judged themselves without indulgence, and especially did they beware lest they should in any way offend each other. And if it happened at any time that one said anything which hurt another, he was seized with remorse and could not rest till he had acknowledged his fault. . . . No one of them considered anything as his own; their books and whatever else they had were for common use, according to the tradition handed down from the apostles. But, although they themselves were truly poor, yet out of the things God had given them they liberally and ungrudgingly, for the love of God, gave to others, especially the poor who sought an alms. Sometimes when they were traveling and met beggars, having nothing else to give, they would share with them their garments, sometimes giving away their hood, sometimes tearing off a sleeve: that so they might fulfil the Gospel which says, Give to them that ask.

---

[2] This phrase, "*idleness, the enemy of the soul,*" was frequently on the lips of S. Francis, and occurs several times in his Rule and Last Testament.

"When the rich ones of this world came to them, the brethren received them readily and with kindness, being anxious to draw them from evil and lead them to penance. They were anxious not to be sent to their native places, in order to be free from the company and conversation of their relatives; thus observing the prophet's words: 'I am become a stranger to my brethren and as an alien to the sons of my mother.' Thus did they rejoice much in their poverty, . . . and they were joyful in the Lord at all times because among themselves there was no cause for sadness."[3]

No wonder that Jacques de Vitry, traveling through Italy in A. D. 1216, in the early days of the Franciscan movement, was struck with astonishment at this new body of men and women whose life recalled to him "the manner of life of the Primitive Church, concerning which it is written: 'The multitude of them that believed had but one heart and one soul.' "[4]

Surely in the whole history of Christendom since the days of the Apostles themselves, there has been no such another evangelical movement as this. Never has the world seen such another dramatic setting of the Gospel, played with such fidelity in the minute details of daily life. It was too sublime really for general acceptance. As the number of Francis' disciples increased (and they increased with surprising rapidity) the first high fervor waned. There were still some who walked on the high road of Francis' heaven; but the majority could not attain thereto. Historians lament the decline of the movement. Need we be surprised? The life of Francis and his early disciples was an inspiration rather than a set rule of life. Other men of less spirituality came after them, who aspired to walk in their footsteps. Most frequently they followed only at a distance; yet the world has been the better even for such a following as theirs. The humblest follower of Christ is still a witness to the Christ, even though he point to the Christ from afar off, and were he to disappear the world would oftentimes be lost in utter spiritual darkness. We must be grateful when Providence sends us the greater lights of religion; but let us not despise the lesser lights who are more constantly with us.

---

[3] "Legend by the Three Companions," chaps. x. and xi. [4] This letter of Jacques de Vitry is most valuable to the student of the early Franciscan movement. But its significance will easily be exaggerated unless we bear in mind that it is the letter of a traveler giving his impressions. M. Sabatier has, it seems to me, done violence to the text when he draws the conclusion that the religious Sisters of the order were "sœurs hospitalieres," and not contemplatives, because Jacques says: "They dwell together in various hospices; they receive nothing, but live by the labour of their hands." But this is quite consistent with the contemplative life. Francis did eventually enlarge the scope of his order, so as to include women devoted to a more active life.

Besides these humbler, but honest, disciples of Francis, there were others who called themselves disciples—and they were not a few—who seemed destined to subvert, if it could have been subverted, the noble ideal of Francis' life. They saddened the saint's last years; after his death they well nigh brought the Franciscan movement into contempt. They gathered round Francis like moths around a lamp. They were not of his; they only usurped his name. We may therefore leave them to their fate in the contempt of history, and fix our gaze upon the pure and heroic figure of the saint himself. For by doing so we shall be able most surely to understand the spiritual motive which lay at the back of that wonderful religious revival of the later middle ages.

Renan, in whose mind truth jostled so intimately against error, had long ago singled out St. Francis as one whose personality has a religious message for the present age; and in his brilliant critique of Karl Hase's "Franz von Assisi" puts his finger upon the secret of the saint's influence, both in his own age and in the present. "Francis of Assisi," he wrote, "possesses for religious criticism an interest beyond expression. After Jesus, no other man has been endowed with a clearer conscience, more absolute ingenuousness, a more lively sentiment of his filial relation to the Heavenly Father. God was in very truth his beginning and his end." Then after pointing out how the life and character of Francis transcends our ordinary conception of life so far as to be almost incredible, and that nevertheless we have incontestable documentary evidence to prove it, he proceeds: "Francis of Assisi has always been one of the strongest reasons which has made us believe that Jesus was nearly all that the Synoptic Gospels have painted Him to be." In this last sentence we believe Renan has expressed in somewhat pedantic fashion the weightiest argument for Francis' popularity. Francis is a unique witness of the Person of Christ. The study of his life makes one realize the beauty of the perfect Christian life and its possibility; for here in a mortal man like ourselves, without any claim to divinity, we have a character so supremely Christlike, that the Gospel itself, in the light of his history, becomes an actual palpitating truth, convincing beyond any argument drawn from speculative reason. After all the most persuasive argument for Christianity is the living Christian. Yet even when we have admitted this, we can hardly be said to have given a satisfactory answer as to the secret of Francis' influence in the Christian world both in the Church and outside; nor can we be said to have given any sufficient reason for assigning to him, as many do assign to him, a special influence upon the further development of spiritual life in the Church of the future. Conformity to Christ is always the lever of spiritual power in the Church; but this conformity must not be merely of external life, but of the interior spirit. The real Christian embodies in himself the Truth of Christ, not simply the outward action; and it is in the degree that he helps us to realize truly and understand the very life and thought of the Sacred Humanity of Jesus that he is a permanent factor in the development of the Christian life.

Now we believe that the most potent claim of St. Francis to the reverence of the Church is that he in great measure solved in his own actual life the difficulty which has always faced, and still faces, earnest souls as to the apparent duality of life. From the very beginning, at least since men began to look into their own souls, human nature has seemed to be the battleground of two irreconcilable forces, each of which seems to claim the proper allegiance of man, and each of which seems necessary in opposition to the other. So that man's nature has seemed to be an essential contradiction, and the only way to obtain interior peace has seemed to lie in sacrificing one element to the other. Yet, on the other hand, the instinct of the Church has been opposed to this view. She admits the apparent contradiction, yet points to a further development of man's being in which the contradiction shall exist no more, and yet the apparently opposing elements shall be retained. How to harmonize the natural and supernatural, the temporal and the eternal, has always been the crux of philosophers; Christianity has given the only satisfactory solution. Yet how few Christians realize it! In St. Francis of Assisi, however, it has been realized in a notable degree, and it is in this fact that his power lies. In him religion and all that was best in the world-life of his time met and intermingled in a rich harmony; in him it may be said with truth the world-spirit of the middle ages took flesh and blood and was indissolubly allied to religion.

It has been sometimes urged against mediæval Christianity that it retained a great measure of paganism in its spontaneous delight in the visible world and in its worship of the palpable Present, whilst at the same time religion was held to represent something apart from the Visible and the Present. So that, it is urged, the life of the middle ages was a dualism; Sense and Spirit being the two poles of a perpetual antagonism. We must, however, admit that if our mediæval forefathers were conscious of this dualism, they had also an idea, more or less vague, that this dualism could be resolved into a deeper unity, as is evident from the manner in which they were able to bring their delight in the sensuous into the religious liturgy. In doing so they manifested a belief that harmony between the spiritual and the temporal is possible, however dimly they may have realized this harmony in actual life. They might not be able to reconcile the two terms of life; but they believed reconciliation possible. Their healthy instinct preserved them from that subtle form of Manichean heresy which has been so prevalent since the middle ages. Puritanism in all its forms (and we must bear in mind that Puritanism went beyond the Puritans) banned nature from the realms of grace, as an evil spirit is banned from heaven. But nature when thus banned is apt to become a troublesome enemy. The joy of life is not found in outcasting one of life's constituent elements. Mediæval Christianity recognized all the elements of human nature, from an instinctive belief in their essential harmony; and this instinctive belief was vindicated by Francis in his own personality. He was, in fact, the hoped-for Messiah in whom the promise of the mediæval spirit was realized. The patient belief that life's apparent dualism (represented in scholastic phrase as nature and force) did but hide a deeper essential unity (also represented in scholastic phrase as regenerate nature) was realized in Francis. He was a manifest embodiment of regenerate nature. Others beside him realized this belief in their own inner life, as any one acquainted with mediæval biography knows; but Francis did so on a larger and more generous scale.

He had indeed the natural genius which enabled him to do this. Of a poetic temperament he was quick to take note of the beauty of all created forms and to recognize a universal kinship between himself and all creatures, whether man or beast, or the very elements. He lived, so to speak, in them, and their life was part of his. The flower of the field and the running brook sent him into an ecstacy of delight; he seemed to understand the mute language of the beasts; he would sing for very joy because of the mysterious beauty of the sun and stars. His soul moved in all the grand elemental forces of nature as the soul of the musician delights in the complex harmonies of the symphony. He was a poet, with a poet's largeness of heart vision and intimate sympathy. But he was more. He was of that rare order of men to whom a right intellectual concept or an intuition is a moral conviction. Such men do not so much sing of truth or beauty as act it. They are themselves embodiments of the beauty and truth which they behold in the world outside themselves; in them the best that the world can give is mirrored and expressed. Such men are not merely artists: they themselves are an inspiration of art, and the value of their inspiration is in proportion to the generosity of their sympathy. Francis' sympathy with the world outside himself was indeed great and generous, as any one can learn who will but open the "legends" of the saint—

now easily accessible to all—or the *Fiorretti*, that wonderful supplement to the historical narratives, embodying the traditions and impressions of a somewhat later age.[5]

Now this sympathy with nature in its various creations was the very groundwork of Francis' religious life. With his poetic intuition he could never have acknowledged that nature was the work of the devil. In him the mediæval belief was strong that God and nature are allied, and that to love nature is to worship the Creator. He had an intuitive conviction of the great Catholic truth that the Divine is revealed in the Creaturely. "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof; the world and they that dwell therein"—such was the song that the heart of Francis perpetually sang. It was the chant of his worship both before and after his "conversion."

It was towards the end of his life that he composed his "Song of the Sun," an unmetrical string of verses in which he praised the Creator for the beauties of the creation. But this was only a more conscious rendering of the religious sentiment of his youth.[6]

Francis' conversion was, of course, the leading incident in his life, both historically and from the point of subjective analysis. He was in his twenty-fifth year and full of the ambition of youth when he fell sick of a fever. He was only just released by the Perugians, having been taken prisoner in a battle fought between the "patriots" of Assisi and the robber-nobility, who were assisted by the neighboring republic of Perugia. As soon as he was convalescent he longed once more for the freedom of the fields and the hills. But to his vast disappointment when he went forth the country had lost its charm, and he returned home with a chilled and stricken heart. Again he mingled in the civic revelries and led the light-hearted youth of the city as had been his custom; but the sunshine had gone out of it all, and in the midst of the fun Francis was sad and listless. The fact was that during his sickness he had been brought face to face with the thought of eternity; and the thought had taken hold of his soul and given him a new vision of life, or rather it had clouded the simplicity of his former view of life as a present enjoyment, and he could not yet grasp the mystery that had taken its place. He felt lonely in the midst of his former life; its joys had fled when the reality of eternity had first dawned upon his mind. Slowly and with much anguish of spirit which at times caused him to go out of the city to some solitary cave, and there cry aloud for very pain, Francis came to see the truth. He had now become conscious that there is a duality in life; that the temporal and the eternal, the secular and the spiritual, are two actualities. Hitherto he had professed this belief, and now he realized it. This realization it is which precedes any spiritual conversion. One must perceive life as a contradiction before one can attain to any perception of the deeper spiritual unity. It is the way in which the human mind is accustomed to work.

---

[5] See especially the twelfth part of *The Mirror of Perfection*, which treats of "His love towards creatures."

[6] This song is supposed to be one of the earliest efforts in Italian literature. Generally St. Francis composed his songs in the language of the Provençal troubadors. The "Song of the Sun" takes its name from the verse coming immediately after the stately prologue. It begins:

> Laudato sia Dio mia Signore contute le creature,
> Specialmente *messer lo frate sole.*

To such a man as Francis, so sensitive to the beauty and joy of life, the perception of any essential, or apparently essential, contradiction between the temporal and eternal, must be the acutest pain. He was ever too much alive to allow himself to be comforted by the belief, generally adopted by men of less spiritual energy, that things will right themselves somehow. For him to live, was to live in the full consciousness of the realities around him. Life might be a contradiction; then he must drink the cup of contradiction to the very dregs. Or beyond the contradiction of life there might be a higher truth and more essential unity; if so, such a man as Francis will discover it. It was the same problem as presents itself in the fascinating legend of the founder of Buddhism; but in Francis how differently it worked out. The solution as it came to Francis may be stated thus: "The eternal begins in the temporal; time is the seed of eternity. What you see to-day with your eyes is not wholly true, neither is it wholly false. Nature in so far as it is not spoiled by man, is the germ of heaven; the beauty you delight in to-day is the promise of a greater beauty hereafter." Thus was Francis reconciled again with the visible world, from which the consciousness of eternity had for a time separated him. But the reconciliation was not yet complete. The visible world had gained with him a new reality; it had become part of the eternal; at least there was in the visible world the beginnings of eternity, mixed up with much that was a mere perversion of the original creation. Something was yet necessary to bring Francis into actual touch with the realities of his new spiritual vision, so that he might not be a mere stranger wandering through the Father's Kingdom.

Never, as far as we know, had Francis felt the need of total self-surrender. He had enjoyed life with the irresponsible enjoyment of youth. This was no longer possible. Had he been other than he was, or had his realization of the eternal been less intense, it might have been possible for him to regain touch with the facts and duties of life by taking to himself a wife or attaching himself to some great leader of men. Some such surrender of oneself to a personality other than one's own is necessary to every man who would live in actual spiritual contact with the world around him. Such is the law of human life. But no ordinary love was able to bring Francis into touch with the greater world now opened out to him. He must surrender himself to Christ only and for Christ's sake renounce those lesser ties which bind lesser men to the realities of life. He must renounce all for Christ, as under other circumstances he might have had to renounce all for some chosen woman's sake.

When this inward call made itself manifest, Francis was once more happy. He no longer went aside from his friends and groaned for the solitude of his soul. In surrendering himself to Christ he had again found the joy of life, only now it was a deeper joy—the joy born of an extended vision and of a deep personal love. He was once more at home in creation; but creation had now a larger aspect and a deeper significance. The vision of truth which was within his soul cast itself upon the vision of beauty without, and mingled in inexpressible delight. There were shadows there, wrought by man's sin, especially by luxury and selfishness. But the vision of earth which Francis now saw was one of essential delight. And with all this Christ had put him into immediate relationship, because Christ was the centre of it all. It was Christ's own kingdom. The glory of the earth was Christ's glory; the sorrow of the earth, too, was Christ's. Love of Christ therefore meant love of all creation, especially of all mankind.

The intuitive apprehension of this truth is the explanation of Francis' subsequent career and of that widespread movement which for a period brought back to earth the primitive spirit and conditions of Christianity when men forsook all for Christ and learned from Christ how to love one another. This evangelical revival, which realized the yearnings and hopes of all the best spirits of the later middle ages, was remarkable chiefly in that it reconciled the religious spirit of the age with all that was best in the secular spirit. The reconciliation was brought about by a fuller appreciation of that central mystery of the Gospel, the Incarnation, and its influence upon life in general. In the Incarnation Francis saw the reconciliation of the world with God, a reconciliation which implies that of the secular spirit with the religious, of temporal interests with the eternal. But in Christ he also saw how this reconciliation is brought about only by suffering and renouncement. This is the cost man has to pay for making an idol of the Present and Visible and separating it from its proper relationship with the Unseen and Future. Not until Francis became impressed with the reality of the other world had Christ any real significance to him as the Reconciler of this world with the Father. At the same time the Incarnation taught him to give the visible creation a positive value, fraught as it is with eternal verities. With Francis renunciation was but the stepping-stone to a larger life; it gave him freedom to satisfy his spiritual aspiration and it likened him more closely to his Master, Christ. His renunciation of wealth and comfort had in it none of the Puritan's belief in the wickedness of nature. Even to the last he could appreciate the spirit in which ordinary mortals make merry at the dinner board over the meeting with a friend. He would order the knight Orlando to go and entertain his guests, when the knight himself thought it becoming to converse on spiritual matters with the saint. His religious songs were couched in the style and phrase of the troubadour. He saw nothing improper in applying the titles and style of chivalry to his own disciples. The friars were on his lips, "God's Knights of the Table Round;" St. Clara and her companions were "fair ladies of Poverty;" he himself was "the herald of the Great King." He was, then, no hater of the world; he loved the world for what was good in it; he pitied it with a gentle sorrow for what was evil. The evils of the world were the thorns which tore the bleeding feet of God's fair creation. This generous sympathy with all creatures it is which makes Francis so like unto Christ. Others have renounced the world for Christ's sake as completely as did Francis; others have preached to the world and ministered to its wants, spiritual and temporal; but few have so utterly appreciated and sympathized with the world as Francis did. In this he is almost unique. Not more truly did the impression of the five stigmata on his body mark him out as Christ's special follower than did his Christlike love of the world.

In his passionate love of Christ Francis again realized in the highest degree the aspiration of mediæval piety, which as Harnack has pointed out[7] found its first great expositor in St. Bernard of Clairvaux, and its complete expression in the Poor Man of Assisi. To attach oneself to Christ and to follow Him in all the humble estate of His earthly life—this was the ideal of the middle ages, especially of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It was an ideal which appealed at once to the imagination and the heart; and the secret of all great moral movements lies in the appeal to the imagination and the heart.

I doubt whether people brought up outside the Catholic Church can appreciate what such personal devotion to Christ meant to those mediæval revivalists. To them Christ was an ever-present Reality, without Whom there was no reality, but only vanity and disappointment. He was the unifying principle of creation; everything visible received a permanent value only in so far as it proclaimed the beauty and truth and love of Christ's spiritual kingdom. Hence they sought for vestiges of Christ's presence everywhere, and every discovery increased their joy because it bore witness to the fact of

---

[7] "History of Dogma," Vol. VI., chap. 2.

Christ's presence among them. Thus Christ was the bond which united them to all external objects. Now Protestantism, whilst professing to be an evangelical reform, effectually severed this bond of direct spiritual relationship with Christ which was alike the secret of primitive Christianity and of mediæval Catholicism. The Reformers declared that the Catholic Church with its sacraments and dogmas had come between the soul and Christ; but they themselves created a barrier which experience has shown to be impassable in their worship of the Bible. They at once reduced Christianity to the servile observance of a moral code in place of that personal attachment to Christ, spiritually conceived by the believer, which mediæval Catholicism in its best representatives endeavored to foster. The influence of the rationalizing party among the Schoolmen undoubtedly tended to base Catholicism exclusively upon an intellectual assent to certain formulæ. And, too, there were the mediæval ritualists who in their multiplication of ceremonies tended to forget the significance of the symbol and to reduce religion to mere externalism. Oftentimes they put the jeweled cope in place of the clean heart, and sang psalms when they should have been teaching the poor. These were the abuses of the mediæval Church against which many a reforming spirit had protested long before Luther. But the constant teaching of the leading lights of the middle ages—of such men as SS. Bernard, Bonaventure and Aquinas—was that true religion depended upon communion with Christ as a present spiritual Personality. Only a few might attain to this intimate communion in any high degree; but all were urged to strive after it. To them the Bible was of value only in as far as it gave them some glimpse of the life of Christ, either in His earthly career or in His spiritual working, as the Divine Word, in the hearts of His chosen people. What they sought was, in a word, the Personality of Christ, that they might conform themselves thereto. The Reformers, on the other hand, did as many modern nations which have taken to themselves a written Constitution, and govern by conforming to the letter of the law rather than by fidelity to the national ideal. Hence to the mind steeped in sixteenth century Protestantism, the religious life of St. Francis and his mediæval compeers is as unintelligible as is the English ideal of free government to the peoples of the Latin race.

Perhaps nowhere is the character of the mediæval devotion to Christ more vividly expressed than in the dramatic poem, "Amor de Caritate," sometimes, but erroneously, ascribed to St. Francis,[8] and more generally supposed to have been written by the friar-poet, Jacopone da Todi. The poem describes the surrender of the soul to

---

[8] The style of the poem is evidently of a somewhat later date than the opening of the thirteenth century.

Christ and gives utterance in the unrestrained style of a decadent period to the idea of mediæval devotion:

"I asked, not knowing, when I prayed,
For love of Christ; it seemed so sweet.
Methought in peace I should have stayed."[9]

But the soul finds the love of Christ a consuming fire. It can find no peace now in mere creaturely delights. Heaven and earth do but cast the soul back upon itself with the sharp admonition:

"With all thy heart love thou the love
Which has created us that we
Might draw thy spirit heavenward
To love Him Who hath so loved thee."[10]

And so the soul finds no peace except in entire self-surrender. Then

"Transformed by Christ, with Him made one,"[11]

the soul gains a new life and joy. It

". . . . . is made
The likeness of its Lord to bear;"[12]

and in its new life indeed no soul-peace but the soothing ardors of a great love.

"In Christ I'm newly born again—
The old man dead, the new restored;
And whilst my heart is cleft in twain,
Transfixed by love as by a sword,
My spirit, all on fire, would fain
Behold the beauty of its Lord."[13]

This beholding of the beauty of the Lord, or more correctly, of Christ all beautiful was the supreme ideal of the mediæval religious spirits. The beauty of Christ was the dream of their life, and it must be added that the sorrow of their life—a sorrow which finds expression nowhere more pathetically than in the life of Francis—was that the beauty of Christ was marred by the world's sin and misery. Sin to those mediæval disciples was no mere disfigurement of a passing world; it was rather a gaping wound in the body of Christ. As Christ is spiritually united with the whole world in intimate relationship of joy and sorrow, so the world's evolution was to their mind an extended drama of the life of Christ. Christ Himself was glorified in the pure heart, in the patient and in the just and in all the extension of His moral kingdom. He was also crucified again in the world's suffering. The stricken leper, the hungry beggar, even the broken flower, were incidents in the mystery of Calvary. Hence to the mind of Francis suffering had a peculiarly religious significance. To him it was the price of the world's redemption. Through suffering only could man attain to the perfect state; whoever would be of Christ must suffer with Christ the penalty of the world's sin. Like Christ Himself, Francis would willingly have borne, had it been possible, the world's burden upon his own shoulders; have suffered its pain and endured its varied wretchedness. As it was, his soul melted with compassion for his fellow-mortals. He welcomed all his personal pain because it identified him more and more with the suffering Christ and his suffering fellow-creatures. Days and nights he spent in prayer beseeching the Divine mercy to pardon a sinful world. He himself became an apostle, and willed that his friars should become apostles, to spread abroad the knowledge of God's love to comfort the sorrowful and to preach repentance for sin that Christ's passion might not be in vain nor the world's suffering misery unending. In sin he saw the source of all suffering; in penance and reformation of life, the remedy. With this conviction he put aside the idea of living a hermit's life and became a religious and a social reformer. "The world's suffering and Christ is still crucified in the world. Let us go forth and preach the Gospel of Divine Love and Eternal Life, that men may be stirred to put aside selfishness, hate and luxury, which are the cause of the people's misery." Such was in effect the precept he gave his disciples on the memorable day when he sent them forth to be evangelists, "to preach to the poor and heal the broken heart."

---

[9] Inanzi ch'io provasse, domandava
Amor a Christo pensando pur dolzura;
In pace di dolzezza star pensava.

[10] Che celo e terra grida et semper clama,
Et tutte cose ch'io dibbia amara,
Lascuna dice: Cun tutto core ama,
L'amore che n'ha fatto briga d'abbrazzare;
Che quel amore perzo che te brama,
Tutto nui hà fatte per ti à se trare.

[11] In Christo transformata quasi e Christo
Cum Dio unita tutta stà divina.

[12] De Christo se retrova figurato.

[13] In Christo e nata nova creatura,
Spogliata homo vecchio, e fato novello;
Ma tanto l'amore monta cum ardura,
Lo cor par che se fenda cum coltello,
Mente cum senno tolle tal calura;
Christo se me tra tutto tanto bello.

Such then was Francis of Assisi, the most Christlike of saints, and such was the character of the evangelical revival associated with his name. Rightly to appreciate him, one must, as we have already pointed out, view him in connection with his own time. He was typically mediæval, of the thirteenth century. Yet in the circumstances created by his own time he solved the question that has puzzled many souls in every age, and not least in our own. He discovered in religion a unity and perfection of life, a harmony of life's varied realities, such as the present world with its long tradition of Manichean duality is hungering for. It was said that he who would find heaven must leave the earth to the devil; that to take delight in the world that is, is to forfeit the heaven that is to be. For a time men tried to live by this doctrine with consequences sometimes heroic, sometimes hideous, according to the temperament of the individual and his circumstances. The doctrine produced a Cromwell and his hearts of iron—no mean advantage to a demoralized nation such as the England of the seventeenth century—but it also gave us the prime hypocrite and the soul-stricken gospeler of a later time. The revolt against so sore a heresy was sure to come in time. When it came there was danger of the Present and Visible being idolized and put in place of God Himself. Yet if Christianity teaches any truth at all it is that man is to look forward to another life and another world. Other-worldiness is the essence of Christianity. At the same time it has consistently fostered an appreciation of the Present and Visible, differing from that of ancient Greek and modern Pagan, because it teaches us to look through the Visible to the Invisible, through the Present to the Future. This world is the step to eternity. We are not to sit down and make ourselves comfortable on the step, but to pass over and enter in.

Francis of Assisi explains the problem on the mediæval background of his. He does not give us a direct solution of the problem in its modern details, but he gives us a key wherewith to work out the solution for ourselves. This key is a realization of and a personal devotion to Christ in His relationship with the world, and a Christlike love of the world. I say *Christlike love*, because there is another love which has for its patrons Epicurus and the leaders of the Pagan Renaissance, and in these days of catch phrases it is well to mark the significance of one's words. The evangelists of the thirteenth century, inspired by the life of Francis, would have had little to say that was pleasant to such love as this. Not Epicurus, but Christ, was their ideal; and how their endeavor to give effect to their belief brought to the world for a while something of the glow of undiluted Christianity can be known by the perusal of those early "legends" written by St. Francis' personal disciples and now once more published to the world.

As I have already said, it is well for us Catholics in the midst of the evolution of modern life and its necessary influence upon the life of the Church to keep in mind the heroic figures of the past. They have many a lesson to teach us which will be of value to us in these days, and save us perhaps much trouble and waste of energy. The Church of the future has its own work to do; it cannot afford to lose sight of the work already accomplished. A neglect of the history of the past would only entail greater labor in the days to come.

FATHER CUTHBERT, O. S. F. C.

Crawley, England.

SOME HETERODOXIES AND INCONSISTENCIES OF RUSSIAN "ORTHODOXY."

NOT long ago an indubitably Catholic journal in one of our Western States, a journal which is not one of those weaklings which are so wanting in Catholic stamina and in proper knowledge that their demise would benefit the Catholic cause, told its readers in an editorial that "the Russian Church is not heretical; it is *merely* schismatical." Such an assertion would not have been astounding, if emitted by that leading secular journal of the metropolis which, on the occasion of a recent attempt at theological excitement, showed that its religious editor was incapable of distinguishing the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin from the divine origin of Jesus, or from a supposed virginity of St. Ann.[1] But so important an error on the part of a professedly Catholic journal, one which has shown itself to be well equipped for a defense of Catholic truth, and which has battled for that truth more successfully than very many other American Catholic organs, might add to the material for a future volume on "The Curiosities of American Catholic Literature," were it not too true that similar misconceptions concerning the Greek Schism and its offshoots have found lodgment in the minds of perhaps the majority of our people. Russia, as well as the other lands where the spiritual progeny of Photius languishes, is very distant from us. Until recently very few of her sons came to our shores, and very few even of our more educated Americans have cared to know anything about the spiritual condition and the religious history of her children. Then we have been accustomed to hear that the Russian Church "is almost Catholic;" or that "it is Catholic in everything, save the Pope;" or the real truth that "it has a true episcopate and a true priesthood, the Holy Mass and all the Seven Sacraments;" and the more simple-minded among us have come to believe implicitly, certainly not explicitly, that perhaps after all the poor Schismatics are about as well off spiritually as is the obedient flock of him to whom Our Lord and Saviour said: "Feed my sheep!" Again, comparatively few among us have had anything like an accurate notion of the meaning of the word "Schism," unless in its philological sense; and hence it seemed quite natural to think of a Russian as only or *merely* a Schismatic, one who might not be on the straight road which Christ indicated as leading to heaven, but who, at any rate, skirted the road, and who, with a little care, might avoid the ditches at its sides. We heard, now and then, of some unfortunate priest who disobeyed his bishop, and who, followed by some poor ignoramuses or perhaps by some problematical Catholics, set up a little "Catholic Church" of his own. We pitied the poor schismatics, and in time we saw them all returning to the obedience of him who was commissioned by the Vicar of Christ; but in all such instances we failed to apprehend the deep significance of the term "Schismatic" in the sense in which it is applied to, and deserved by, the "separated churches of the East." The great misery of all the Oriental Schismatic churches, including the Russian, the principal one, is found in the stubborn fact that each of them is historically and theologically *heretical.* The poor man, or set of men, who simply refuse to obey the authority divinely established in the Church, may be merely *schismatical;* but they who absolutely deny the supremacy of the successors of Peter are heretics purely and simply, since they deny an article of Catholic faith. Again, the "Orthodox" Russian Church is heretical because it denies the Catholic dogmas of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father *and from the Son;* of the existence of Purgatory; of the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady; and of the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. The time was when there was no great need for an accurate perception of this truth by the Catholics of this republic; but now that large numbers of Russian and Greek Schismatics are dwelling among us, too frequently mixing with our Catholic congregations, and not seldom causing dissension among them (whether as emissaries of the Holy Synod or not, we are unaware); now, we insist, our people should be taught the wicked absurdity of which they would be guilty, were they to palliate the heinousness of rending the seamless garment of Christ by the cherishing of such a thought as that expressed in the asseveration: "The Russian Church is *merely schismatical.*" Reflections such as these have prompted us to dilate to some extent on the heterodoxies of which Russian "Orthodoxy" is culpable, and upon some of the flagrant inconsistencies into which its heretical blindness and obstinacy have led it.

---

[1] This genius probably had for his Gamaliel that theologist of Agnosticism, James Anthony Froude, who discovered that when Pope Pius IX. proclaimed the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, "by one stroke of his pen he made St. Ann a virgin."

One of the principal grievances of Russian "Orthodoxy" against the Roman Church is found in the fact that the Mother Church administers the Sacrament of Baptism by "infusion" instead of by "immersion." Both the "Orthodox" and the Constantinopolitan Schismatic theologies hold that immersion is *probably* of the very essence of valid baptism; and therefore, say all the separatist Eastern Christians, the efficacy of the Roman rite of baptism is at the best problematical. Thus, in the reply to Gagarin's "Will Russia Become Catholic?" written by Karatheodori, physician to the Sultan of

Turkey, under the title of "Orthodoxy and Popery," we are told that "the baptism of the Latins is not a true baptism," although, strangely admits the medical theologian, "it may be adopted in case of urgent necessity." The same doctrine, we are told by Gagarin, one of the most learned and judicious of the modern converts from the Russian Establishment, is inculcated in many works which have received the approbation of the Russian Holy Synod; and we know that after the rupture of the reunion of the Eastern Schismatics with the Catholic Church which the Council of Florence had effected in 1436, and after the deposition of Isidore, the Muscovite patriarch who had signed the Act of Reunion, his successor decreed: "The Russians must rebaptize all Roman converts to their faith, since the Westerns baptize only by infusion, a condemnable practice which renders the rite null and void." But, strange to say, in the face of this opinion of the Holy "Orthodox" Church, and despite the tremendous importance of baptism in the minds of Russian theologians, it is not the custom of the "Orthodox" clergy to insist on a rebaptism, even on a conditional one, of such Catholics and Protestants as embrace the Photian Schism. None of the German Protestant Princesses who enter the imperial Russian family, not even the one who becomes Czarina, is asked to submit to what "Orthodoxy" pronounces essential to her status as a Christian; she is simply required to declare her adhesion to the Holy "Orthodox" Church of Russia, even though there is very great probability that, owing to the not uncommon carelessness of Protestants in the essentials of the baptismal rite, the "converted" lady is a mere pagan. The clergy of Holy Russia are not shaken out of their supineness by the fact that some day the possibly pagan Czarina, like that Princess of Anhalt-Zerbst who became the infamous Catharine II., may become in time the Russian Pope as supreme mistress of their Holy Synod; they know that the lubricious "Semiramis of the North" was not rebaptized when she married Peter III.; and the fairly well-read among them know that Catharine avowed to the sycophantic philosophist, Voltaire, that the Russian Church does not rebaptize its converts from Catholicism or from Protestantism.[2] In our own day there have been instances of wholesale so-called "conversions" to the Russian Establishment on the part of Polish Catholics, thanks to the knout, the bayonet, starvation, fear of Siberia, and, above all, to treachery and chicanery;[3] and in no instance were these "converts" rebaptized, thanks to Peter the Great, the institutor of the Holy

---

[2] On December 27, 1773, O. S. (January 7, 1774), Catharine wrote to Voltaire, who had alluded to his impression that the "Orthodox" rebaptized their converts from other Christian denominations: "As head of the Russian Church I cannot allow you to persist in this mistake. We do not rebaptize." [3] See the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Vol. XXIII., p. 194 *et seqq.*

Synod, who by virtue of his autocratic power abrogated the decree of the Patriarch Jonas, thus opening to many a perhaps unbaptized Protestant the way to the priesthood and even the episcopate in the Russian Church. It is worthy of remark that the more intellectual among the "Orthodox" clergy have frequently appreciated the significance of this inconsistency, especially when they reflected on the more consistent practice of the clergy of the Constantinopolitan Schismatic Patriarchate, from which they pretend to derive their origin, and with which they communicate; they have endeavored to explain away the contradiction in a very curious fashion. Thus, in the *Causérie Ecclesiastique,* a periodical published by the Ecclesiastical Academy of St. Petersburg under the very eyes of the Holy Synod, we read in the issue of September 17, 1866: "The Greek Church (Schismatic) admits willingly the *validity* of baptism given by infusion; but it demands from converted Latins a new baptism in order that it may draw a well-defined line of demarcation between the Greeks and the Latins—in fact, the Greek Church so dreads a possible reconciliation with Rome that it has thought it wise to make the Greeks believe that the Latins are in no sense Christians." It is amusing to note that the famous William Palmer,[4] while still involved in the mazes of the English Royal Establishment, discovered that if he wished to become a Constantinopolitan Schismatic a trip to St. Petersburg would dispense him from a rebaptism. "There is a way out of the difficulty," he wrote; "a trip to St. Petersburg will settle the matter. I can join the Russian Church without being rebaptized; then I can go to Constantinople, and since the 'Orthodox' and the Greek (Schismatic) Churches communicate, I can be admitted to the sacraments and even to the priesthood at the hands of His Greek Œcumenicity."[5]

No less striking than that in reference to baptism is the inconsistency of the Russian "Orthodox" Church in regard to the dissolubility of matrimony. According to the olden doctrine of that Church, just as according to that of its pretended source, the Schismatic Greek Church, a consummated Christian marriage can be dissolved only because of adultery; but in practice there are now one hundred and ninety-five cases in which the tie of marriage may be nullified. One of the most interesting modern instances of this flagrant inconsistency was that of the divorce of the Grand Duke Constantine, brother of Alexander I., from his wife, Anna Feodorowna.

---

[4] William Palmer, one of the luminaries of the Oxford Movement, characterized by Dean Church as "a man of exact and scholastic mind, well equipped at all points in controversial theology," was perhaps most famous for his attempt to effect a union between the Russian and the Anglican Establishments. His efforts resulted only in his being told by the Greco-Slavonic heretics that he should be reconciled with his own patriarch, ere he extended the olive-branch to the separatist patriarchates of the Orient. He became a Catholic in 1856.

[5] See Palmer's "Eastern Question," p. 10.

Not a soul breathed a word against the matrimonial fidelity of the Princess; the state of her health compelled her to live apart from her husband; and he had fallen in love with the Countess Grudzinska. On March 20 (April 2), 1820, Alexander I. made known to all his subjects that the Holy Synod, "relying on the precise text of the thirty-fifth Canon of St. Basil the Great, declared that the marriage of the Grand Duke and Czarwitch, Constantine Paulowitch, with the Grand Duchess, Anna Feodorowna, was dissolved, and that he was free to contract a new marriage." It would be interesting to know how many members of this Holy Synod, this servile creature of the autocrat, were acquainted with the life of one of the glories of the Greek Church—St. Theodore Studita, who flourished at a period when the Eastern Churches were still devotedly attached to the communion of the Apostolic See. When the Greek Emperor, Constantine VI. (Porphrogenitus), having discarded his wife and contracted a "marriage" with his concubine, Theodota, was upheld by a conciliabulum of courtier prelates like those who are the slaves of the Protasoffs, etc., of our day, Theodore protested against the legalized adultery, and from his dungeon he wrote to the Father of the Faithful, Pope St. Leo III.: "Since Our Lord Jesus Christ confided the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven to Peter, and afterward conferred on him the dignity of Prince of the Apostles, it is our duty to make known to the successor of Peter such innovations as are introduced into the Church of God. . . . Oh divine superior of all superiors! There has been formed here, according to the expression of Jeremiah, an assembly of prevaricators and a meeting of adulterers." But the members of the Holy Synod were then, as they have ever been and still are, of calibre diametrically contrary to that of the Studita; as for the support which they pretended to find in a Canon of St. Basil, it is evident that just as in the case of the Grand Duke there was no question of adultery, so in the adduced canon there was no question of divorce, but simply one of a more or less grave ecclesiastical censure to be visited on spouses who separated "from bed and board."[6] But instances like this of Constantine Paulowitch are insignificant when compared with the consequences of a ukase of Nicholas I. permitting new marriages to all Catholic wives whose husbands had been sent or would be sent to Siberia, to prison, or to forced labor in the mines—providing, of course, that they would promise to raise their children, future and already born, in the Church of the State. The reader who accompanied us in our investigations into the martyrdom of Poland from the days of Voltaire's "St. Catharine" to the advent of the present Czar, and who is therefore able to appreciate the iniquities of the great majority of the "criminals" who have languished in Russian penal establishments, will understand how widespread would have been the desolation if most of the Polish women had not been worthy of their Catholic ancestors. We would merely note that by the provisions of his matrimonial ukase Nicholas I. simply enforced the principles of modern Liberalism regarding the competency of the State, and the incompetency of the Church, in matrimonial causes—principles which an American proconsul has recently actuated in Cuba, in illustration of the beauties of a new "civilization," and which were interpreted for the benefit of Pope Gregory XVI. by Count Gourieff, Russian Ambassador at the Vatican, when in a memorial *ad hoc* presented to the Pontiff in May, 1833, he impudently asserted that "the pretensions of the Catholic Church in regard to matrimony constitute an attack on the prerogatives of the State, and that the efforts of the Roman Court in behalf of those pretensions are mere attempts to actuate certain enactments of ancient Councils *which have now fallen into desuetude*." Such inanities as these of the little diplomat call for no attention. Let us rather use some of our limited space for a few observations on the manner in which the Canon Law of "Orthodoxy" came to recognize the one hundred and ninety-five causes for dissolution of matrimony which are unknown to the Divine and to the original Russian Ecclesiastical Law. In every age of the Christian era, just as in the days of the Old Law and of Gentile Paganism, the conflict between the ecclesiastical and the civil power has been perennial; and such it will be until the end of time, since the average human ruler will ever refuse to act as though he recognized that between him and his subjects there is always extended the ordaining and guiding hand of God. Rulers like Charlemagne, St. Edward, St. Louis IX. and Garcia Moreno are seldom granted, even to Christian peoples. Thus the Eastern Emperors, even while the Eastern Patriarchates were still devotedly bound to the Chair of Peter in ecclesiastical and filial communion, frequently pretended to a right to arrange matrimonial causes according to their momentary whims. Justinian, by his *Novella 117*, admitted six reasons for divorce in favor of a husband and five in favor of a wife, in spite of the fact that even the Eastern Church, when it mistakenly relied on a false interpretation of certain verses of St. Matthew, allowed divorce only in the case of adultery. Then, just as in later days in the case of the United Greeks, the Holy See could only protest, and exclaim: *"Ipsi viderint."* But the condemnation was launched against this violation of the law of God, and the obstinate and puerile Orientals could enjoy such satisfaction as may be derived from continuing a practice which is reprobated by the Vicar of Christ. In time the sins of the Lower Empire merited for it the usurpation of Photius, the imperial sword-bearer; and when governmental brute force had detached the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate from the communion of the Catholic Church, the intruder compiled a new code of Canon Law which he designated as a *Nomocanon,* and in which he incorporated all the *Novellæ* of Justinian. From that day the canonists of the Constantinopolitan Schism, and those of all the derivatives of that Schism, have accorded a place, aye, even the first place, to the matrimonial ordinances of a civil government. Nor should we forget that Photius augmented the matrimonial consequences of the Justinian *Novella* by the addition of three new causes for divorce; for that matter, the Canon Law of the Wallachian Greek Schismatics admits three others. And we must note that the most recent Collection of Canon Law received by the Schismatic Greeks, the one compiled by Rhalli, the president of the Athenian Areopagus, under the auspices of the Holy Synod of the governmental Hellenic Church (1856), opens with the *Nomocanon* of the disreputable Photius, and eulogizes the reprobate in most extravagant terms. From these observations the reader will understand the readiness with which the Holy Synod recognized the Nicholaite one hundred and ninety-five causes for the dissolution of the matrimonial tie, when it failed to breathe a word of disapproval of them, and allowed the "Orthodox" clergy to bless the unions which were contracted in accordance with the imperial dispensations. It is true that these privileges of Satan were ostensibly granted to the Poles alone; but we fail to comprehend how an autocrat can possess religious jurisdiction over one portion of his "thrice blessed subjects," and not over all of them. Nor can it be said that the case of the hundred and ninety-five dissolving causes was a matter of the civil law. In Russia the civil and the ecclesiastical law emanate from the same source; the civil and ecclesiastical autocrat cannot be supposed to regard his civil and his ecclesiastical enactments as mutually destructive; and when the "Orthodox" priests perform a religious rite with the consent of the Holy Synod, that tribunal must be supposed to approve the act.[7] However, we cannot drop this subject of Russian Cesarian usurpation in matters of matrimony without an admission that in our day there have been many abuses by Polish Catholics in the matter of divorce; there have been adduced nullifying reasons which were deliberately ignored by the contracting parties at the time of the marriages. But we must remember that in the premises there is one great difference between the conduct of the "Orthodox" Schismatics and that of the Catholic Church, namely, the protestation which the latter, when suffering because of human passions, never fails to emit. The Catholic Church is never derelict in this matter, even though the blood of her bishops and priests must necessarily flow in consequence of her steadfastness. In 1830, when Poland still had a semblance of a National Diet, that assembly heard the courageous protests of the Polish bishops against the frequent violations of the Ecclesiastical Canons in matrimonial causes, and it was in spite of those protests that supposedly nullifying reasons were relegated to the consideration of the civil tribunals, and that the apostolic zeal of Gutkowski, Bishop of Podlachia, and of Skorkowski, Bishop of Cracow, entailed upon them dismissal from the capital before the dissolution of the Diet.

---

[6] The text of the Canon is thus given in the "Juris Ecclesiastici Græcorum Historia et Monumenta, Jussu Pii. IX., P. M., Curante J. B. Pitra, S. R. E. Card." Tom. I., p. 592:

'Επὶ δὲ τοῦ καταλειφθέντος ἀνδρὸς ὑπὸ τῆς γυναικὸς, τὴν αἰτίαν χρὴ σκοπεῖν τῆς ἐγκαταλείψεως· κἂν φανῇ ἀλόγως ἀναχωρήσασα, ὁ μὲν συγγνώμης ἐστὶν ἄξιος, ἡ δὲ ἐπιτιμίου' ἡ δὲ συγγνώμη τουτῷ πρὸς τὸ κοινωνεῖν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ δοθήσεται.

The following is a free but accurate translation: "If a man has been abandoned by his wife, the reason for the abandonment must be investigated; and if there seems to have been no just reason, the husband will deserve indulgence, while the wife will merit punishment the indulgence toward the husband consisting in his not being segregated from the communion of the Church." The judicious Oratorian, Lescœur, in his valuable work entitled "The Church in Poland" (Paris, 1876), tells us that he compared the Greek text with the Slavonic of the *Kniga Pravil*, or Book of Canons of the Russian Church, and with the *Kormtchaia Kniga* used by the Holy Synod in 1820: and that he found the three versions agreed.

---

[7] For details concerning the matter of imperial interference in matrimonial causes in the

The great "reformer" of the Muscovite Church, and also its greatest robber, was the Czar, Ivan the Terrible; and according to him the foulest error of the "Western heretics" was the shaving of the beard. In an edict which this Head of the "Orthodox" Church issued in 1551, being unaware that another Russian Supreme Pontiff, the "great" Peter, would one day enact the contrary, he proclaimed that "the effusion of a martyr's blood would not atone for this crime." However, with all due respect to the memory of the terrible Ivan, the modern clergy of Holy Russia agree with their cousins of the Schismatic Constantinopolitan Patriarchate and with the derivative Churches of that separatist organization, in the declaration that the prime justification of the Photian rebellion must be found in the fact that the Roman Pontiffs had confirmed the "heretical" teaching according to which the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *and* from the Son. In fact, the doctrine that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *alone* is the cardinal dogma of the "Orthodox" belief. And nevertheless, in the most important official act which the Russian Establishment has performed in modern times, namely, the declaration of the Holy Synod dated March 25, 1839, whereby certain apostates from Catholicism, certain United Greek bishops of Lithuania, were received into the communion of the Russian Establishment, no recantation of "the most damnable Latin

---

days of the Eastern Empire, the reader may profitably consult Perrone's "De Matrimonio Christiano," Vol. III., p. 397, *et seqq.* Rome, 1858.

heresy" was demanded from the "converts." The sole requisite for an admission to the yearning embrace of Holy Russia was a renunciation of obedience to the Pope of Rome. Listen to the text of the Synodal declaration: "Their solemn profession that Our Lord and God, Jesus Christ, is alone the veritable Head of the One and True Church, and their promise to persevere in unity with the holy orthodox patriarchs of the East and with this Holy Synod, leave nothing for us to demand from these members of the United Greek Church in order to effect their true and essential union in the faith; and therefore nothing prohibits their hierarchical reunion with us. Therefore the Holy Synod, by virtue of the grace and power given to it by God the Father, by Our Saviour Jesus Christ and by the Holy Ghost, has resolved and decreed," etc. And then the Holy Synod warns the "converted" prelates not to trouble their flocks, whom they hoped to drag with themselves into the vortex of the schism, with questions of mere "local significance," things which "involve neither dogma nor sacraments." Can it be that the Holy Synod would have asked the innocent and ignorant to believe that an exterior and public manifestation of the nature of the belief in the Procession of the Holy Ghost was a mere matter of "local significance, which involved no dogma?" Truly this act of the Holy Synod was both cowardly and (according to its faith, if it had any) sacrilegious; and when the brigandage of Chelm, which we have elsewhere described, almost destroyed the remnants of the United Greek Church in Russia, there was observed what the powers of darkness must have regarded as the same "prudent silence." How different this course from that pursued by the Holy, Roman, Catholic and Apostolic Church, which receives no convert into its pale, let the person be ever so humble or ever so exalted, until he or she has abjured not only every dogmatic error in general, but also the specific errors of the forsaken creed!

Plato, metropolitan of Moscow, probably the most illustrious churchman whom Russian "Orthodoxy" has produced during the nineteenth century, was once asked by a Western concerning the teaching of his Church on Purgatory; and the prelate replied: "We reject the doctrine of Purgatory as a modern invention, excogitated probably for the sake of money."[8] And this assertion, a delectable morsel for the average Protestant, is dinned into the ears of every "Orthodox" student, despite the notorious fact that almost the principal revenue of the Russian priests is derived from prayers for the dead, and although the Russian "Particular Catechism," the work of Philarete, metropolitan of Moscow, inculcates the propriety and even the necessity of that practice.

---

[8] Lescœur: "L'Église et La Pologne," Vol. II., p. 504.

Not the least strange among the inconsistencies of Russian "Orthodoxy" is the hostility which it manifested toward the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady; it is strange indeed, since the principal monuments of the Eastern Church are so redolent of testimonies in favor of the doctrine, that it may well be said that if Pius IX. had proclaimed its contrary, the Holy Synod would have denounced him as a heretic *ex alio capite.* However, the author of "Orthodoxy and Popery" avers that in the dogmatic definition of Mary's great prerogative, the Roman Church "manifested its unbridled love of change, of movement, and of innovations in the domain of a faith which is eternally unchangeable by its very nature." And, nevertheless, this author tells us that according to the Eastern Church the Blessed Virgin "was exempt from the effects of original sin"—an avowal which is so true, that any reader of the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus* will perceive that His Holiness relies chiefly on the testimony of the Eastern Fathers for the establishment of his thesis. This same "Orthodox" author knew very well that one of the chief complaints of the Russian Starovere heretics against the Holy Synod is to the effect that this would-be authoritative tribunal renounced, in 1655, the ancient belief of the Christian East in the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God. The same author must have remembered that in the seventeenth century the ecclesiastical Academy of Kiev, speaking through Lazarus Baranowitch, Bishop of Tchernigow, regarded that doctrine as indubitably true;[9] and we can scarcely imagine that the Academy could have deemed otherwise when it was accustomed to hear, among other and innumerable evidences furnished by the Russian Liturgy, that passage of the Office for the Nativity of the Virgin: "We proclaim and celebrate thy birth, and we honor thy Immaculate Conception."

We shall merely touch the manner with which the "Orthodox" Church treats the secret of the confessional. The awfulness of the subject, and the notoriousness of the sins of "Orthodoxy" in this regard, excuse us from dilation on the matter. In 1854 Snagoano, a Greek archimandrite, who gloried in his communion with "the holy patriarchs of the Orient," published in Paris a work on "The Religious Question in the East," from which we cull the following passages: "The Russian Church is simply a schism, because it has separated from the great Eastern Church; because it does not recognize the Patriarch of Constantinople as its head; because it does not receive the Holy Unction from Byzantium; because it is ruled by a Synod, over which the Czar is a despot . . . and *because Confession, instituted for the betterment and the salvation of penitents, has become, through the servility of the Muscovite clergy, a mere instrument of*

---

[9] Gagarin: "L'Église Russe et L'Immaculée Conception." Paris, 1876.

espionage in the interest of Czarism." That this accusation is well founded has been demonstrated for the enlightenment of those who have had no extensive experience in Russia, by Tondini[10] and by the "Orthodox" author of "The Raskol."[11] The latter writer tells us that "there is an ordinance which compels each priest to reveal to the government every plot against it which may come to his knowledge in the confessional." And this ordinance is in accordance with a ukase issued by Peter "the Great" on February 17, 1722, enjoining the taking of the following oath upon every priest of the "Orthodox" Church: "I will denounce and reveal (all conspiracies) with entire truthfulness and without any disguise or palliation, having in my mind the fear of losing my honor and my life." Certainly the term "inconsistency" is too mild to serve as a qualification of such sacrilege on the part of the priests of a Church which holds, at least theoretically, the same views concerning Sacramental Confession that are taught by the Church of Rome. However, this abject cowardice and diabolical treachery is but natural in an organization in which the civil power takes no pains to disguise its tyranny over the ecclesiastical, and in which the clergy manifest no shame because of their groveling, but rather consider it a matter of course that they should give to the autocrat the blind obedience of a soldier.

The "Orthodox" Church claims to be a divinely instituted organization, empowered to labor for the eternal salvation of men, and resolved to accomplish its task in spite of the influence of earthly power, when that power is hostile to its objects. Did it not claim such origin, endowment, and intention, it could not present itself as the Church of God. We pass, for the present, the matter of the origin of the Russian Ecclesiastical Establishment; now we would briefly consider its course when it finds itself confronted by the civil power. "It would be easy," remarks Lescœur, "and it has been done a thousand times, to multiply proofs of the absolute degradation of the Russian sacerdotal order in its relations with the government. Were we to examine all the grades of the hierarchy, from the pretended Holy Synod which is servile when it is silent, and more servile when it speaks, down to the humblest village pope; from the Universities and the privileged convents where are trained the few distinguished governmental candidates for bishoprics, or for diplomatic posts, or for the general run of the public offices, down to the miserable convents of men or of women, in which there languish wretched beings without piety or charity, and which are inevitably homes of ignorance and vice; everywhere we would find the same conditions produced by the same cause—the subordination, or rather the absolute effacement of the religious element, absorbed by the civil power."[12] Even in purely theological matters, the "Orthodox" episcopate and priesthood have seldom or never been able, if willing in rare instances, to withstand the governmental pressure. When Peter "the Great," following the counsels of the Genevan, Lefort, to whom he owed the invention of the Holy Synod, tried to demi-Protestantize his Church, he found his clergy, his seminanarians, and even his bishops, so subservient, that when the Lutheran, Frederick Lütiens, dedicated his curious book to the Grand Duke Peter Feodorowitch (afterward Peter III.)‘ he felt justified in congratulating the Prince and his bride (the future Catharine II.) on the fact that "the glorious Peter had so restored and modified the modern religion of the Russians in accordance with the Scriptures and with the rules of the primitive Church, that he had made it as similar as possible to that of the Evangelico-Lutherans."[13] And the Lutheran was able to support his assertion by quoting the text of the Catechism which had been compiled by the "Orthodox" bishop, Theopanes Procopowitch, the prelate whom Peter "the Great" had employed to draw up his "Ecclesiastical Regulation." In this Catechism, declared Lütiens, "we find the purest Evangelical doctrine on the forgiveness of sin, on justification, and on the eternal salvation which is attained by faith in Jesus Christ alone."[14] And when, in 1807, the court of St. Petersburg had tired of its playing with Protestantism, and felt the necessity of resuming its comparatively closer connection with the primitive Church, did it turn to its bishops for the accomplishment of the restoration? By no means. The imperial "supreme judge of the Holy Synod" appointed a mixed commission of ecclesiastics and laymen, according to it absolute control over the curriculum of each seminary; and in this commission there were numbered merely a few bishops, and they were all favorites of the court.[15] But the Holy Synod perceived no insult to itself, no usurpation of the things of the sanctuary, in this imperial pretension; it was as ready then to abrogate every ecclesiastical prerogative as it was in 1830, when, in order to aid in the final destruction of agonizing Catholic Poland, it took from the seminaries 20,000 seminarians, declared them forever debarred from the priesthood, incorporated them into the army, and sent them to evangelize the Poles in the fashion which we have seen recommended and adopted by Siemaszko.[16] There is one instance of abjection, however, on the part of the "Orthodox" clergy, which perhaps speaks more eloquently than those which we have indicated. In every Russian liturgical service at which the litanies are recited, not only the name of the Czar, but that of the last little baby of the imperial family, is mentioned before the existence of the Holy Synod is recognized. But hearken to a few of the abject phrases used by the Holy Synod; we cull them at random from some acts of the tribunal: "Conformably to the most exalted will of His Majesty, the Holy Synod has undertaken to better the condition of the provincial clergy—By order from above, many monasteries have been deprived of their rights of fishing—The bishop of Kursk is allowed to print his sermons—His Majesty has found it wise to dissolve the Commission for Ecclesiastical Schools, and to confide their direction to the Holy Synod, charging the supreme procurator (always a layman, and generally a soldier) with the execution of its orders—By a decision of the Imperial Council, confirmed by His Majesty, the marriage of ———, a pagan, with ———, a Mussulman, is pronounced valid, provided that the latter receives Baptism—We humbly beg Your Majesty to assure the salvation of the United Greeks by allowing them to join the Orthodox Church of All the Russias." It is not surprising that Voltaire, after feasting on such fulsomeness as exhales from these and similar phrases, should write to his "saint," the Messalina of St. Petersburg: "As for me, Madame, I am faithful to the Greek Church (Voltaire was very weak in historical knowledge), and so much the more since in a certain sense your beautiful hands swing its thurible, and since you may be regarded as the Patriarch of All the Russias."[17] Nor can we wonder that among the many millions of Russian dissidents who to-day despise the authority of the official Church, who await an opportunity to combat it *à l'outrance*, and who hate the Catholic Church with a venom almost equal to that expressed by the Holy Synod, by far the greater number find the sole justification of their revolt in the really unchristian dependence of "Orthodoxy" on an earthly power. "For a long time," remarks Gagarin, "the bosom of the Russian Church has been lacerated by dissident sects, but the development of these to-day is immense; between fifteen and eighteen millions are enrolled under their standard."[18] The "Orthodox" author of "The Raskol" says that the Raskolniks "confound the temporal sovereign with the head of the Church (and why not?), and therefore they are in a state of perpetual, although latent, war with the laws of the land. They excommunicate the Czar; they style him Antichrist."[19]

---

[10] In his commentary on "Le Reglement Ecclesiastique de Pierre le Grand," p. 248. [11] "Le Raskol, Essai sur les Sectes Religieuses en Russie," p. 236. Paris, 1859.

---

[12] *Loc. cit.*, Vol. II., p. 468. [13] "Dissertatio Historico-Ecclesiastica de Religione Ruthenorum Hodierna." 1745. [14] For more information on this subject, see the already cited work of Tondini, Gagarin's "Etudes de Theologie et d'Histoire," Vol. I., p. 56, and De Maistre's "Quatre Chapitres Inédits sur la Russie," ch. 3. Paris, 1859. [15] See Gagarin's "Clergé Russe," p. 135. [16] The reader need not be surprised at this treatment of the seminarians by the Holy Synod; for during many centuries the Russian Church has not known the meaning of the phrase "ecclesiastical vocation." In Russia the priesthood has been, until very recently, as

---

much a hereditary caste as it is in Hindustan; but with this difference, observes Lescœur, that in the latter country the priesthood is honored, whereas in the former to be called a son of a pope is to receive a mortal affront. See Gagarin's "Clergé Russe," p. 20.

[17] Letter of July 6, 1771. [18] "Études d'Histoire et de Theologie," Vol. III., p. 483. [19] Some

Now for a few reflections concerning the Holy Synod, the presumed authoritative voice of Russian "Orthodoxy;" we shall see that the very existence of this tribunal is both an inconsistency and a heterodoxy. We have noted that the author of "Orthodoxy and Popery" reproves the Roman See for an alleged "insatiable yearning for religious innovations;" and it is notorious that the "Orthodox" have always prided themselves on the immobility of their Church, even when they were obliged to ignore the fact that with them immutability and lethargy are generally synonymous. But can the "Orthodox" show us, we will not say any Scriptural foundation, but rather any Eastern tradition—any Eastern conciliar or patristic warrant for the existence of this Holy Synod? Is it not a matter of cold history that this body is much less than two centuries old? And can any student deny that from its very creation it has been the docile instrument of innovations at once anti-canonical and scandalous? Has the Roman Pontiff, whose alleged "omnipotence" is denounced as strenuously by the "Orthodox" as by the Anglicans and other Protestant sectarians, ever attempted to change the essential form of ecclesiastical government; has he ever dared to suppress anything in this line that the Apostles prescribed; has he ever presumed to substitute a cardinalitial, episcopal, presbyteral, or civil governmental régime for that monarchical primacy of Peter alone which all his predecessors declared to be of divine institution? But this most fundamental of all innovations the Russian Czarate effected, without any efficacious or even serious protest on the part of the "Orthodox" hierarchy, when it instituted the Holy Synod. In the "Particular Catechism" of the Russian Church the sublimity of impudence is reached when, on page 68, to the question as to "what ecclesiastical authority rules the principal divisions of the Universal Church," the following answer is given: "The orthodox patriarchs of the East and the Synod of Russia, the order of hierarchical precedence being, 1st, Constantinople; 2nd, Alexandria; 3rd, Antioch; 4th, Jerusalem; 5th, the Patriarchate or Synod of Russia." And then to the question as to the rank of the Holy Synod, the reply is: "The Synod has the rank of a patriarch, since it takes the place of the Patriarchate of Russia which was abolished with the consent of the other patriarchs." The more than implication that there is no such thing as the Patriarchate of Rome; that the Church of God is peculiarly an Oriental Church; was probably very acceptable to the simple "Orthodox" who received as Gospel truth the lessons in history which Nicholas I. gave to his subjects when he decreed that in all the educational institutions of his empire

---

very interesting studies on the Raskolniks were published in 1874 by Leroy Beaulieu in the *Revue des Deux Mondes.*

the qualification of "tyrant" should never be given to Nero, Caligula, or Ivan the Terrible; that no teacher should dare inform his pupils that the House of Romanoff became extinct in 1761 in the person of the Empress Elizabeth, and that it was the foreign family of Holstein-Gottorp which then (as now) held the czarate; that every pedagogue should insist that the reigning autocrat descended in direct line from Rurick of Moscow; and that the reason for the preference of the ancient Romans for a republic is to be found in the fact that *they had not the good fortune of being acquainted with the blessings which are entailed by the rule of an autocrat.*"[20] As for the implied falsehood that the consent of the Oriental patriarchs to the establishment of the Holy Synod was both seriously asked and freely accorded, we reply that granted this seriousness and this freedom, the prelates in question had no power to change the patriarchal constitution of their churches; and, furthermore, that there is good reason to believe that at least the patriarchate of Constantinople afterward withdrew its consent. This we are led to believe from the words of the well-informed Greek archimandrite, Snagoano, who added to the already cited anathema against "Orthodoxy" the following indictment: "Since the impieties of this Synod are so signal, who will dare to assert that the Russian Church is not schismatical? It is rejected by the Councils; the Canons forbid its recognition; the Church spurns it, and all who hold the faith of the Church, and whom the Church acknowledges as her children, must respect her decisions and regard the Russian Rite as schismatical." However, even if we hold that the Oriental patriarchs could and did abolish the Russian patriarchate, we cannot forget that the constitution of the Holy Synod destroyed the episcopal authority, a thing of divine institution, as to its very essence; that it left the Russian bishops that episcopal character which is God-given, and which no Synod could efface, but that it left them no more authority than that exercised by the unconsecrated Methodists, Episcopalians, Moravians and such like, who merely parade an empty episcopal title. But what would the Greek Fathers have thought of this assembly composed of nominees of an emperor, men who were movable at his caprice?[21] Listen, for instance, to that St. John Damascene whom the "Orthodox" are so fond of quoting in fancied support of their theory concerning the Procession: "The emperors have no right to give laws to the Church. Hearken to the words of the Apostle: The Lord has established Apostles, prophets, pastors and teachers. He says nothing about emperors."[22] And what would St. Athanasius say? "If the bishops so decree, why do you speak of the emperor? When did an episcopal decree derive any authority from an emperor; when was such a decree regarded as an imperial decree? Long before our day many synods have been assembled and many decrees have beeen published by the Church; but the Fathers never consulted the emperors, the emperors never examined into ecclesiastical matters. St. Paul had friends among the familiars of Cæsar; but he never admitted them into his councils."[23] Bishops of the calibre of Sts. John Damascene and Athanasius would scarcely have submitted the results of their deliberations to the judgment of a colonel of hussars, himself the creature of a temporal ruler. But this temporal ruler must fain talk in pontifical fashion when he institutes his new secretariate. In 1720, announcing to his subjects the great blessing about to accrue to them, Peter the "Great" thus perorated: "Amid the innumerable cares which are entailed upon us by the supreme power which has been given to us by God, we have cast our regards on ecclesiastical affairs in order to reform our people and the kingdoms subject to our empire; and we have discovered grave disorders, as well as many faults of administration. This fact filled our conscience with legitimate fear lest we would prove ungrateful to the Most High, if, after having effected, through His aid, such happy reforms in the military and civil orders, we neglected (mark the logical sequence of ideas) to exert ourselves to the utmost in order to restore sacred affairs to their highest perfection and their greatest glory. Therefore, following the example of those monarchs of both the Old and the New Testament whose piety was so illustrious,[24] we have determined to improve the present condition of sacred things." And observe the eloquent significance of the oath which each member of the Holy Synod takes on his installation: "I avow and affirm under oath that the supreme judge of this Synod is our monarch, the Most Clement (listen, spirits of Polish martyrs!) Emperor of All the Russias."[25] It is a remarkable fact, observes Tondini, that this avowal of dependence on the Czar—a dependence so utterly incom-

---

[20] "La Vérité sur la Russie," par le Prince Pierre Dolgoroukow, p. 317. Paris, 1860.

[21] Only three bishops sit in the Synod *ex officio*—those of Moscow, Kiev and St. Petersburg, and of course these can be removed from their sees at the imperial pleasure. [22] "De

---

Imaginibus," Art. II., No. 12; cited by Pope Gregory XVI. in his Brief to Mgr. Lewicki, Archbishop of Leopolis, Ruthenian Rite, July 17, 1841.

[23] "Hist. Arian. ad Monachos," No. 52.

[24] What one of these pious monarchs had three "wives" at the same time? Peter had discarded Eudoxia Lapoukine as well as her successor, and was at this time, while both of these women were still living, "married" to Catharine (afterward Empress as Catharine I.), the wife of a Swedish soldier who had been made prisoner of war. Catharine had been the mistress of two Russian nobles before Peter "married" her.

[25] The journals of Russia seem to consider the enslavement of both the Holy Synod and its subjects as a matter of course. On February 2, 1860, just after the death of Colonel Protasoff, the late procurator of the Synod, the *Nord* of St. Petersburg said: "He was in reality, if not in name, the head of the Orthodox Church in Russia. With his firm and energetic will he knew how to conquer the retrograde tendencies of the older clergy. By means of the Synod of which he was the veritable head, he distributed mitres among young and *civilized* ecclesiastics," etc., etc. In a previous number of the QUARTERLY we have shown how Dimitri Tolstoy, although a mere civilian, was a fit successor of this colonel in the matter of *civilizing* the Russian clergy.

patible with the Gospel and so repugnant to the honest student of ecclesiastical history—is not demanded from the members of other Russian tribunals. "The framer of the oath knew what he wanted," says Tondini; "he wanted docile prelates, and he gained his point, thus proving, as he himself boasted, that he was greater than Louis XIV."

Before we treat of the prime inconsistency of Russian "Orthodoxy," its rejection of the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, it may be well to notice another inconsistency which it manifests in regard to the instigator of the Greek Schism. Prince Augustine Galitzin, in his valuable work on the "Orthodox" Church,[26] remarks that "the origin of the Schism was so disgraceful that it dares not venerate its founder, whereas, among its thousand other contradictions, it joins the Universal Church on October 23 in celebrating the Feast of St. Ignatius (patriarch of Constantinople), the first victim of Photius."[27] It is true that individual writers of the Russian Church and of the Schismatic Constantinopolitan Patriarchate have been sufficiently audacious to describe Photius as of "happy memory;" and some have ventured to quote his letters to Pope Nicholas I. as models of piety, brazenly ignoring his deposition of his legitimate patriarch and his violent occupation of the patriarchal throne after a reception of Orders *per saltum*—of all, from tonsure to the episcopacy, in the space of six days. Sincerity could not have been characteristic of a prelate who, when prepared to forswear his allegiance to the Holy See, nevertheless wrote to the Pontiff in the following strain, so long as he conceived it possible that Rome might countenance sacrilege and ecclesiastical intrusion: "My predecessor having *resigned* his dignity, the assembled metropolitans, the clergy and, above all, the emperor, who is so kind to others but so cruel to me, impelled by I know not what idea, turned to me, and paying no attention to my prayers, insisted that I should assume the episcopate; in fact, in spite of the tears of my despair, they seized me and executed their will upon me."

As is well observed by Lescœur, if the "Orthodox" theologians have frequently fluctuated between the Church and Protestantism, according to the spirit of the times, and especially according as the imperial will has inclined for the nonce, there is one doctrine concerning which they are frankly Protestant. "When one hears the theologians of the Holy Synod declaiming against Popery, he might believe himself in London or in Geneva; but when he beholds the measures, sometimes petty and often barbarous, with which all recourse to Rome is either prevented or punished, he recognizes that he is in Russia. The Poles know full well that it is more dangerous to be a Papist frankly in Warsaw than it is to be a Raskolnik in Moscow." And nevertheless—and here we approach the chief, the most radical inconsistency, and the *raison d'être* of every heresy which afflicts "Orthodoxy"—a Russian cannot consult the Liturgy of his own Church, or celebrate the feasts which that Liturgy prescribes, or peruse the most authoritative books of devotion recommended by his spiritual advisers, without being confronted in bold relief, as it were, by St. Peter proclaiming his prerogatives, and by the entire body of doctrine which the Roman See teaches to the world. The cultivated Russian cannot escape the knowledge that the Church of Constantinople, from which, as he believes, his ancestors received Christianity, was at that time subject to the See of Rome, or was, as moderns are fond of saying, Roman Catholic. He knows that originally his "Orthodox" Church was far more Roman than Greek; that his Church was not Schismatic Greek in its origin, and that it is not Greek in its language, its polity, or its government. History tells him that his ancestors were converted by the Roman Catholic Apostolic Church; for whether, as we learn from Constantine Porphyrogenitus, the first missionaries to Russia were sent by the Catholic patriarch of Constantinople, Ignatius, in 867, or, as Nestor asserts, by the schismatic intruder, Photius, in 866, it is certain that no real impression was made upon the Russian masses before the close of the tenth century,[28] when the Grand Duke Vladimar, called "the Apostolic," embraced Christianity—an epoch at which the Greeks were in communion with Rome, for the properly so-called Photian Schism had ended with the second and final deposition of the intruder in 889, and the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate remained subject thenceforward to the Holy See until the definitive actuation of the Greek Schism by Cerularius in 1054. Our cultivated Russian knows also that the definitive defection of the Greeks did not much affect the relations of his countrymen with the Papacy until the twelfth century; that only then they were seduced entirely from the Roman obedience; that a reaction having taken place, by the time that the Council of Florence was held (1439) there were as many Catholics as Schismatics in Russia;[29] and that it was a second Photius, Archbishop of Kiev, who extended the Schism throughout the land about the middle of the fifteenth century.[30] Nor will our well-informed Russian fail to realize that his Church is not Greek in its liturgical language; that this language is the Slavonic, and not the vernacular, but the Old Slavonic, with which the people are not familiar.[31] Again, this unbiased Russian will learn from the monuments of his own "Orthodox" Church that the Papal supremacy over the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate or, as it was at that time not improperly termed, the Greek Church, dates from the first day of that patriarchate's existence. He must feel that if obedience to the See of Peter had not been part of the faith of all the Oriental Patriarchates when Photius started the Greek Schism on its first stage, that desperate intruder would not have troubled himself so exceedingly to obtain the Pontifical confirmation of his sacrilegious and all but murderous seizure of the Constantinopolitan crozier. Quite naturally he must reason in the same manner when he thinks of Cerularius, who separated definitively the greater number of the Eastern Christians from the communion of Rome. He must ask himself how it is, in the supposition that his own "Orthodox" Church was not Roman in its origin, that his Church celebrates so many feasts which Rome prescribes, but which the Schismatic Greeks reject? And finally he must wonder how it happens that if the Russian Church did not in its early days proclaim the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, nevertheless the ancient "Orthodox" Liturgy avows that supremacy in terms which admit of no exception on the part of a Catholic theologian. For instance, St. Peter is termed "the sovereign pastor of all the Apostles—*pastyr vladytchnyi vsich Apostolov.*" Pope St. Sylvester is called "the divine head of the holy bishops."[32] We read of Pope St. Celestine I. that "firm in his speech and in his works, and following in the traces of the Apostles, he showed himself worthy of occupying the Holy Chair by the decree with which he deposed the impious Nestorius (patriarch of Contantinople)." It is said of Pope

---

[26] "L'Église Greco-Russe." Paris, 1851. This Galitzin should not be confounded with another Galitzin, also a convert, and the author of "La Russie, Est Elle Schismatique?" Paris, 1859. The name of the latter was Nicholas Borrissowitch. [27] For a concise but detailed account of the beginnings of the Greek Schism, and therefore of the sufferings of Ignatius, see our "Studies in Church History," Vol. II.

---

[28] About the year 945 Olga or Elga, widow of a grand duke of Russia, journeyed to Constantinople, and was there baptized. Returning to Russia, she tried in vain to convert her countrymen. But her grandson, Vladimir, having married Anna, a sister of the Greek Emperor, Basil II., was baptized in 968, and in a few years nearly all the Russians received the faith [29] See the Bollandists, at Month of September, No. 41. [30] Some authors hold that

---

the Schism of Cerularius did not affcet the entire Greek Empire in the eleventh century. It is certain that Pope Alexander II. had an agent, an *apocrisiarius* (not a legate) at the court of the Emperor, Michael Ducas, in the person of Peter, Bishop of Anagni: and it is equally certain that this representative of the Papacy remained as such in Constantinople for a year. Pope Pascal II. sent Chrysolanus as legate to Alexis Comnenus. It is to be noted that Euthymius Zagabenus, who obeyed the order of Alexis Comnenus to collect all patristic testimonies against each and every heresy, never speaks of the Latins as heretics. Even in the twelfth century there were many Greeks in the communion of Rome, as we learn from many narratives of the Crusades, from the "Alexias" of Anna Comnena, from the "Life of Mannuel," by Nicetas Choniates, and from the letters of the Venerable Peter of Cluny to the Emperor, John Comnenus, and to the Patriarch of Constantinople.

[31] Protestants should note this fact as evidence of their mistake when they adduce the example of the Russian Church as an encouragement for their own use of the vernacular in their Liturgy—when they have one. Not one of the ancient Churches, neither the Greeks, nor the Syrians, nor the Copts, nor the Chaldeans, nor the Armenians, nor the Nestorians, nor the Jacobites have the vernacular of the people for the medium of their Liturgy. The reason is evident; they all have preserved the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and they realize the necessity of having an unchangeable medium for the expression of their sentiments and doctrines—a medium which is furnished by the now unspoken languages in which their ancestors learned the truths of Christianity. For information on this point consult Assemani's "Bibliotheca Orientalis," Vol. IV., ch. 7, 22. Rome, 1719.

[32] Gagarin cites the

St. Agapetus that "he deposed the heretical Anthimius (another patriarch of Constantinople), anathematized him, and consecrating Mennas, whose doctrine was irreproachable, placed him in the See of Constantinople." Similarly we hear of Pope St. Martin I. that he "adorned the divine throne of Peter, and holding the Church upright on this rock which cannot be shaken, he honored his name;" and this praise is given to St. Martin because "he segregated Cyrus (patriarch of Alexandria), Sergius (another patriarch of Constantinople), Pyrrhus and all their adherents from the Church." Pope St. Leo I. is styled "the successor of St. Peter on the highest throne, the heir of the impregnable rock." Pope St. Leo III. is thus addressed: "Chief pastor of the Church, fill the place of Jesus Christ." What must be the feelings of any sacerdotally sensitive member of the enslaved "Orthodox" clergy, when he hears his Liturgy teaching how a Pope ought to speak to a wicked or heretical sovereign! We hear Pope Gregory II. warning Leo the Isaurian, the imperial champion of the Iconoclasts: "Endowed as we are with the power and sovereignty of St. Peter, we have determined to prohibit you," etc. Nor does this same Liturgy of the Russian Church hesitate to admit that a Roman Pontiff can excommunicate emperors as well as patriarchs; and not only emperors who belong to the Roman Patriarchate, but also those of the Eastern. In a fragment of a Life of St. John Chrysostom this Liturgy tells its admirers that "Pope Innocent wrote more than once to Arcadius, separating him and his wife, Eudoxia, from the communion of the Church, and pronouncing anathema on all who had helped in driving St. John Chrysostom from his See. He not only deprived Theophilus (patriarch of Alexandria), but he segregated him from the Church. Then Arcadius wrote to Pope Innocent, begging pardon most humbly, and assuring the Pope of his repentance. The emperor wrote also to his brother Honorius, asking him to implore the Pontiff to lift the excommunication, and he obtained the favor." It certainly appears strange that during so many centuries the leaders of the "Orthodox" Russian Church have not found some means of disembarrassing themselves of these and many similar testimonies of their own Liturgy to the supremacy of the Chair of Peter; but at least they have endeavored to neutralize the force of these arguments by a free use of that favorite weapon of all heretics—calumny. Prince Nicholas Galitzin, writing while he was still an "Orthodox" professor, averred that "in Russian seminaries it is taught that in the eyes of Catholics the Pope is an irresponsible autocrat, claiming to be *impeccable*."[33] And that

---

quotations which we give, and many similar ones, in the Old Slavonic text, in his "Études de Theologie," Vol. II.; and Tondini comments on them most judiciously in his "La Primauté de Saint Pierre Prouvée par les Titres que Lui Donne L'Église Russe dans Sa Liturgie." Paris, 1867.

[33] "La Russie, Est-Elle Schismatique?" p. 38.

medical theologian, Karatheodori, whose work, by the way, was translated into French by a Russian priest formally commissioned to the task by the Russian government, dared to emit the following: "Popery asks us to recognize in this mortal (the Pope) all the rights and all the authority of the Universal Church . . . and what is more, it asks us to believe that by ordinance of God this mortal is superior to all the Divine Commandments themselves, and that he enjoys the right to change them, adding to them or subtracting from them according to his own will." Having read this barefaced illustration of "Orthodox" mendacity, we are prepared for the Greek physician's assertion that men of the stamp of "the Jesuit Prince" (Gagarin, whose writings Karatheodori affected to refute) are "ever ready to reject the clearest truths," and that they prosecute their ends by means of lies and the falsification of documents, following the example of the "Council of Florence, in which Cardinal Julian (Cesarini) adduced forged Acts of the Seventh General Council." Here the Sultan's physician simply imitated the time-serving Mark of Ephesus in his too successful efforts to undo the good work of the Florentine synodals, carefully refraining, however, from any mention of the refutation of the Ephesine prelate's charges which Bessarion, the most eminent Greek Schismatic of any day, and who was converted by his experience at this same Council of Florence, adduced in his apposite letter to Alexis Lascaris. The reader will scarcely accuse us of digression, if we dilate somewhat on this charge against the Florentine synodals, since the words of Bessarion illustrate the position assumed by Karatheodori and others of that ilk. Mark of Ephesus had accused the Latins of having adduced falsified testimonies of the Fathers as corroboratory of the Catholic doctrine on the Procession of the Holy Ghost; and to this calumny Bessarion, who was still the Schismatic Archbishop of Nicea, thus replied: "Finally they (the Latins) showed us testimonies of the Fathers which evinced most clearly the truth of their teaching; and they adduced passages not only of Western Fathers, against which we could only contend that they had been corrupted by the Latins, but also sayings of our Epiphanius which declared plainly that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *and* the Son, and to this evidence we also retorted that it had been corrupted. Then they introduced Cyprian and others, and we gave the same answer; finally we repeated this reply when they adduced the authority of Western saints. And when we (the Schismatics) had debated among ourselves for many days as to what we ought to say, we could devise no other reply, even though it seemed too trivial for our purpose. And firstly, the doctrine (of the Roman Church) appeared to be concordant with the mind of the saints; secondly, so many and so ancient were the volumes containing it, that they could not have been falsified easily, and we could show neither Latin nor Greek copies which gave the quoted passages differently from the version of the Latins; and thirdly, we were unable to cite any doctors who contradicted the Roman doctrine. Therefore it was that being unable to find an apposite reply, we remained silent for many days, holding no sessions with the Latins."[34]

So much for the "Orthodox" allegation of dishonesty on the part of that Œcumenical Council which put a temporary end to the Greek Schism. Such charges form the stock in trade for such of the "Orthodox" clergy as enjoy some smattering of theological education; but unfortunately for the prospects of conversion of the majority of the teachers of "Orthodoxy," the average Protestant preacher in these United States is scarcely less versed in the essential elements of ecclesiastical lore. Were the "Orthodox" clergy well indoctrinated even with profane science, of course not with the German materialism which alone has affected some of them, they would come to realize the truth of those words which Lamoricière addressed to the Pontifical army on the eve of the unsuccessful but glorious campaign of Castelfidardo: "Christianity is not only the religion of the civilized world. It is the moving principle and the very life of civilization, and the Papacy is the key-stone in the arch of Christianity. To-day all Christian nations seem to have some consciousness of these truths." Gagarin would discern Russia among the nations whose perspicacity appealed to Lamoricière. "Russia does not yet believe," reflected the zealous ex-Orthodox polemic, "that the Papacy is the key-stone of Christianity; she does not comprehend the phrase, but already she seems to have a sort of consciousness of its truth, and in her pale there is an increasing number of souls who are penetrated by that truth, and who place their chief hopes in it."[35]

REUBEN PARSONS.

Yonkers, N. Y.

---

[34] But Bessarion was not satisfied with repelling the Schismatical charge that the Roman theologians were falsifiers; he retorted the charge against the Greeks. Speaking of a passage from St. Basil in which that Father says that "the Holy Ghost is from the Son, having His being from Him, receiving from Him, and depending entirely from that Cause," the Archbishop of Nicea declared that out of six codices of St. Basil's works brought by his fellow-schismatics to Florence, five gave the passage in question in its entirety, while the sixth codex "was defective in some parts, and presented many additions which had been made according to the whims of the transcriber." When he returned to Constantinople, the Archbishop searched the libraries, and he discovered indeed some codices in which the questioned passage was absent; but those codices were perfectly new, having evidently been written after the termination of the Council of Florence. At the same time the prelate found in the libraries many ancient manuscripts of St. Basil's works in which the passage occurred. [35] "Tendances Catholiques dans La Société Russe," Paris, 1860.

THE TWO KENRICKS: THEIR EARLY ENVIRONMENT.

REGARD for the interests of the Church, the requirements of historical justice, and the characters of the two distinguished brothers, the Archbishops Kenrick, necessitates the task of preparing a record of their lives, in the world and in the Church, which may fill up and complete such sketches of each as have already been given to the world. It is true that each of these distinguished men filled so large a space on the Church's canvas, in his own time, that no biographer could possibly hope to present a complete reflection of their lives, their views, and their acts in the compass of anything less than an encyclopædia. But so many details have been left untouched by former writers, so many lacunæ remain to be filled in, and so many lights require to be thrown upon the picture, that the attempt at a complete biography ought no longer to be postponed, lest the importance of so doing should become obscured by the demands of an ever-widening ecclesiastical growth. Such a work is now in preparation; and as a note of introduction to it some word of the early surroundings of the Kenrick family and the social, political and literary atmosphere which prevailed when they began to imbibe their ideas may not be without interest.

It was in the old portion of the Irish capital, known for centuries of warfare as "the Pale," that the Kenrick family had their habitation. This was in earlier times the part of the city which was enclosed within embattled walls, with fortified gateways and loopholed towers, designed to repel the "wild Irishrie," camped often enough on the opposite bank of the Liffey, in threatening design and formidable force. Circumscribed by the military cincture, the citizens were obliged to restrain their taste for wide streets, if they had any, and so all around the central fortress, known as "the Castle," there spread a network of narrow, crooked and dingy thoroughfares, many of which might be easily spanned by a man's extended arms, some by much less. It was in one of these, which was called Chancery lane, that the family of the Kenricks had their abode. The thoroughfare, which a few years ago was condemned to demolition for street improvement, ran from Bride street to Golden lane, and was in early times quite an aristocratic part of the city. Here, indeed, was kept the Court of Chancery, from which it derived its title, and here lived in great state some of the high officials connected with that important department of the State, as well as some of the great legal lights of succeeding eras. The Chancery Court was in the evolution of the city transferred to the central building across the river, known as the Four Courts—the first stately pile which compels the admiration of all travelers driving along the Dublin quays from the western side. Not one in a thousand explorers in old Dublin could realize, from the present condition of such ancient thoroughfares, it is safe to say, what was their estate in the more prosperous period before the Act of Union despoiled Ireland of her Parliament and Dublin of her resident notables. No one could ever dream that such forlorn and dilapidated and foul-smelling places as Chancery lane was one of the most fashionable thoroughfares in the city, or that crowds of beaux in court suits and powdered periwigs, and dainty ladies *à la* Watteau as to attire, borne in sedan chairs, might be found there, on the way to Christ Church or St. Patrick's on Sundays, or mayhap to the Fishamble street or Smock alley theatre, close by, on week nights, with the link-boys running before them to light the way. Yet such indeed was the position of the whole interesting neighborhood. Across the street lay—and still lies—a little pocket of old rookeries called Derby Square, the entrance to which is a passage little more than a yard in width yet in its time this was the abode of a number of the Irish nobility and a place of the most exclusive *haut ton.* Crossing the thoroughfare called Skinners' alley, just outside the opening of Bride street (which was originally "St. Bride's"), one came to an archway which spanned an arcade running alongside the southern wall of Christ Church Cathedral. Above this archway stood a carved wooden effigy of Satan, and the arcade itself, as if in cynical mockery of its proximity to a consecrated edifice, bore the awesome name of "Hell." The arcade itself was a warren of lawyers' offices: perhaps this circumstance may be explanatory, to some extent, of the strange title, for in Ireland there is some traditional connection between the gentleman in black and the black-robed gentlemen who plead in the law courts—a connection which they themselves, in that age, did not repudiate, since we know from O'Connell's biographies that the corps of volunteers formed from the members of the Bar, and of which he for some time was one, was known as "the Devil's Own." The presence of these lawyers' offices in the sulphurously-named arcade was explained by the fact that in a sort of annex of Christ Church Cathedral was held the Court of Exchequer, which was also originally located near Chancery lane, in another dingy thoroughfare called Exchequer street. Interspersed with the lawyers' dens were several of the more congenial resorts known at the time as chop houses, some famous coffee houses and some equally celebrated taverns. Night-time at all these establishments found them crowded with the wits of the Irish Bar and the idle class of Dublin—men of the stamp of John Philpot Curran, Ned Lysaght and Jonah Barrington; and mirth and repartee prolonged far into the small hours gave a colorable base for a theory of "happiness in Hell." Only separated by the width of St. Werburgh's Church—where the Irish Viceregal Court worships when not residing in "the Castle," but at the Viceregal Lodge in the Phœnix Park—from Chancery lane ran Hoey's court, another constricted avenue to the Castle region, made immortal by its connection with the great Dean of St. Patrick's. It was in this now squalid and fever-laden purlieu that Jonathan Swift first assumed his "heritage of woe;" and if the house in which he was born is still allowed to lurch and nod there, propped up by internal and external crutches, a menace to the denizens and curiosity-hunters, it is simply a tribute to one who had very little respect himself for things deserving of demolition.

If in the secular sense the ground was classic, in the loftier one it was far more so. It was ground consecrated to the holiest use by the sainted footsteps of Ireland's glorious Apostle, Patrick, by the scarcely less sanctified sandals of St. Laurence O'Toole, and by many a martyred prelate and priest of the sanguinary days of the Tudors. Perhaps the first sounds that broke on the infant ears of the future Archbishops were the peals of the campaniles of the twin Cathedrals of St. Patrick and the Holy Trinity, whose shadows fell athwart the family homestead, from the one at noonday, from the other at eventide. The older pile was originally reared by St. Patrick himself. In its crypt may yet be seen portions of the original structure, while many mementoes of the days when Catholicism was the only faith of the land show in the larger pile which grew up around the foundation that the holy hand of the great Apostle had laid. In the days of Danish supremacy in Dublin the newer mass of the Holy Trinity Cathedral sprang into being, as a memorial of the piety of the Scandinavian monarch, Sitric. The rapacity of the "Reformers" had wrested from Catholic hands both these beautiful "poems in stone." And within a stone's throw of each are similar proofs of the satire of the newer "evangelization." St. Audoen's Church and tower are monuments of the piety of a foreign merchant, it is said, who was shipwrecked on the estuary of the Liffey, and who in gratitude for his rescue devoted a fortune to their erection. So, too, the Church of St. Nicholas Within, in near by Patrick street. The forgotten founder of this edifice left a fund for its maintenance, on condition that a Mass be ever afterward offered for the repose of his soul, once a year, within its walls. The church is now a ruin, but the bequest remains; and on the disestablishment of the Protestant Church in Ireland, thirty years ago, it came out that the then incumbent, the Rev. Tresham Gregg, drew his salary of four hundred pounds per annum from that bequest, although the church had fallen into desuetude, on the plea that he had held a Protestant service of some kind within the ruin once in every year since he had come into enjoyment of the benefice, although prayers for the dead were to clerics of his stamp a Popish superstition. The names of St. Bride and St. Werburgh suggest also the reverence which in the older days of the City of the Pale was felt by the inhabitants of this particular quarter. No Catholic can tread this ground insensible to the sacred memories which make it hallowed. We may be sure that they sank into the souls of the youths who were destined in other lands to revive the glory of the old faith, and fired them with the noble ambition of compensating in some measure for the great wrong by which such beautiful temples of the Most High were wrested from their proper purpose, by rearing, under other skies, many a fane wherein the worship banned by English law might be rendered by hearts still leal to the true Church of Christ.

While the Protestant churches thus flourished in the borrowed splendor of other days all around, in the same ambit the sanctuaries of the Catholics existed only on sufferance. Mole-like they carried on their office in obscure alleys, hidden by the surrounding factories and dwellings of the poor. They were not honored with the title of church. In the Puritan *régime* they were "Mass-houses" (with a small m); when the period of toleration supervened, they were, by a great stretch of liberality, designated "chapels." Catholics themselves, by force of usage, grew into the habit of so referring to them. Thus we find Dr. Clarke, in his short sketch of Archbishop Kenrick of Baltimore, stating that his uncle was "parish priest of Francis Street Chapel." The proper description of the edifice is "Church of St. Nicholas of Myra;" and in Catholic days the street on whose line it is situate received its full title of St. Francis street. This curtailment of name of street and square became a universal practice, in Dublin as in most other places where the "reformers" had a strong footing. Bride street was originally "St. Bride's street," Stephen's green "St. Stephen's green," Audoen's Arch "St. Audoen's," Patrick street "St. Patrick's street." The great Abbey of White Friars, said to have been founded in Dublin several centuries before the Anglo-Norman invasion, was represented in those days by a modest church walled in by a mask of high houses on Aungier street in the front and Whitefriars street in the rear; and the principal approach to the edifice to the present day is through a passage cut in these same houses (now tenanted by the Carmelite community themselves) from Aungier street. The Church of St. Michael and John was buried in a wretched little wynd called

Smock alley; so, too, the neighboring Church of St. John the Evangelist, familiarly known in that period and much later as "Adam and Eve Chapel." These examples will serve to show the spirit of the days of relaxed persecution. Not only was the Catholic system held in contempt by the dominant spoilers, but Catholics themselves, insensible to self-respect, accepted the contempt unmurmuringly, content, apparently, that they were accorded the privilege of a despised existence as a separate religious denomination. This was the degeneration which caused the Protestant poet, Thomas Davis, to write:

> "No wonder that his step betrays
> The freedman born in Penal days."

Nor was it merely in material and inanimate things that the brand of moral inferiority was thus sought to be permanently affixed upon the vanquished downtrodden. All public and private life around was redolent of insult and injustice to Catholics. They were debarred from citizen rights, they could not aspire to any public office. They had to endure the galling wrong of taxation without representation. Their vulgar-minded and implacable foes seized every possible opportunity of taunting them on their overthrow and their condition of serfdom. The name of Skinners' alley has been mentioned. It no longer exists, but in those days it was an unsavory narrow thoroughfare which lay where Christ Church place now opens up the view along Thomas street, and its chief claim to notoriety was the house of a fraternity called the "Aldermen of Skinners' Alley." Antedating the Orange Society, the aims and principles of these conspirators were precisely the same as those avowed by the Ulster brotherhood. They held drunken carousals on all Williamite anniversaries, and their headquarters on these occasions were always the focus of riot and noisy demonstrations intended to insult the Catholic population. They drank sulphurous toasts to the downfall of Pope and Popery; they marched in defiant procession, decked with the flaunting emblems of bigotry, on Boyne anniversaries, down to the statue of King William on College green, and, having decked it with festoons of orange lilies and streamers, marched around it like bacchanals, to the clamor of fife and drum. They lorded it in the Municipal Council, and squandered the citizens' money without let or hindrance in these orgies of insult.

Such was the condition of things which the Catholic community in the Irish capital had to endure year after year down to the date of the Emancipation Act; and such on a smaller scale was it in the lesser cities wherever the Ascendency party was numerous enough to indulge in insult and outrage with impunity. In such an atmosphere, and right in the storm-centre of perennial persecution, was the abode of the Kenrick family.

A difficult thing, one may well imagine, to cultivate, amid such environments, the holy virtues of piety, charity, self-restraint and love of one's neighbor. Yet this was precisely what the Kenrick family did during many trying years. Only supernatural grace could have enabled them to do it. And this grace, beyond all question, was given to the two youths who were destined to plant the flower, in due time, upon a far-off strange soil.

The fact that the orthography of the family name has seemed doubtful to some who were familiar with it need not surprise any reader, since variorum spellings of patronymics are common, especially under Anglo-Saxon processes of adjustment. The name would appear to be of Danish or Scottish origin, judging from its modern form of presentation; but it is unsafe to be guided by such a rule. If the Kenricks had long been rooted in Dublin, it is highly probable that they sprang from a Danish stock, since the Northmen had obtained a firm foothold in the Irish capital and held it steadfastly for several centuries, even after their power was broken at Clontarf. They became highly civilized, and developed not only talents for commerce, but for the liberal arts, as may still be seen by the noble structure of Christ Church Cathedral, as well as by many interesting relics of their *régime* preserved in the Royal Irish Academy. A large number of notable Dublin families trace their origin to this period, and if that of the Kenricks were of the same stock the fact would, so far from militating against their intellectual claims or their patriotic standing, only strengthen the belief in the benefits of an admixture of the strongest races in the development of the highest physical and spiritual types. A process of mutation has been going on in the spelling of family names ever since the English language was introduced into Ireland and endeavored to accommodate its characters to the different sounds and signs of the Gaelic speech. Still it is hard to conceive how the change from Kendrick, as sometimes spelt, to Kenrick could have taken place, since the *d* is, in such a position as in this case, a forcible factor in the determination of the sound, not to be eliminated by the natural tendency to drop such letters as finals. Kendrick and Kenrick may have been originally entirely distinct family names. Indeed genealogists might find a purely Irish derivation for Kenrick by tracing its connection with the other Irish patronymic MacEnery, by presuming that in course of time the common process of ellipsis had worn away the first two letters of the Mac and left the strong final consonant as the first and determining particle of the parent name. This is notoriously the case with regard to many Irish names, such as Guinness or Ginnis, evidently an abbreviation of MacInnis or Innes, Keever from MacIvor or Eever, and so on. There is in existence a couple of convincing proofs that even those connected closely with this particular Kenrick family believed that the proper orthography of the name included the *d;* and this fact starts the query whether any members or branches of it had conformed to the State religion in the penal days, for certain it is that at least one Kendrick is found in that unfortunate position. This individual, moreover, was one who had acquired a certain share of reflected fame by his connection with immortal genius, and lives in biography, although in most cases anonymously. It is known that during the earlier part of the eighteenth century one Roger Kendrick was City Surveyor to the city of Dublin, and afterwards Verger of St. Patrick's Cathedral. He acted in the latter capacity to the famous Dr. Jonathan Swift. When the Dean on a certain occasion had prepared to address a congregation, he only found the official Verger present. However, in no manner disconcerted, the witty Dean commenced his sermon with the words, "My dearly beloved Roger," and the discourse was rendered brief as the circumstances very properly required.

This Roger Kendrick, however, appears to have had talents beyond the needs of a verger—in fact, had claims to a literary distinction of his own. Some years ago there lived in Werburgh street, in Dublin, a curious antiquarian—one who combined archæology with commerce in a very prosaic way—Mr. Edward Evans. Like the Scottish devotee, he might describe himself as cultivating the Muses on oatmeal, since while his shelves upstairs were loaded with the rarest literary treasures he dispensed meal and flour from behind his counter to customers with the unaffected bonhomie of the genuine philosopher. When Mr. Evans died his precious collection was put under the auctioneer's hammer, and amongst the rare volumes disposed of was a collection of Sir James Ware's works (Walter Harris' edition). In the catalogue of these was found the following note:

"The first volume ('History of the Bishops,' etc.) belonged to a subscriber, Roger Kendrick, City Surveyor to the Corporation of Dublin, and afterwards Verger of St. Patrick's Cathedral; it contains his autograph and numerous interesting MS. marginal notes by him; several of the subscribers are noted as being his friends; after Dean Swift's name is written: 'Under God, my best friend.' It afterwards passed into the possession of the Ven. Archdeacon Cotton (has his autograph), who made corrections in the addenda, and it subsequently became the property of the present owner, who, with great labour and research, compiled, as a supplement, in clearly written MS., The Succession of the Roman Catholic and Protestant Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland from the Reformation to the present time, with the Ecclesiastical Division of the Dioceses, Biographical Memoirs and Notices of the most distinguished Ecclesiastics, and an Index, thus rendering it a Unique Copy of the Work, and an invaluable contribution to the Ecclesiastical History of Ireland."

The man who could claim Swift as "his best friend under God" enjoyed a rare distinction, and if he were a real Kenrick it is to be regretted that such an intellect was to be found on the side of those who made the laws to oppress the more steadfast Kenricks and men of like genius and fidelity, and scattered them all over the globe.

Thomas Kenrick, the father of the two famous prelates, lived in No. 16 Chancery lane; later on he kept a scrivener's office in York street, a thoroughfare running eastward from Aungier street to St. Stephen's green. It was at that day an exceedingly select section, and, indeed, it has not very much deteriorated since. The business of scrivener was an important and respectable one; for all legal documents were then required to be copied by hand, to be rigidly correct in the minutest particular, following set legal formulæ, and abounding in quaint Latin and Norman-French phrases and abbreviations. In this office the two youths successively spent several years before entering on their clerical studies; and it was here that the wonderfully gifted, "most musical, most melancholy" Irish poet, James Clarence Mangan, spent an apprenticeship which he seemed to regard as a kind of Promethean fetterment. This may be gathered at least from an article of his on the life of Dr. Petrie, the renowned archæologist, in whose company he afterwards spent several years in the Record Office of Dublin. A true poet is a sort of unconsecrated priest—though in his material life he may be the very antithesis of one, as the world knows too well. Mangan seems to have had all the refinement of the spiritual nature; but he possessed, unfortunately for himself, that species of fatalistic melancholy against which the sacred calling is, in sensitive and high-strung natures, the only true shield and antidote. His sublime gloom—worse by many degrees than that of Byron—was intensified by poverty. He was compelled to drudge at the scrivener's desk for the support of a helpless family; and to make his servitude all the more poignant, he had betaken himself to the deadly solace of drink—some say opium besides. The poet's plaint of this period when he felt, like Samson, "in brazen fetters doomed to grind," is heartrending; yet it compels the tribute of sympathy and admiration, for in its deepest agony his spirit confessed the hand of the Divinity and acknowledged his own lamentable weakness, as in the opening note of that cry of anguish, unmatched since the psalter of Job, "The Nameless One"—

> "Roll forth, my song, like a mighty river
> That rushes along to the boundless sea:
> God will uphold me while I deliver
> My soul of thee."

Under all his trials and mental submersions Mangan carried the rectitude of the Catholic heart. To his exemplary conduct in the scrivener's office the late Archbishop of St. Louis, who had spent some years there along with him, bore unqualified testimony in a letter to Mr. John McCall, of Dublin, in October, 1877. His Grace said:

"I knew James Mangan for several years very intimately, and highly esteemed him for his talents and virtue. . . . After my father's death, in 1817, his office was continued for some years, in which both Mangan and myself were engaged. The office was in York street."

It was Father Francis Kenrick who continued the office for those years. He conducted it for the benefit of the widow and children of his brother. We may be sure that this holy priest would have no one in his employment who was unworthy of confidence and respect. Great, then, must be the admiration felt for the gifted poet's character when he is found bearing up manfully with a condition which was repugnant wholly with his aspirations, for the sake of those who were cast helplessly on his hands. He was at this time a lad in his teens, and the power of poetical expression which even at that early age was his is indicated in those lines which he afterwards recalled when penning his article on his departed friend, Dr. Petrie:

> "O Genius! Genius! all thou dost endure
> First from thyself, and finally from those
> The earth-bound and the blind, who cannot feel
> That there be souls with purposes as pure
> And lofty as the mountain snows, and zeal
> All quenchless as the spirit whence it flows,
> In whom that fire, struck like the spark from steel,
> In other bosoms ever lives and glows.
> Of such, thrice blest are they whom, ere mature
> Life generate woes which God alone can heal,
> His mercy calls to a loftier sphere than this—
> For the mind's conflicts are the worst of woes:
> And fathomless and fearful yawns the Abyss
> Of Darkness thenceforth under all who inherit
> That melancholy changeless hue of heart
> Which flings its pale gloom o'er the years of youth,
> Those most—or least—illumined by the spirit
> Of the eternal archetype of Truth.
> For such as those there is no peace within
> Either in action or in contemplation,
> From first to last—but even as they begin,
> They close the dim night of their tribulation;
> Worn by the torture of the untiring breast,
> Which, scorning all, and shunned of all, by turns,

> Upheld in solitary strength begot
> By its own unshared shroudedness of lot,
> Through years and years of crushed hopes, throbs and burns,
> And burns and throbs, and will not be at rest,
> Searching a desolate Earth for that it findeth not.'

Although the aloës of disappointment permeates this rhadsody, there is none of the misanthropy of the weary sensualist that cast a pall over Byron's melancholy spells, as mirrored in "Manfred." Hence when it is known that the intimacy between the elder Kenrick and Mangan was so close as to permit the one to learn German from the other, there could be no fear that any distrust in God was drunk in with the communion of ideas. Mangan was an enthusiastic student of German literature, and singularly well versed in the language. His "German Anthology" is a living proof of his genius in this regard, and his whole-souled sympathy with the spirit of German poesy.

Father Kenrick, as already stated, carried on his brother's business for the benefit of his widow, whose name was Jane. He did so until the year 1825 (two years before his own demise), and though there is no documentary or other authority for his reasons in resigning it then, we may be sure that the necessity for continuing it had quite ceased, for the business of scrivener was at that period, and for many years after, both profitable and reputable. Hence those who read the life of James Clarence Mangan will find it necessary to fortify themselves against the wayward and lymphatic poet's morbidness over this period of his career, lest they be led into doing a grave injustice to the memory of an exemplary and most conscientious priest. One would really think, from Mangan's tone, that he was little more than such a drudge as Dickens painted in drawing the character of Smike, toiling unconscionable hours in a dingy den for the most jejune pittance. He left a blood-curdling account of the moral tortures he underwent while earning his bread as a scrivener's apprentice and afterwards as an attorney's hack, but these are declared unreliable. The late Father Meehan, O. S. F., the eminent historian of "The Franciscans in Ireland," and kindred makers of ecclesiastical history, a personal friend of the poet's, questioned him on the subject, and concluded the story was based on self-deception or morbid fancy.

At the period when the two Kenricks began to receive their first impressions of the meaning of life the atmosphere was redolent of the spirit of heroism and sacrifice. At every Catholic fireside the tale of persecution and chivalric resistance was told with emotion and lingered over with pious delight. The daring of the priests in the crucial times when hunters like the Portuguese Jew, Garcia, made it a regular business to set and capture them by means of machinery resembling somewhat that of Pinkerton's agency of our own day, was the theme of many a fireside story. The Unitarian historian, John Mitchell, pays a tribute to the steadfast heroism of the priesthood, amid that storm of savagery, which brings it vividly before the mind's eye: "In truth," he says, "the ardent zeal and constancy, utterly unknown to fear, of the Irish Catholic priests during that whole century" (the eighteenth) "are as admirable in the eyes of all just and impartial men as they were abominable and monstrous in the eyes of the Protestant interest. They often had to traverse the sea between Ireland and France in fishing smacks, and disguised as fishermen, carrying communications to or from Rome, required by the laws of their Church, though they knew that on their return, if discovered, the penalty was the penalty of high treason—that is, death. When in Ireland, they had often to lurk in caves and make fatiguing journeys, never sure that the priest-hunters were not on their trail; yet all this they braved with a courage which, in any other cause, would have been reckless desperation. The English colonists could not comprehend such chivalrous devotion at all, and could devise no other theory to account for it than that these priests must be continually plotting with foreign Catholics to overthrow the Protestant interest and plunder them of their newly-gotten estates. This was the secret terror that always urged them to fresh atrocities."

Nor were the Muse's favors limited, in that unlikely old precinct of Dublin, to the eccentric children of genius, Swift and Mangan. Not very far off, in Aungier street, the more fortunate child of song, Thomas Moore, first saw the light a few years before the latter. The house in which Mangan came into the world almost faced Hoey's court, wherein Swift first drew breath. Probably not more than twenty or thirty yards' length separated the two. Moore's birthplace was a few hundred yards away. It was a grocery store, and so was the Mangans' place. But Moore's parents were prosperous, while the other poet's were the reverse. Moore got the best education that Trinity College could give, while his less fortunate but more gifted brother of the lyre was fain to be contented with whatever odd learning he could pick up outside the parish school.

Mangan's patriotism, if we may judge from his writings in the *Nation* and the impassioned spirit of some of his poems, was more sterling and deep-seated than that of the "curled darling" of the Irish aristocracy, Thomas Moore. The lines in which it found expression flowed from the soul of one who had nought to gain by the iambics which attuned an individual melancholy to a nation's threnody of bereavement. But it had no share in the formation of patriotism in the mind of Francis Patrick Kenrick, inasmuch as he never knew

Mangan personally. The times in which his youthful mind found expansion would be likely to infuse in him a spirit of defiance and revolt without any external stimulus. His infant ears may have been pierced with those sounds which filled O'Connell's heart with dread of a further appeal to physical resistance to the powers that were in Ireland. Born within bowshot of the Castle-keep of Dublin, the cries of the men tortured at the triangles in its courtyards must have fallen upon his undiscerning ear, and were he ever taken abroad by parent or nurse, his wondering eyes might have fastened with instinctive shuddering upon tthe phenomenon of a crimson tinge in the street gutters—the sickening token of slaughter in the public ways which impelled the Lord Lieutenant's wife to implore her husband to put a stop to the daily butchery of Irish patriots in Thomas street and the adjoining thoroughfares upon the defeat of the insurgents of '98. He was ten years old when the mad attempt of young Emmet was quenched in blood, and then, surely, he must have received a vivid impression of the meaning of English rule in his native land and the fate of those who dared to oppose it. His youthful ears must have drunk in the thrilling story of that daring enthusiast; he may have heard his voice thundering out its notes of defiance to Norbury in the courthouse across the river; perchance he was one of those who caught a glimpse of his bearing on the scaffold and saw the dogs lap his blood below after the executioner had got through his ghastly work. We cannot tell; yet we are free to surmise that such moving incidents had their effect, either from the actual beholding or the recital, upon the sympathetic spirit of the embryo patriot and churchman, from the intensity of his devotion to the cause of his country in his youthful days and his abhorrence of the cruel system which doomed her brightest and her best to ignominy in quiescence or torture and death if they dared to assert the spirit of freemen. All the environment was redolent of this spirit: futile resistance, imprescriptible oppression, were written upon the very stones of the streets and the fabrics which sprang up around. On the spikes of the Castle gates grinned the skulls of those whom the English called traitors then as in the days of Shane the Proud; the Birmingham Tower, close by, showed from whence the gallant boy-princes, O'Neill and O'Donnell, had sought release from English thraldom at the risk of their lives. Across the street, at Cork-hill, stood the house at which Lord Maguire and the leaders of the revolt of 1641 planned their abortive attack on the stronghold of British power in Ireland; a few hundred yards away, off Thomas street, was the building in which Emmet planned his assault and piled up his munitions of war; close by was the spot, opposite St. Catherine's Church, where he paid with his life the ransom of his bold attempt; a few yards further and the patriot came upon the house in which the gallant Geraldine, Lord Edward, was trapped by the red-coated hunters and fell like a soldier. The spirit of Swift and Molyneux and Lucas still hovered over the old Council Chamber on the brow of the Castle hill; the burning periods of Grattan thrilled the atmosphere beyond the walls of that legislative fabric soon to become a temple of the money-changers. The mute memorials of a defeated but unsubdued nationality were all around; and the air was vibrant with tokens of its returning life. Back lane, where the sturdy Catholic Committee had voiced its vitality so often, under the leadership of John Keogh, was within a stone's throw of the Kenrick home. The fearless Daniel O'Connell was speaking with a Stentor's voice in denunciation of the immeasurable wrong which at once stifled the religious liberty of his countrymen and their civil freedom.

Gloomy apprehensions had pictured the melancholy results which must follow the Act of Union: a lowering of the moral prestige of the nation must be accompanied with material losses to its arts, its industries and its commerce. More swiftly than had been anticipated these forebodings were borne out by the event. The withdrawal of the nobility and Parliamentary representatives to London had almost instantly brought ruin to many Dublin mercantile firms. That city had long been enriched by the almost constant presence of a rich and prodigal aristocracy, luxurious in its tastes and full of rivalry in display of equipage and retinue. At one blow all the arts and industries of which this proud society was the pillar were stricken down. The great mansions of the nobles, both in town and country, were shut up or devoted to sordid uses, while their owners drained the country of vast sums of money in the shape of rent, to be squandered in London or on the European Continent. Within a few years of the passage of the Union measure a very large proportion of the mercantile houses of the metropolis, which had been in prosperous circumstances while Parliament sat there, had filed petitions in bankruptcy. The public debt of the country had increased in inverse ratio to the falling-off in its resources. While it had stood at only a little over two million pounds before the Union, in four years' time after that event it had mounted up to the enormous total of more than fifty-four millions. Imports of manufactured articles from England began at the same time to drive those of Ireland out of the home market, by reason of their lower price, though inferior quality. Despite this decreasing exchequer, the screw of taxation succeeded in drawing greatly enhanced sums from the pockets of the people, so that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was enabled to make a cynical jest about the prosperity of the country as indicated by his increased receipts, while in the very same year he was obliged to bring in a bill for the relief of the people whom Pitt's policy had rendered homeless and penniless public burdens. Little wonder that the whole island was seething with discontent when it found itself thus cajoled, deceived and betrayed, or that the Ministry found itself unable to proceed without recurring again and again to the time-worn panacea for every Irish ill, a fresh Coercion Act.

All through these years of multiplying evils the religious difficulty grew more and more in tension and menace to the public peace. Far from finding relief from the United Parliament, as Pitt and Castlereagh had promised, the Irish Catholics found only an intensified persecution. That nefarious institution, the Orange Society, was encouraged openly in its war of aggression upon Ulster Catholics and obstruction of every concession sought for the general body by the liberal-minded few in Parliament. Arms were furnished the lodges from the governmental arsenals; agents of the Government were sent down from Dublin to organize lodges in districts where none had existed, and to excite animosity against the Catholic residents. These things are vouched for by the impartial Protestant historian, Mr. Plowden. When the Catholic Committee organized a movement for redress it was met by the odious device known as the Convention Act, a measure ostensibly directed against revolutionary purposes, but in reality intended to extinguish the constitutional rights of public meeting and free speech—in Ireland only—for no such procedure would be tolerated in any other part of the United Kingdom. This tyrannical instrument was invoked at the first moment that the Catholic agitation became troublesome; under its provisions the Catholic Committee was suppressed and two of its leading members—Dr. Sheridan and Mr. Kirwan—were prosecuted, tried before a packed jury, and, as a matter of course, condemned.

Now to every one of these occurrences the active mind of young Kenrick must have been painfully directed. They were the subject of discussion everywhere—by the family fireside, in the public mart, in the coffee houses, often in the pulpit. Is it matter for wonder that a young and ardent temperament like his should have been stirred to its depths by sympathy with the victims of so much wrong? More sluggish spirits had been stirred to action against it; finer natures like his quivered under its galling provocation.

If any outside student of historical development ever imagined that the relaxation of the more odious enforcement of the penal laws meant justice or leniency to the Catholic population, he labored under an egregious error. If priest-hunting had ceased, the practice of ostracism, public and private, reigned in unrestricted acerbity. But there was more than ostracism: there was no redress for injury for a Catholic against a non-Catholic. The statute of Kilkenny, which declared it no crime to kill one of "the Irishry," had been, it is true, repealed; but there was a law not less effective because not on the statute-book which forbade twelve men in a jury box from allowing a Papist the benefits of the British Constitution. The means by which this frustration of Magna Charta was secured is simplicity itself. It is the science of jury-packing. The Crown claims the right of unlimited challenge in all important trials; for the words, "Stand aside," at the calling of any particular juror's name it is not called upon to give any reason. On the other hand, the right of the accused to challenge is limited to a few without any reason assigned, and to a few more for cause shown—even in cases of high treason and treason-felony. That system flourishes in Ireland to the present day, although it was held up to the odium of the whole civilized world when it passed under the review of the three Law Lords of the British House of Peers in the famous appeal of Daniel O'Connell and his fellow-traversers against the Crown in the year 1844. Notwithstanding the solemn ruling of Lord Denman and his fellow peers, that O'Connell's conviction was illegal, because the system of trial by jury in Ireland, as illustrated in that particular case, was "a mockery, a delusion and a snare," that system still flourishes in all its pristine vigor, although it may not perhaps be so frequently called into requisition for Governmental purposes as it was in the days when Francis Patrick Kenrick began to observe the lurid phenomena of Irish politics. At the present time the evil is even more flagrant than it was in those days, because then no Catholic could possibly have a chance of serving on a jury, but now religion is no longer a bar against this class of citizen duty, and the odium of the "Stand aside" mandate, whenever it is heard in public court, is all the more reproachful to the shameless official who makes a bid for legal promotion or judicial position by resorting to it at the behest of the Government. Against this monstrous distortion of law the scathing invective of O'Connell was frequently heard clamoring in the early days of the past century. Political trials were frequent, and murder according to legal forms was perpetrated at almost every assize. It was a period when the power of the press was beginning to make itself felt. It was the day especially of pamphleteering. Ireland had been long conspicuous for successful resort to the pamphlet. Molyneux, Lucas and Swift—especially Swift—had had resort to this political weapon with deadly effect. While young Kenrick was in the chrysalis state of his intellect, between boyhood and adolescence, some memorable pamphlets were circulated, and some memorable trials sprang out of their diffusion. One of these pamphlets had its origin in the trial and execution of a farmer named Barry on a trumped-up charge by a flagrantly packed jury. It was published by the well-known printer and bookseller, Hugh Fitzpatrick, of Capel street, Dublin; and the kernel of the offense charged was that it gave, besides the evidence establishing the complete innocence of the murdered man, a summary of the despotic laws under which the Irish Catholics groaned. The prosecutor in this case, as well as in a still more exciting one, that of the Crown *v.* Magee, an action for libel by the Lord Lieutenant, the Duke of Richmond, against the proprietor of the *Evening Post,* was Saurin, descendant of a French Huguenot refugee—an extremely rancorous partisan and Government hack. O'Connell defended both men, but he never hoped for a successful defense. Both were convicted and paid a monstrously heavy penalty in fine and imprisonment. But he took such a course as fastened the eyes of the world on the iniquity of the system under which his clients were victimized. He assailed the Attorney-General, the presiding Lord Chief Justice and the system of jury-packing with a boldness that stupefied every listener. He defied the jury to render a just verdict: they must be false to their oaths as Orangemen and false to their party if they elected to be true to the oaths they had taken as jurors to try the case without "fear, favor or affection." Thousands listened spellbound to his daring philippic; the crowd outside the Four Courts passed the lacerating sentences along as they fell from the intrepid orator's lips to the vaster crowds outside, and they were sped on the wings of the wind over the whole city ere they found their way into the press.

O'Connell's voice was the only agency in those days by means of which the national spirit was kept alive. That dark and melancholy epoch, depicted by Curran as the time when "Ireland, like a bastinadoed elephant, knelt at the feet of its rider," presented all the tokens of national death. The rebellion had been drowned in the blood of the people, and hope had fled with life.

Perhaps some clue to the aversion with which Francis Patrick Kenrick regarded O'Connell is to be found in the change which occurred in the latter's views on the subject of a salaried Irish clergy later on. This change estranged a good many of those who had formerly supported the Liberator with voice and purse. Among others it aroused in the formidable "J. K. L." the warmth of righteous anger, as will be seen by this extract from a speech delivered by him at a meeting in Carlow in the year 1825: "What my opinion was I declared in London to my right reverend brethren; I repeated it since in Dublin: that if the prelates were led to approve of a provision emanating from the Treasury—if the ministers of Christ were to be paid by the ministers of State for dispensing the mysteries of God—then in that case I would not create dissension among them; but sooner than that my hand should be soiled by it, I would lay down my office at the feet of him who conferred it, for if my hand were to be stained with Government money it should never grasp a crozier, or a mitre ever afterwards be fitted to my brow. This was, and is, my fixed determination."

In Dr. Clarke's sketch of Francis Patrick Kenrick it is set forth that he learned his lifelong lesson of firmness in upholding the liberty of the Church, together with the virtue of meekness in suffering, from the example of the Sovereign Pontiff, Pius VII. Released from a long captivity in France by the event of Waterloo, that illustrious Pope had returned to Rome about the time when young Kenrick was commencing his clerical studies, and there was joy throughout the whole Catholic world, combined with pride in the heroism with which he had resisted every effort of Bonaparte's to bend the Papacy to his worldly ambition. But in Ireland this feeling was tempered with disappointment that a similar firmness had not been shown with regard to a design by no means less nefarious on the part of the British Government to gain the Papal consent to a legislative measure by means of which the British Crown would acquire the determining voice in the election of Catholic bishops, by the exercise of the veto. While the Pope was a prisoner in Bonaparte's hands his Pontifical authority was delegated, for certain purposes, to Monsignor Quarantotti; and it was for Ireland a most unfortunate circumstance that such was the case, inasmuch as the views of Catholic Ireland and those of the Delegate were on matters of high policy diametrically opposite. The Sovereign Pontiff was in ignorance of the real state of opinion on the matter, so that when he emerged from durance he was easily led by the artful whisperings of English Catholic emissaries despatched by the Government to lend some sanction to what had already been done by Monsignor Quarantotti. It would be difficult to conceive of any course more likely to be exasperating to a people who had fought for the faith so tenaciously as the Irish did, than that proposed by this weak and pliable Monsignor. His language, no less than his action, was obsequious and humiliating. In the Rescript announcing the dishonorable proposal he surrendered everything for which the Papacy, during many centuries, had successfully battled with the English Crown. He said, amongst other things: "It is better, indeed, that the prelates of our Church should be acceptable to the King, in order that they may exercise their ministry with his full concurrence, and also that there may be no doubts of their integrity, even with those who are not in the bosom of the Church. For 'it behoveth a bishop' (as the Apostle teaches, I. Tim. iii., 7) 'even to have a good witness from those who are not of the Church.' Upon these principles we, in virtue of the authority intrusted to us, grant permission that those who are elected to and proposed for bishoprics and deaneries by the clergy may be admitted or rejected by the King, according to the law proposed. . . . If the candidates be rejected, others shall be proposed who may be acceptable to the King; but if approved of, the Metropolitan or Vicar-Apostolic, as above, shall send the documents to the Sacred Congregation here, the members whereof, having duly weighed the merits of each, shall take measures for the obtainment of canonical institution from His Holiness. . . . Another duty is assigned to the board . . . that they are charged to inspect all letters written by the ecclesiastical power to any of the British clergy, and examine carefully whether they contain anything which may be injurious to the Government, or anywise disturb the public tranquility. Inasmuch as communication on ecclesiastical or spiritual affairs with the Head of the Church is not forbidden, and as the inspection of the board relates to political subjects only, this also must be submitted to. It is right that the Government should not have cause to entertain any suspicion with regard to the communication between us. . . . Those matters only are to be kept under the seal of silence which pertain to the jurisdiction of conscience within us. . . . We are perfectly convinced that so wise a Government as that of Great Britain, while it studies to provide for the public security, does not on that account wish to compel the Catholics to desert their religion, but would rather be pleased that they should be careful observers of it. For our holy and truly divine religion is most favorable to public authority, is the best support of thrones and the most powerful teacher both of loyalty and patriotism."

This was a project which the Irish people at large stigmatized as an attempt to make a bishop a surpliced dragoon and a priest a policeman in the confession box. In the long course of the country's connection with Rome nothing ever occurred that went so dangerously near imperilling the stability of the tie. The Irish bishops and clergy, almost to a man, declared their hostility to it. The hierarchy held a meeting, put their sentiments on the subject on paper, in the shape of a strongly worded remonstrance, and despatched it, by the hands of Dr. Murray, coadjutor to the Archbishop of Dublin, to lay it at the feet of the Holy Father. But the protest was disregarded, for the English faction at Rome was then powerful, and the Pope had not had sufficient opportunity, since his liberation, to look into the true merits and significance of the question. Dr. Murray (afterwards a warm friend of young Kenrick's) returned to Dublin with his tidings of evil, and the assembled prelates having heard the message, again formulated their solemn warning, this time in stronger phraseology still. They said:

"Though we sincerely venerate the venerable Pontiff as visible head of the Church, we do not conceive that our apprehensions ought to be removed by any determination of His Holiness adopted, or intended to be adopted, not only without our concurrence, but in direct opposition to our repeated resolutions and the very energetic memorial presented on our behalf, and so ably supported by our deputy, the Very Rev. Dr. Murray, who in that quality was more competent to inform His Holiness of the real state and interest of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland than any other with whom he is said to have consulted."

This outspoken resolution was signed by every one of the bishops, and Dr. Murray was again despatched to Rome, this time accompanied by Dr. Moylan, of Cork. Meantime a vehement agitation against the veto burst out all over the country, led at first by Daniel O'Connell and afterwards by the fearless "J. K. L."—the Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, Right Rev. Dr. Doyle. The opponents of the veto triumphed in the end, but not without a long struggle. We may be confident that young Kenrick was fully alive to all that was going on around him at this dangerous crisis; and if he chose Pope Pius VII. as his model of constancy in after life, it would be unreasonable to think that over this particular episode he took it as a safe or judicious example in dealing with questions into which he had not had the advantage of personally informing himself.

Justice demands, ere this episode be dismissed, that Monsignor Quarantotti should be held blameless as to the birth of the veto idea. Both in Mr. Plowden's History and the Rev. Father Brennan's "Ecclesiastical History of Ireland" the blame is laid at the door of the English Prime Minister, William Pitt. Lord Castlereagh was made the medium of the negotiation. In the year 1799 ten of the Irish bishops, constituting the Board of Maynooth College, held an official meeting in Dublin to consider a proposal from the Government of a State endowment to all the Catholic bishops, the *quid pro quo* to be acceptance of the veto rule. Besides this tempting offer, Lord Castlereagh, according to Father Brennan, gave solemn assurances that the acceptance of the Government's proposals would immediately secure a measure of emancipation for the Catholic population, and on the decision the fate of that great national question depended. "Thus beset," says Father Brennan, "by the proffers of the Minister on the one hand and by the alarming posture of the country on the other, the bishops already alluded to agreed 'that in the appointment of Roman Catholic prelates to vacant sees within the Kingdom such interference of Government as may enable it to be satisfied of the loyalty of the person appointed is just, and ought to be agreed to.' This statement was accompanied with an admission 'that a provision, through Government, for the Roman Catholic clergy of this Kingdom, competent and secured, ought to be thankfully accepted.'" Dr. Troy, Archbishop of Dublin, was one of those who agreed to this resolution, also the Primate, Dr. O'Reilly, of Armagh, as well as Dr. Moylan, of Cork. The transaction was kept secret for eleven years, and before the disclosure was made several of the prelates who signed the resolution had put their hands to another declaring it to be inexpedient to introduce any alteration in the canonical mode previously observed in the nomination of the Irish Catholic bishops.

It is easy, therefore, to believe that Monsignor Quarantotti had been led into a mistake about the disposition of the Irish bishops on the one hand regarding the proposed veto, and of the Government on the other regarding the question of Catholic emancipation. The eminent Dr. Milner was quoted in Parliament as having sanctioned the offer of the veto, but he published a letter stating that he had no authority to sanction such an offer. It remains still unexplained from what quarter emanated the idea that such a proposal might find acceptance at the hands of the Irish hierarchy—possibly one of the numerous secret agents of William Pitt.

Looking back at this whole veto incident, pregnant as it was with evil potentialities to the whole Church, not merely in Ireland, but throughout the world at large, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that its origin is to be traced to a design to rend the Church by schism, and so destroy it, rather than to a political motive. Such a suspicion did it certainly generate in the quick and penetrating mind of Edmund Burke. That great thinker, who had never faltered in effort for the emancipation of the Catholics, thus masterfully portrayed the fallacies of the idea and the mischief it was likely to develop in case it were carried into effect, in his public "Letter to a Peer:" "Never were the members of one religious sect fit to appoint pastors to another. Those who have no regard for their welfare, reputation, or internal quiet will not appoint such as are proper. The Seraglio of Constantinople is as equitable as we are, and where their own sect is concerned, fully as religious; but the sport which they make of the miserable dignities of the Greek Church, the factions of the Harem, to which they make them subservient, the continual sale to which they expose and re-expose the same dignity, and by which they squeeze all the inferior orders of the clergy, is nearly equal to all the other oppressions together exercised by Mussulmen over the unhappy members of the Oriental Church. It is a great deal to suppose that the present Castle would nominate bishops for the Roman Church of Ireland with a religious regard for its welfare. Perhaps they cannot, perhaps they dare not do it." To Dr. Hussey, Bishop of Waterford, Burke also wrote: "I am sure that the constant meddling of your bishops and clergy with the Castle, and the Castle with them, will infallibly set them ill with their own body. All the weight which the clergy have hitherto had to keep the people quiet will be wholly lost if this once should happen. At best you will have *a masked schism, and more than one kind, and I am greatly mistaken if this is not intended, and diligently and systematically pursued.*"

It is little wonder that clear-seeing Catholics should have opposed the veto proposition, when fair-minded Protestants like Burke saw in it so frightful a menace to the Church and society. Among the most strenuous and uncompromising opponents of the proposition was Bishop England. The warmth of the relations between this distinguished prelate and young Kenrick warrants the assumption that amongst the views which were held in common between them were those regarding the veto and its mischiefs. In the vigorous attitude assumed by Bishop Kenrick in regard to the trustee trouble in the Philadelphia Diocese we can discern his sentiments regarding the idea of lay control, whether by the State or the individual, over ecclesiastical interests and action. In the trustee system he encountered the veto practically in action, only under another name. This was how Bishop Hughes regarded it, as we may learn from the text of his vigorous denunciations of the abuse of the system, and the measures he took to neutralize the evil. The Bishop saw no outcome but heresy and schism if the trustee system were not checked or modified. It differed from the veto, therefore, only in design; its operation was precisely that which Burke anticipated in the passage above italicized.

All through his life love of his native land was a marked characteristic of Dr. Kenrick. Patriotism in him was inseparable from faith and virtue; it could have, indeed, no real existence without the one or the other. In the priest patriotism differs from the estimate of it formed by the layman, in very many cases. Though it be a shining virtue, its brilliancy is derived from the supernal light of faith and the constant communion with God which is the exalted privilege of the priest. In the performance of his sacred duty, in whatsoever region of the globe his lot may be cast, he perceives the first and most imperative service he is called upon to render on earth; and it is in the fulfilment of that grateful office that he finds the solace and satisfaction which soften the asperity of prolonged exile and severance of all the ties that make home and fatherland so cherished of all other men. Whithersoever God calls is the true priest's land; and it is this fact which explains the phenomena so often witnessed of a dual loyalty in operation among the Catholic priesthood in the United States—an enthusiastic devotion to the flag and the Constitution of their adopted country, and an undying interest in the fortunes and interests of the land of their nativity. Hence in the exercise of his sacred office, either as priest or bishop, Francis Patrick Kenrick saw no lines of nationality or ethnology. All men were alike to him—brethren in Christ. Many races marched under the banners of the Crusaders, but they forgot not their own particular nationality. The charity of the priest must be larger still. He recognizes no foes, even among those against whom he is bound to fight. Mahometan and Buddhist alike appeal to his humanity and his charity, as well as fellow-Christian.

All those who were brought into close contact with Francis Patrick Kenrick, either as priest or as prelate, were profoundly struck by one great distinguishing characteristic. It is one that may be described as *sui generis*. Unquestioning faith is the inherent attribute of the Irish race, as a general rule. This faith takes the form of a childlike trust in God as well as a profound reverence for the truths of God and the things of His ministry. That faith was possessed by this typical Irishman in a pre-eminent degree. It shone translucently in his every act of life. There never lived a man who more implicitly trusted in God, placed his fate in His divine hands, or sought His guidance in the important things of life, than he. This sublime confidence was reflected in the cheerful glance of his eye, the turn of his speech, the kindly intonation of his voice. Every step he took in the planting and development of Church and seminary was marked by a sense of confidence begotten of the consciousness of support from on high. God had been called upon to light his human way, and God had not failed to answer in His own mysterious way. He needed all the strength derivable from such a sustaining source, for trials lay before him, and tasks were set for his hands to accomplish as great, perhaps, as had fallen to the lot of any individual priest or prelate since the early days of the Church.

This perfection of Christian faith was not a plant of slow growth in the case of either of the Kenricks. It was a family heritage. It manifested itself in the early instruction of the two children by their devout parents and in the responsive acceptance by their youthful minds of the truths of religion as naturally as the blessing of the sunshine and the balmy airs of heaven. That most beautiful attribute when seen in early boyhood, an ardent and unaffected piety and a natural inclination toward the things of God and His Church, exhibited itself in both cases in a singular degree—so much so, indeed, that both were enrolled in a purgatorian sodality almost from infancy, and so little difference existed between their respective conceptions of their duty and responsibility as members of this spiritual band, although a nine years' interval separated their ages, that when Francis Patrick relinquished his place in the sodality on leaving for Rome, his brother was, notwithstanding his extreme youth, promoted to the vacant place. At this time they were respectively only eighteen and nine years of age! Boys rarely develop devotion so deep in very early years. They may be exemplary and attentive to what they are taught as articles of faith, but as a rule their minds are not deeply impressed with the profounder mysteries of the communion of saints, nor is the symmetry of the whole sublime edifice of salvation perceptible to the mind's eye as in a maturer period. It may be accepted as a certain token of the higher destiny when the tender mind of youth is thus illuminated by the rays of a faith which in other minds demands cultivation and a rationalizing process for the thorough comprehension of its logical basis. Only those familiar with Irish ideals can imagine with what joy the parents of children so blessed observe the symptoms of a religious vocation as they are thus gradually unfolded; and especially keen must be the delight and gratitude when such symptoms are not confined to one member of the family. To have given children to God is indeed the crowning delight of an Irish mother and the highest blessing that could be brought to any household, high or low.

This simple, abiding, absolute faith exists nowhere stronger than in Ireland. It has a royal virtue in it—like the glorious sun, which shines not for itself alone, but sheds its blessings over a whole mighty system. The faith of the Irish has made faith in many others, by merely beholding the sincerity and completeness of it. Subtle and magical must its influence be when it could make a mind like Montalembert's turn from its paths of cynical unbelief and confess the beauty and the power of a loving reliance on God. No agency was more decisive in bringing about Newman's conversion than the effect of Catholic faith on the people who professed it. How deeply he must have been impressed with the continuous, all-environing proofs of that faith which he saw while he sojourned in Ireland! If ever a scintilla of lingering doubt floated back on the waves of introspection, the entire abandonment of self in the worship of God which came under his eyes daily during his residence in the Green Isle must have annihilated it.

In his Apologia (part vii.) he says: "People say that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is difficult to believe; I did not believe the doctrine till I was a Catholic. I had no difficulty in believing it as soon as I believed that the Catholic Roman Church was the oracle of God, and that she had declared this doctrine to be part of the original revelation. It is difficult, impossible to imagine, I grant—but how is it difficult to believe? Yet Macaulay thought it so difficult to believe that he had need of a believer in it of talents as eminent as Sir Thomas More before he could bring himself to conceive that the Catholics of an enlightened age could resist 'the overwhelming force of the argument against it.' 'Sir Thomas More,' he says, 'is one of the choice specimens of wisdom and virtue; and the doctrine of Transubstantiation is a kind of proof charge. A faith which stands that test will stand any test.' But for myself, I cannot indeed prove it, I cannot tell *how* it is; but I say, 'Why should it not be? What's to hinder it? What do I know of substance or matter? Just as much as the greatest philosophers, and that is nothing at all.' "

The Irish imagination certainly is equal to the requirement deemed impossible by this great divine, although it might be impossible to narrow down the conception or the idea to the terms of a proposition or a formula. Had Newman been an Irishman he need not have penned the confession of such an inability.

Another denotement of vocation of the two Kenricks was the faculty of receptivity. In the acquirement of knowledge and the desire of learning all things necessary for the life of the priest Francis Patrick Kenrick early displayed an aptitude and an earnestness which singled him out among his schoolmates.

He was only eighteen when he received the glad news that he was one of those selected to go to Rome to study at the far-famed Propaganda College. Fired with the prospect of drinking in learning at the fountain-head, of studying amidst the tombs of the Apostles, of imbibing from the wisdom of all nations and ages stored in the great libraries of the Church, of treading the ground sanctified by the footsteps of the martyrs and confessors of the early days, he started full of the noblest ambitions and enthusiasms. He came in the days in which the Church was jubilant with the awakening from the long nightmare of French persecution. Pius the Seventh had been restored to his long-bereaved people and capital, and the breath of freedom once more blew over Rome. The gentle bearing of the much-tried Pontiff made an indelible impression on the mind of the young Levite. The meekness and humility of the Divine Master were reflected in the spirit in which His Vicegerent had met persecution, and the constancy of the martyrs in the front he had shown to all the overtures of Bonaparte to lower the Church to the status of a dependent portion of his civil system. These two lessons sank into the heart of the young student. They gave him those ideals of conduct which in after-life were to exercise so powerful an influence on his own career and the fortunes of the then infant Church in the New World.

The years of study at the Propaganda for young Kenrick were the span of Jacob's first service to Laban. In that span he had made himself famous. He had won renown as a scholar; he had gained a reputation for sanctity never surpassed by any student. Tried in the crucible for the sacred ministry, his assay had been made and the purity of the metal demonstrated. But he was seen to be the possessor of more than learning and sanctity: the discerning eye of Rome had noted in him those qualities which make leaders in the Church, the mind to conceive, the genius to plan, the patience to endure, and the charity to conquer. These were precisely the qualities that were needed in the new spheres where the prospects for the Church were beginning to unfold themselves before the eyes of her holy ambition. There came, at that moment, a call for help from the new field. Bishop Flaget, of Kentucky, was in sore need of some help in his mission, especially in the department of theology in his newly-established seminary. Father Kenrick had passed brilliantly in this branch. Though he had gained high honors in the department of science, his courses in sacred literature, especially theology, had been uncommonly distinguished; he was an exceptionally successful competitor, indeed, in every branch of clerical study—philosophy, literature, languages, science—and to these gifts of intellect he added the advantages of acumen, resolution, ready wit and that unfailing cheerfulness of disposition which is the characteristic of the mind whose whole trust is in God and is prepared to do whatever it recognizes as the Divine will at all times and under all temporal conditions. There is in the texture of the Irish mind a peculiar fitness for the study and mastery of theology and scholastic philosophy. A proof that it is not only capable of mastering the principles of analysis, but of the synthetical art as well, is afforded in the case of the famous doctor, Scotus Erigena, whose scheme was so grand and daring as to elicit from Dr. Erdmann, of Halle, a comparison between the brilliant Irishman and the Emperor Charlemagne: both created mighty empires doomed to perish with their own lives. Though it remained for the Angelic Doctor to blend harmoniously the principles of mediæval philosophy with the truths of the ancient school, the Irish doctor had grasped the idea not less boldly, though he failed to work it out on terms acceptable to Christian scholasticism. The Celtic spirit is indeed by nature attuned to the inaudible and intangible pulsations of the realm of fancy and metaphysical suggestion; though in speaking of the illustration afforded by Scotus Erigena it cannot be forgotten that he is an example rather of the Celtic intellect carried to excess in the genius for subtlety than of the ultimate luminousness and grasp of the elusive and cryptic truth which makes the true theologian emerge from the struggling philosopher, like the butterfly from the chrysalis.

A blending of this genius for refinement in analysis with the power to arrange the tangled ends of argument in a symmetrical pattern, appears in the unfolding of Father Kenrick's mind. At the same time it is clear that this intellectual facility was incapable of forcing mentality into channels of mere abstraction, being counterbalanced by those more active practical elements which distinguish the man of affairs from the man of philosophic speculation. The usual landmarks of nature in human character, separating men into groups and assigning each his proper function in the great plan of life and thought, were absent in his case. His was a curious combination of the abstract and the real. The spiritual insight of the Irish mind blended in him with the instinctive capacity for the utilization of means which is claimed as an ear-mark of the less dreamy Anglo-Saxon stock.

The secret of this seems to be that to Francis Patrick Kenrick was given the identical gifts which made Patrick and Columba and Columbanus the great moulders of early Western civilization. They were, by Divine decree, possessors of the dual intellect. They were not only expounders, but creators, so to speak. It was not merely theirs to make desert places bloom as gardens, but they possessed the art of the gardener and the builder of the greenhouse as well. Such wonderful duality was especially needed for the mighty work opening up before the Church on the new continent; and those who follow the career of the two Kenricks cannot avoid the conviction that the development of the Church under their guidance, in their respective spheres of activity, was the manifestation of a principle too high for the flight of human reason.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

ANGLO-SAXONISM AND CATHOLIC PROGRESS.

WE have seen, during the last couple of years, a curious attempt of politicians to unite this Republic with the British Empire in an alliance against the rest of the world. The base of this union, which is to undo the work of the American Revolution to a large extent, is the supposed community of Anglo-Saxon race and institutions between England and America. In fact, the term "Anglo-Saxon," untruthful as it is historically, has been brought into common use mainly for this purpose. The familiar "Briton" and "British" was good enough to satisfy English ears when their superiority over other nations was to be expressed. As it could hardly be expected that Americans could be drawn warmly to singing "Rule Britannia." or echoing "Britons never will be slaves," the expression Anglo-Saxon has come into favor in England and among admirers of English ways in our own land. As a matter of fact the Anglo-Saxons are but a fraction of the English people itself, and a fraction, too, which had less than almost any other in forming its institutions and character. The Norman Frenchmen founded the English Constitution and parliamentary institutions. Magna Charta owes its origin to the Norman Cardinal Langton and the French De Montforet. Since the eleventh century the rulers of England have been of almost every race but Anglo-Saxon. There have been Norman French and Angevin French, Welsh, Scotch and German Kings in England during the last eight hundred years, but no Anglo-Saxon. The expression itself was practically unknown fifty years ago. British superiority over foreigners in everything was the national faith of the English people until the growth of the United States forced attention on even the British mind. The vague Anglo-Saxon has since gradually displaced the traditional Briton in English Jingo language, but the meaning attached to both words is still the same in England.

What is stranger, a certain class among English Catholics are trying to bring the Anglo-Saxon myth, in a new form, within the pale of the Church. As the United States is invited to an "Anglo-Saxon" federation with England against the world, so a knot of Catholics in England is trying to set up a special alliance in religious interests between the Catholics of England and America. There is a distinct suggestion that their Catholicity is of a different type from that of other Catholic nations, and especially from what are called, in the true spirit of British insularity, the Latin races. The attempt to describe the Catholic Church as merely the Latin

Communion has been a favorite device with English Protestantism since the days of Charles I. and Laud. It is significant to find a strong echo of it to-day among Englishmen professing themselves Catholics. The Catholic Press of London furnishes numerous illustrations. The *New Era* confidently assures its readers that "the broad fact has to be faced that the Latin races have done their work, and the progress of the world, in the future, depends on the Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic races." The *Register*, commenting on the recent question of teaching Latin in the schools of the American Christian Brothers, lays down as an axiom that "the Latin mind will never understand the Anglo-Saxon." It further decides that "the highest tribunals of the Church in Rome proceed in a manner which no other courts in the world would consider tolerable." With genuine British inconsistency it admits that the Roman Judges in question are "absolutely free from any suspicion of wrong-doing or conscious unfairness," and that "the Roman bureaucracy is, in fact, a marvel of intellectual ability and moral rectitude," and then goes on to dwell on the importance of its ways of action being changed on British lines of procedure. One is reminded of the English housemaid who condemned the blue uniforms of the German infantry because "as every one in England knows blue is only proper for sailors and artillerymen."

Dislike of and an ignorant contempt for the Catholic nations of Europe, especially the French, has been a marked feature in the popular temper of Englishmen since the days of Cromwell. "I hate the French because they are all slaves and wear wooden shoes," is the expression of it which the novelist Sterne, in the last century, puts in the mouth of a crippled sailor begging his bread from charity and appealing to popular feeling. The cripple's further illustration of the liberties enjoyed by Englishmen at the time: "I was knocked down one night by a press gang, who then bade me stand up and serve His Majesty in the fleet," is significant. It is curious to find a similar spirit find utterance in the Catholic London *Register*. When a proposition was made a few months ago to bring some Benedictine monks from the Abbey of Solesmes to form a choir in the Westminster Cathedral, the editor loftily asked Cardinal Vaughan if "he did not know how the reputation of French Catholics stood in England," and wound up his remarks by declaring "it will be still more galling to know that the Cathedral is a standing reminder of the connection of Catholics with the Dreyfus case."

The attitude of a large body of English Catholics towards their French fellow-Catholics during the Dreyfus case is a striking example of the self-conceit and readiness to misjudge other nations which is so characteristically English. It reminded Irishmen forcibly of the language of the *Times* and other English papers during the Parnell trial and the Land League agitation. The new feature was the attempt to give it a character of Catholic zeal instead of English bigotry. A little knot of English Catholics are even said to have forwarded a memorial to the Sovereign Pontiff calling his attention to the action of some Hungarian Catholics, including Bishops, on an anti-Semitic question, and gravely pointed out to Leo XIII. that his predecessors had frequently interfered to protect Jews against persecution, and that they did not see why he should not do the same in Hungary!!!

The recent writings of the late Professor Mivart are a still stronger instance of the lengths to which Anglo-Saxon nationalism can lead professing Catholics. In the *Nineteenth Century* he declared seriously: "The Curia, *i. e.*, the Papal Administration, has learned nothing of the real conditions of mankind beyond its own surroundings. It has learned nothing of that dominant factor in the world, *our own race*. It has no glimmerings of the truth that the English-speaking peoples have thrown off despotism of whatever kind, and will never submit to the centralized tyranny which is the Curialists' only notion of government."

We have been long familiar with language of this kind in the English Protestant Press, but it is new to find a Catholic describing the administration of Leo XIII. and Pius IX. as a centralized tyranny. Equally remarkable is it to find the writer claiming the body of "English-speaking Catholics throughout the world" as his own race and assuming to act as spokesman for them all. The Catholics of Irish race certainly have no desire to see English methods of law and justice such as they are only too familiar with substituted for the methods of administration established by the wisdom of centuries and of countless saints in the highest tribunals of the Catholic Church.

Professor Mivart's utterances may be regarded as the eccentricities of an individual, but examples are not lacking to show that the desire to change the methods of government and religious action of the Church to English ideals is not confined to him. The London *New Era* recently announced that "unless the Church is to continue to be tied to moribund nations she must make progress in England, America and the British colonies." To assume that the whole Catholic world, outside the Anglo-Saxon sphere of influence, is moribund is a flight of self-conceit that would be natural on the platform of a Protestant missionary society, but that sounds like lunacy to the ears of a Catholic. To describe the two hundred and more millions of Catholics outside the pale of the English language—Italians, Frenchmen, Germans, Hungarians, Poles, Spaniards, Portuguese, Flemish and Slavonian—as all moribund is a stretch of calm ignorance that can only be possible in the incomprehensible "Anglo-Saxon mind" which Rome is incapable of understanding, as is plaintively bewailed. It need not surprise us, then, to be told further that "humanly speaking the only field for the spread of the Church, at the present moment, would seem to be the English-speaking countries." The Divine commission to "teach all nations" is apparently forgotten by the writer.

But if the Church's mission is to be restricted to the English-speaking countries another power is introduced into the missionary field by journalistic authority.

"It is true," says the same paper, "the British Empire is predominantly Protestant. It is equally true that it makes for peace, for liberty, for law and order and for social and intellectual progress. A great and sacred trust has been committed by God to the British Empire, and the spread of that Empire is preparing the way for the spread of Christianity and a new era of Catholicity."

The assured confidence in the Divine nature of the trust committed to the rulers of Great Britain, and that its spread as an Empire is a first step towards the conversion of the world are typical of English Protestant ideas. It raises serious thought to find such utterances put forth as Catholic thought. One cannot help recalling that the people of England fell away from the Faith during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by following the principle of nationality before religion. The growth of a similar spirit to-day would give little prospect of the spread of Christianity. As a matter of fact, up to the present time the growth of the British Empire has done nothing for the conversion of the non-Christian lands that have fallen under its power. Since England's separation from the Church some twenty-five or thirty millions of pagans in various lands—Japanese, Chinese, Hindoos, Malays and American natives—have been brought to Christianity by the missioners of Spain, France, Italy and other Catholic countries. The French Society of Foreign Missions to-day keeps a population of a million and a quarter of Asiatic and African converts in the practice of Catholic life. There is scarcely a fiftieth of that number receiving instruction from English Catholic missioners; and the Protestant converts throughout the British Empire do not reckon a third of the converts of the French missioners alone. Where any indication of the likelihood of the spread of the Empire leading to a new era of Catholicity can be found passes our comprehension.

That the work, in a religious point, of the English Government and policy, from the days of Henry VIII. to those of George III., has been to take the people of England out of the Catholic Church is an undisputed historical fact. That the national spirit of the English people during the greater part of that time has been distinctively and specially hostile to Catholicity is another fact. Elizabeth begged the Turkish Sultan in 1587 to send his galleys "against that idolator, the King of Spain," and assured him if he did so that "the proud Spaniard and the lying Pope will be struck down and God will protect His own and punish the idolators of the earth by the arms of England and Turkey." The Minister of Queen Victoria, at the time of the massacres of the Syrian Catholics, in 1860, declared that the safety of the Turkish power was a greater object to Her Majesty's Government than the protection of the lives of Christians. It is hard to find in such a system any preparation for the spread of the Faith or any warrant for the supposition that the Anglo-Saxon race is divinely chosen to advance Catholicity. It will throw light on this subject if we examine what is the actual number of Catholics of English race among the twenty or thirty millions of Catholics in the British Empire and the United States at the present moment, and to what extent those Anglo-Saxon Catholics are promoting the growth of a new era of Catholicity. We shall find that the English-speaking Catholics are emphatically as little Anglo-Saxon as are the Catholics of France or Spain, either in origin, sympathies or religious thought.

The last census estimated the Catholics of this country at somewhat less than ten millions. We believe this to be an underestimate, but it can be used as a basis to determine the number of Anglo-Saxons in the Catholic body here. The census of Ireland gave a population, which is certainly not Anglo-Saxon, of three and a half millions of Catholics. The Canadian returns showed about two million Catholics in less than five of a total population. Of these two millions nearly a million and a half were classed as French in language, the other half million Celtic Irish and Celtic Scotch. It is not easy to know whether the French Canadians or the French Catholics of the Mauritius and part of the English West Indies are included in the "English-speaking" Catholics by the champions of Anglo-Saxonism as a force in the Church.

A similar question needs to be answered with regard to the twelve hundred thousand Hindoo and Ceylonese Catholics in the Indian Empire and the two hundred thousand Maltese, not to speak of such Catholics of the Uganda Mission as escaped butchery a few years ago at the hands of Captain Lugard and his Maxim guns while building up the British Empire there. Whether people who do not use the English language can be classed as English-speaking Catholics seems at least doubtful.

The Australian colonies and New Zealand have a Catholic population of about a million, somewhat under twenty-five per cent. of the total. In South Africa fifty or sixty thousand is the highest estimate of the Catholics of European race, and a still smaller number in British Guiana. The whole Catholic population then of the British colonies is about five and a half millions, or about two-thirds of the number of Malay Catholics in the Philippines. The Anglo-Saxon element, or the body which either in race or sympathies is connected with English ideas, does not amount to one hundredth part of these five and a half millions.

In Great Britain, unlike other countries of Europe, no census returns have been made of the religions of the population. In Scotland reports which give evidence of accuracy have been prepared by the Archbishops. They give four hundred and twenty thousand Catholics in a total of four millions, or about a tenth. A considerable part, a fourth, or perhaps a third, is made up of Gaelic-speaking Highlanders who retained their Catholicity during the centuries of persecution that followed the overthrow of the Government of Queen Mary. The rest are all but exclusively Irish. There is a close bond of national feeling between the Irish and the Scotch Gaelic Catholics, but none whatever between either and the Anglo-Saxons, or, as the name is usually written in Scotland, Sassenachs.

In England itself the Catholic Directory estimates the whole Catholic population at a million and a half, or six per cent. The proportion is noticeably smaller than even in Scotland. Of that million and a half at least a million are Irish by birth or parentage, and residence in England has developed no Anglo-Saxon sympathies amongst either class. The number of Catholics of English race who kept the Faith through the Penal Laws was less than one hundred thousand at the end of George III.'s reign. If it has doubled since that is the largest estimate that can be made to-day of old English Catholics. The Oxford movement has added probably two hundred thousand members to the Church during the reign of Victoria. The total of Catholics who, in any sense, may be called Anglo-Saxons, who either in race, sympathies or thought are in any sense English, cannot be counted at over half a million among the two hundred and fifty million Catholics of the world or the eleven millions in the Empire. If we wish to use the term "English-speaking" to describe those eleven millions we should add "not English race" as a matter of accurate expression.

The only settlement of Catholics of English race in the territory now comprised in the United States was Lord Calvert's colony of Maryland. It numbered about four hundred families, a large part of whom, however, were Irish, not English. In every other English colony the first Catholic population was exclusively Irish. It was so in Pennsylvania, in New York and in New England. In fact, before the Revolution in those countries Catholic was practically synonomous with Irish. In Louisiana, Missouri, Illinois, Michigan and Indiana the original settlers were French Catholics, who have formed no inconsiderable element in the subsequent population. In Florida, Texas, California and New Mexico the first Catholic population was Spanish. Of the mass of immigrants from Europe that has built up the people of these United States during the century the official records show that scarcely a tenth is of English origin. As Catholics in England have never been a twentieth of the population during that time, it is accurate to state that they cannot have given over a two-hundredth part to the existing American population. Counting the original English Maryland settlers, the converts made on American soil and the arrivals from Europe, it is impossible to reckon the Anglo-Saxon element in the Catholic population here at two per cent., one-fiftieth of the whole. Clearly any supposed incapacity of the "Latin mind" for understanding the Anglo-Saxon is not a question of vital import to American more than to Irish Catholics. There are more Spanish-American Catholics than Anglo-Saxon; there are at least five times as many of French origin, nearly the same number of Italians and fully four times as many Poles and Catholic Slavonians in America to-day, without taking into reckoning the much larger elements of German and Celtic race. However problematical the number of Anglo-Saxons in the whole population may be, it is almost infinitesimal among the body of American Catholics.

If the Anglo-Saxon race is thus small, numerically, among the Catholics of America, the distinctive ideas which bear that name, and such as are expressed by the writers in the London press whom we have quoted are positively repugnant to the great mass among them. The idea of England having a special mission to prepare the world for Catholicity appears little less than idiotic to men of Irish race. They know by experience, or have learned from their fathers, what is the real nature of the "peace, liberty and law and order" for which the British Empire makes. They know that the so-called liberty of Great Britain leaves the Irish Catholic to-day distinctively below his Protestant fellow-countrymen in the law, in education, in the public service and in everything connected with temporal prosperity. They know that whatever of liberty Catholics enjoy to-day in the British Empire was conceded through fear, not granted by a liberality which had any existence save in the lying proclamations which have filled the history of Ireland since the days of Elizabeth. They know that the principles on which the Government of this country has been founded, the rule of the people as individuals, the incompetency of a State to make a religion, the rejection of military force as an instrument of government, are not only not English, but distinctively opposed to the prevalent ideas of the English people.

Of the other race elements which go to make the American Catholic population there is none which holds sympathy with the peculiar ideas of Englishmen, none which feels any desire for a closer bond with English Catholics than those of other lands. The Catholics of German race here certainly do not. The French, Spanish and Italian Catholics are not worried by the supposed difficulty of "understanding of the Anglo-Saxon mind by the Latin." Anglo-Saxon ideas have not entered their thought in questions of religion. They want no lessons on social or intellectual progress from English sources. Indeed, the Catholics of English race show as little desire of closer association with English ideals in religion as any other class. The book of the late Rev. Father Young, "Protestant and Catholic Countries Compared," is one of the most effective answers we know to the theory that Catholic nations are moribund, or that the future of the world is in the hands of the Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic races. Yet Father Young was himself not only of English race, but of English birth; but he was "Catholic first and Englishman after," as every true Catholic must be, whatever his nationality. The Divine claim on man's allegiance is stronger than any human claim.

Having now examined the numerical importance of Anglo-Saxons among the English-speaking Catholics, we shall try to find out how far facts warrant the supposition that the spread of the British Empire is a preparation of the world for Christianity and a new era of Catholicity. At the date of the American Revolution, when the Penal Laws of William of Orange were still in force and the Catholic Church under an absolute ban through the dominion of the English Crown, that dominion had a population of about fifteen millions. Three millions were in the American colonies and about twelve millions in the British Islands. Of the twelve millions at least two and a half were Catholics, almost entirely Irish. Those two and a half millions had been reduced to abject poverty by the policy of England continued during the two previous centuries. The externals of religion—churches, schools, religious orders—had been swept away by persecution, but the Catholic faith survived. It survived, as it did in Japan down to our own day, under confiscation and every punishment an absolute government could inflict. The separation of the American colonies from the British dominions brought the first step towards toleration to the oppressed Catholics. With all their hatred of the Catholic Church, the ministers of George

III. realized that the fate of England might be sealed by an Irish counterpart of the American Revolution. They grudgingly conceded a small modicum of civil rights to Catholics in 1778, followed, after the outbreak of the French Revolution, by a larger one in 1793. The hatred of the English people to everything Catholic continued long afterwards. The Gordon riots in London were a striking illustration of that point; and later, in the insurrection of 1798, the burning of Catholic chapels by the British troops in Ireland was an equally strong one. The excesses of the early Revolutionary leaders in France, strange as it may seem, were the first cause of a revulsion of feeling towards Catholics in England. The English monarchy found itself in a death struggle for existence with Republican France, and it extended some favor to the victims of revolutionary frenzy, even if they professed the Catholic Faith. It was not, however, that the old anti-Catholic spirit was dead either in the Government or the people of England. Catholic priests were often expelled from English settlements in Australia, in Newfoundland and elsewhere by arbitrary action of military officials. The idea of allowing Catholics to take any part in public life, to find place in Parliament or among the officials of Government was held incompatible with the spirit of the Constitution. In England it was unsafe even to build a Catholic church, except in some secluded place, for many years after the relaxation of the Penal Laws. At the same time the liberty enjoyed by every class of English subjects was as loudly proclaimed as is to-day the supposed liberality of the English Government and people to the Catholic Church.

The action of the English Catholics who had held the faith under persecution is a curious illustration of the "new era of Catholicity" which may be expected from the prevalence of Anglo-Saxon sentiments in religious ideas. The first relaxation of the Penal Code, in 1778, was followed by the formation of a committee of prominent English Catholics to obtain further concessions of elementary liberties, and also to suggest appropriate action to their co-religionists. This body suggested as the most suitable mode of conciliating the good feeling of the Protestant majority that English Catholics should elect their bishops without any reference to the Head of the Church, or, as they styled him themselves, "the Bishop of Rome." They urged that statues should not be used in Catholic churches, lest Protestant prejudices might thereby be shocked. They also objected to the introduction of religious orders as unnecessary and dangerous. They declared that not only did they not recognize the deposing power, which in the Middle Ages had been exercised by the Popes with the approval of Christendom, but that the claim to such a power at any time was contrary to Catholic doctrine and heretical. The majority of the committee was prepared to embody this outrageous theory, which virtually condemned the whole mediæval Catholic Church as heretical in an oath of allegiance to George III. They styled themselves by the new name of "Protesting Catholic Dissenters" to emphasize their specially English character in the Catholic communion. It was only the zeal and energy of Bishop Milner that prevented this extraordinary concession of principles being carried into law as the English idea of Catholicity.

The line of conduct of the Irish Catholics at the same time brings out clearly the difference of national character in matters of religion between the Anglo-Saxon and Celtic races. The hostility of sucessive English Governments had borne equally on the Catholics of both races. The Irish "Recusants" had suffered, in a material point, far worse than the English. They had been deprived almost wholly of their own land, and might only live on it as laborers or tenants, at the absolute mercy of landlords of alien race and creed. The pressure of famine was as common among them in the eighteenth century as it has been in the nineteenth. The violence of the Gordon anti-Catholic riots in London was repeated a hundred times among the Catholic Irish peasantry in "ninety-eight." They had no men of wealth or British nobility among them, as the English Catholics had, yet, all through the half century that followed the first measure of toleration, the Irish emphasized their devotion to their faith in all its integrity, while their English co-religionists were trying to hide the very name of Catholic among themselves. The popular outburst of 1814 against the proposition to allow the Protestant Government a veto on the appointment of Catholic bishops shows how radical was the difference between the sentiments of the English and the Irish Catholics. Not less so was their rejection of salaries from the State to the Catholic priesthood, offered in 1829 by the Duke of Wellington. They submitted to the disfranchisement of the whole body of small freeholders among themselves as the price of freedom for their religion, but they refused to accept any aid from a non-Catholic source which might endanger the independence of their religious guides. They had kept their hierarchy unchanged all through the dreary centuries of persecution by that spirit of independence, while the episcopate of Catholic England had been swept out of existence, and that spirit remained as vigorous in the days of O'Connell as it had been in those of Hugh O'Neill, when he demanded freedom of religion from Elizabeth.

This contrast between the English and Irish races in religious sentiment is one which deserves serious consideration in America to-day. Some among Catholics, both here and in England, seem to think that the special characteristics of the Catholics of this country and the British Empire, especially the disinclination to allow interference, in religious matters, of political authorities, and the equal right of rich and poor in the ministrations and teaching of the Church, are in some way due to English character and the influence of English institutions. To this supposition history gives absolute denial. The Celtic Irish, who had no part in forming the institutions of England and who were more foreign indeed to everything English than almost any nation of Europe, have in simple fact given to the Church whatever special character it has in English-speaking countries. The Anglo-Saxons have, indeed, strongly marked characteristics of their own, and those characteristics show themselves among some English Catholics. The writers quoted in this article are typical specimens, but decidedly not of the great Catholic body which uses the English language as its speech. The voice may be English, but the soul is unmistakably Celtic among this body.

During the American Revolution the Irish statesman, Edmund Burke, declared that he was not equal to the task of drawing an indictment against a nation. We acknowledge a similar weakness, though we confess it appears not to be felt at all by the average champions of Anglo-Saxon claims. The London writer who brands the French Catholics with complicity in the Dreyfus case is a good example. We would not, and in truth we could not, affix sweeping charges of any kind on the English Catholics or the English people. We believe the great majority of English Catholics to-day are as sincerely devoted to their faith as are the Maltese or the French Canadians. We honor noble names among them. Cardinal Newman, Father Faber, Lingard, Bishop Milner and a host of other English Catholics are as dear to us as Archbishop Carroll, Oliver Plunkett, Dom Bosco, Lacordaire or other distinguished men in the Church. When, however, we have to consider the question, how far facts warrant assertions that the Church's future is in the hands of the Anglo-Saxon race, or that the spread of the British Empire is a preparation for Catholic progress, we feel it a matter of justice to ask how far such assumptions are justified by facts.

The English people—Saxon, Danish and Norman—was a part of the Catholic Church during a thousand years before Henry VIII. separated from its communion. During all those years its faith and practice were the same as those of the Catholic peoples of Ireland, France, Spain, Germany or Italy. At the rise of Protestantism the new doctrines found no more favor among the English people than among the French. They appear to have been sincerely attached to the Church and the Holy See as their religious guides. Men like

More and Fisher and Warham show that high and enlightened personal sanctity existed among English Catholics. The peculiar events which separated England from the Church show, however, certain national characteristics which cannot command admiration, and which are very different from the ideas of independence and sturdy courage that are popularly supposed to be typically Anglo-Saxon. The King, after years of life as a devout and zealous Catholic, and after receiving the title of "Defender of the Faith" from the Sovereign Pontiff, suddenly threw off that faith and ordered his people, through a packed Parliament, to follow his example. His motives were public and generally reprobated. They were to contract a marriage regarded by the morality of the Catholic world as adulterous, and to enrich himself by seizing the property of the monasteries, which was also the public provision for relief of the poor and education. The men of highest character in England, Sir Thomas More and Bishop Fisher, were executed for refusing to sanction the King's new religion. The people rose in arms, in a large part of England, and obtained a promise of change in the royal action, but as soon as troops were let loose on them the nation, however reluctantly, conformed outwardly to the new system of religion, opposed as it was to their belief and sympathies. When Mary came to the throne the great majority of the English people welcomed the restoration of the Church. Five years later they permitted her sister Elizabeth to proscribe the Catholic Faith again. The only explanation of this course is that political interests held a higher power over the minds of the English people than spiritual interests. They believed in the Catholic doctrines, but they were not ready to make sacrifice of their temporal interests for the things of the unseen world. It can hardly have been a love of freedom which made a nation take its religion from the orders of its sovereign. Yet such was the course of the English people. It was the same spirit which, two hundred years later, made the English Catholic Committee call their Catholic forefathers heretics for the sake of political privileges. Elizabeth herself, while establishing a Protestant State Church and sending her Catholic subjects to death for refusing to accept its doctrines, appears to have sacrificed her own belief to political interests. While describing the Catholic world as idolators to the Turkish Sultan she retained the crucifix in her own chapel, and she freely expressed her dislike of a married clergy while sanctioning its establishment. Such was the English spirit in religion as shown by the history of three hundred years. That it has nothing in common with the spirit of the Catholics who kept the Faith all through in Ireland, or who planted it in the United States, in Canada, in Australia and wherever the English tongue is spoken will not be claimed by any thinking man. This should never be forgotten when there is mention of English-speaking Catholics.

In view of these facts, let us see how far the spread of the British Empire, or the nature of its policy, can be regarded as favorable to the progress of Catholicity. Its government is often contrasted with those of Catholic countries, such as France or Italy, where a faction in control shows hostility to the Church. The fact is that the anti-Catholic spirit displayed in such cases is but a temporary and modified copy of the policy which has ruled the English Government for over three hundred years. We feel sorrow that the French people should allow its rulers to proscribe Catholic religious orders in schools and hospitals or that the Catholics of Italy should permit the spoliation of churches and monasteries, but their apathy is far less than that of the English Catholics who allowed Henry and Elizabeth to change the whole religious practice of the nation at will. When the French Revolutionists treated the Church as Henry had treated it in England a few years ended their persecution, while in England it continued unremitted till Catholics were almost wiped out of existence. What the grounds are for attributing any special favor for Catholicity to the present British Government passes our comprehension, yet such seems to be the serious belief of some English writers. Professor Mivart complained, in apparent seriousness, of "the extraordinary hostility of the Vatican to England and our Empire, throughout which the Catholic Church enjoys such signal advantages and favors." It may clear up this point if we examine the real nature of the progress of the Church in the British Empire during the reign of the present Queen.

At the accession of Victoria, the British Government was more directly hostile to the Catholic Church than any other in Europe. Intercourse with the Pope, in any form, was forbidden by law. The profession of Protestantism was absolutely required as a condition for ascending the throne, and even marriage with a Catholic was forbidden to members of the royal family. The mother of the Queen had abjured her religion before marrying the Duke of Kent. She was received back to the Church shortly before her death, a fact which speaks strangely for the religious principles prevailing in the court. The highest offices of State, such as the Viceroyalty of Ireland, were barred against Catholics. So were the English universities, and in Ireland, though Catholic students might attend the lectures of Trinity College, they were allowed no share in its scholarships, and formal profession of Protestantism was required of all the professors and fellows. The oath taken by the Queen at her coronation and also the oath required of all non-Catholic members of Parliament not only bound them to maintain the Protestant Establishment in Church and State, but even included an express denial of several Catholic doctrines, including Transubstantiation. Though Catholics had been allowed seats in Parliament since the Catholic emancipation act, the whole administration of the law, of local government and education, even in Catholic Ireland, was confined to Protestants. Such were the "signal favors" which Catholics were receiving from the British Government at the beginning of the present Queen's reign.

While such was the attitude of the British Empire towards the Catholic Church, the Catholics of Prussia and other German non-Catholic States, such as Hanover, and of Holland were on a footing of equality before the law with all other subjects. The King of Prussia or Wurtemburg or the Russian Czar had no scruple about maintaining embassies in Rome or visiting as friends the Head of the Catholic Church. It was only in "free" England that all intercourse was forbidden with the Sovereign Pontiff, only there that the Sovereign had to swear to personal disbelief in Catholic doctrines. The public schools and universities, both classes and chairs, were open to the Prussian and Dutch Catholics freely, while even entrance to the lecture halls of Cambridge or Oxford was only to be obtained by formal profession of Protestantism. It is difficult to see how special favor to the Church can be attributed to English institutions or Government at Victoria's accession. England was then preëminently the most anti-Catholic government in Europe.

If the Government was anti-Catholic the public opinon of the English people and press was even more bigoted. During thirty years after Catholic emancipation no Catholic was elected to Parliament in England except one. This was the brother of the Duke of Norfolk, who represented the small town of Arundel, a pocket borough of the Norfolk estate. In any other British constituency a Catholic candidate would be pelted from the hustings. In many towns a priest could hardly appear on the streets without danger of insult or assault. Burning the Pope in effigy was a favorite amusement of the English populace up to forty years ago. How far all this indicated any specially favorable field for Catholic progress in England is hard to see. It is true that priests were not subject to banishment as such, as they had been seventy years before, that schoolmasters might teach, churches be built and that fines were no longer imposed on Catholics for non-attendance at Protestant service. These were gains indeed, but they were not of a nature to warrant any special credit to English institutions, when nearly every other civilized land recognized the rights of Catholics to hold their faith and at the same time all the rights of citizens or subjects.

As to the progress that the Faith has made since in the British

Empire, it is hardly such as to justify the assertion that its government or social conditions are favorable above others to Catholic life. There has been a remarkable movement towards Catholic doctrines, once hated by a large section of Englishmen, since the Tractarian movement. Many converts, perhaps as high in numbers as one per cent. of the population and equal to the whole of the old English Catholics, have returned to the Catholic Church. There has been a notable decline in the bigotry which was so marked a feature of English character at the beginning of Victoria's reign, but there has also been a large growth of infidelity and hostility to Christianity in any form throughout England. The old dislike of Catholics still exists, but it prefers to justify itself on supposed race superiority rather than religious grounds. The attitude of the English Press towards the French people on the occasion of the Dreyfus case, or towards the Irish people during the Land League movement, is a typical example. Anglo-Saxonism has to some extent replaced Protestantism as the national creed of Englishmen. We can hardly see how the change makes for the growth of the Catholic Church.

We may judge the value of the "signal advantages and favors" which the Church enjoys in the British Empire, according to Mr. Mivart, and how far the spread of that Empire is making for Catholic progress by comparing the actual number of Catholics under its rule to-day with what they were sixty years ago. It is a fact that the Catholic population of the British Islands is now hardly two-thirds what it was at the beginning of Victoria's reign. England, Ireland and Scotland then had eight millions of Catholics in a total of twenty-five millions. To-day they have five and a half in a population of thirty-three millions. Catholics were then a third of Victoria's subjects in Europe. To-day they are hardly a sixth. Adding in the whole Catholic English-speaking population of Canada, Australia and all other British colonies, there are now a million fewer Catholics in the Empire than there were when Victoria came to the throne. The Catholics of the German Empire have increased from eleven to fourteen millions since 1875; those of Holland nearly three-quarters of a million since 1840. In every other country of the world—in Austria, in Switzerland, in Belgium, in France, Italy and Spain—there has been a notable increase in the number of Catholics. In the British Empire alone there has been a steady decrease. This fact is not altered in its nature because it is due to the disappearance of Irishmen mainly. Then, as now, they formed the one large Catholic population within the Empire, and if its policy dooms that population to destruction or expatriation its policy is distinctly hostile to Catholic progress. The building of churches and schools and the increase in the clergy and hierarchies of England and Scotland are poor compensation indeed for the extermination of the Catholic people of Ireland.

It is with no feeling of national jealousy that we have shown how false is the assertion that the spread of the British Empire is a preparation for Catholic progress. So far it has been the one power which has absolutely made the number of Catholics among its subjects decrease, while Catholics are growing in numbers in every other land. Its action on the Irish Catholics to-day is similar to its action on the English Catholic body from the days of Elizabeth to those of George III. Year by year they are diminishing, as if struck by some fatal disease, wherever the English flag flies. The remedy will come in God's time, but it will not come from any benignant influence of English ideas or unfounded assertions of Catholic progress under English institutions. The facts speak for themselves.

BRYAN J. CLINCH.

San Francisco, Cal.

THE STORY OF THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

III.—SALVAGE FROM THE WRECK.

IT cannot be denied that the downfall of the Catholic religion in Scotland dates from the Parliament of 1560. Not that the change from Catholicism to Protestantism was immediately effected, for it was the work of years; but the Reformers and their supporters by their high-handed measures made sure of the ultimate success of their cause. When the rites of religion had been proscribed by law, monasteries cast down and their property confiscated and heretical teachers thrust into the places of the orthodox clergy, the nation was rendered powerless to resist the total overthrow of the Church. Individuals might oppose the new creed forced upon them, but isolated efforts were ineffectual against the united strength of powerful nobles and prelates.

The attitude of the people as a body towards the Reformation is a question full of interest to the Catholic student of history; it is one, nevertheless, upon which little can be learned from Protestant historians. These latter, being full of sympathy for the movement, though frequently disapproving of the means used to bring it about, have little interest in studying the dispositions of the nation towards the new doctrines. Indeed, some would seem to consider the staunch Catholics of those days as unworthy of notice, so priceless the gifts offered to them by the despised Reformers! Thus one writer speaks of the latter as men "who earnestly desired to see a purer faith and a more primitive worship established in Scotland;" who "were led to the study of the Scriptures by their love of the truth;" who when "dragged before ecclesiastical tribunals refused to purchase their lives at the price of a recantation."[1] Another and more recent writer seems to regret the troubles brought upon the country by the Reformation, while he has no word of condemnation for the movement in itself. "If James (V.)," he says—he is alluding to Henry VIII.'s attempts to convert that monarch—"could only have come under conviction, and been the subject of a gracious awakening to the truth, it would have been happy for Scotland."[2] The irony of the first part of the sentence does not contradict the wish expressed, as the context shows. It is, however, only fair to quote the words of the same writer with regard to the Reformation. "This is not a topic," he says, "on which it is easy to be impartial. Protestant historians have seldom handled it with impartiality, and their suppressions, glosses and want of historical balance naturally turn into opposition the judgment of a modern reader."[3] Mr. Lang has striven to be impartial, as every unprejudiced reader of his interesting volume must allow, and has succeeded, as far as it is possible for one who is not a Catholic, in giving an unbiased account of this confessedly difficult period of history.

How then did the nation receive the changes in religion brought about by the legislation of 1560? In the opinion of one historian they embraced them eagerly. Speaking of the difficulties Mary Stuart had to encounter, Mr. Hill Burton has no hesitation in affirming that "she, a thorough member of the Church of Rome, had come among a people of whom *the greater portion*, including all the ruling men, had become Protestants."[4] The words here emphasized by italics seem scarcely borne out by the evidence which will be brought forward presently. We know from Knox and other contemporary writers that many of the common people joined the reforming party; for the "rascal multitude" that played a prominent part in violating sacred places could only have belonged to the lowest class. It is scarcely worth while lingering here to discuss the "conviction" and "gracious awakening"—to use Mr. Lang's sarcastic terms—of such converts. Again, several of the nobles joined the ranks of the Reformers, but we have already seen Mr. Hill Burton's estimate of their too apparent motives,[5] while Mr. Lang enumerates among the factors of the Reformation "the passions of the exemplary nobles, whose disinterested conduct," he says with bitter irony, "shines on almost every page of this book."[6] As to the bulk of the nation, it cannot be maintained that they readily acquiesced in the changes. It has been already shown in a former article[7] that the clergy had woefully neglected their duty of regular and systematic teaching, and that would account for the falling away of some. That "the greater portion" had already become Protestants when Queen Mary arrived in Scotland, one year only after the Parliament had formally declared Catholicity illegal, can scarcely be granted. Had it been the case, the disaffection of the people for the old religion would have been more evident than it was, and their attachment to the new doctrines would have been witnessed to by the leaders of the movement. The examination of this disaffection towards the one and attachment to the other will help us to arrive at a more satisfactory solution of the temper of the nation at that period as regards religion.

---

[1] Fraser Tytler: "History of Scotland," Vol. III., p. 40. [2] Andrew Lang: "History of Scotland" (1900), Vol. I., p. 432. [3] Ibid, p. 421 [4] "History of Scotland," Vol. IV., p. 178. [5] *Vide, American Catholic Quarterly*, April, 1899, p. 60.

Had the people as a whole been disaffected towards the Catholic Church we could scarcely expect to meet with the abundant evidence which exists of the interest taken by them in all that concerned its welfare and the carrying out of its worship during the period that immediately preceded the Reformation. Such evidence is found in the many and substantial benefactions bestowed upon the Church by people belonging to almost every class of the community. A free gift of one's substance is an evident proof of one's appreciation of the object of the donation, and if this principle be applied to the benefactions in question we are able to arrive at some idea of the appreciation which Scottish men and women living in the early part of the sixteenth century had for the Catholic Church, its ministers and its ordinances.

It is a striking fact that many of the Collegiate churches of Scotland were founded only a few years before the downfall of religion. This alone speaks strongly in favor of the hold which the Church still had upon the wealthier portion of the people. The Collegiate churches partook of a conventual nature without being monastic. They were served by a certain number of secular canons under the rule of a provost, and in them the Divine Office of the Church was daily and regularly chanted. Sometimes they served as parish churches, at other times they often had a school or hospital attached to them, but upon all rested the obligation of regular and orderly divine service. Their foundation dated from the end of the fourteenth century to the period of the Reformation, and their number and importance afford a striking proof of the faith and piety of many Scottish hearts in an age which has been stigmatized as godless and selfish where it was not puritanical.

---

[6] Lang: "History of Scotland," Vol. I., p. 433. [7] April, 1899.

In selecting examples it will be well to restrict our investigations to the sixteenth century alone; sufficient will be found during that period to bear out the assertion that love for the Church and her rites was still strong in Scotland.

The royal foundation of St. Mary and St. Michael in the Castle of Stirling, although it scarcely comes within the scope of our enquiry, may be allowed to head the list. It was made by James V. in 1501, and provided for a dean, sub-dean, cantor, sacristan, treasurer, chancellor, archpriest, succentor, sixteen chaplains, six singing boys and a master of choristers. It was richly endowed by its royal patron with the revenues of some ten parish churches. In 1505 John, Lord Sempill, founded the Church of St. Mary at Loch Winnoch, in Renfrewshire, for a provost, vicar, sacristan, six chaplains and two singing boys. The chaplains included a schoolmaster, organist and master of the "song school." The clergy, it may be noted, wore scarlet hoods lined with lamb's wool. Sir William Myreton, in conjunction with the Prioress of Haddington, founded in 1517 the Collegiate Church of Crail in the Diocese of St. Andrews. It was served by a provost, sacristan and ten prebendaries. The church was of considerable size, being 135 feet in length. The Church of St. Mary and St. Anne was founded in 1528 at St. Thenew's Gate, Glasgow, by James Houston, sub-dean of the Cathedral and rector of the University of Glasgow. The foundation provided a provost, to be appointed by the Abbot of Kilwinning for the time being, eight canons and three choristers. This church received rich endowments from various sources; Bishop Elphinstone, of Aberdeen; Canon Muirhead and Sir Martin Reed, chaplain of the Castle, being among its benefactors. Four public Masses were celebrated daily, two of them at least being sung to note. On the founder's anniversary each year thirty poor men and matrons received doles of money after assisting at the *requiem*, and twenty-eight scholars received bounties. This church was spoken of colloquially as "Laigh" or Low Church, to distinguish it from the High Church or cathedral.

To come still nearer to the Reformation period, the Magistrates of Peebles, with the assistance of Lord Hay of Yester, founded a collegiate body at St. Andrew's Church, Peebles, as late as 1542. There were nine prebendaries attached to the institution. A year later the church of Cullen, in Banffshire, was made collegiate by the generosity of Alexander Ogilvie of Deskford. Its staff comprised a provost, six prebendary clergy and two choristers. The last to be mentioned, and one of the latest ecclesiastical foundations before the Reformation, was the Collegiate church of Biggar, in Lanarkshire. It was founded in 1545 by Malcolm, Lord Fleming, for a provost, eight prebendaries, "four boys having children's voyces" and six poor bedesmen; the duty of the latter was to say certain prayers for the founder and his family in return for the charity afforded them. The fine church built in 1545, it may be remarked, is still used as a parish church. Its spire was never completed, owing to Reformation troubles. Horrible to relate, some portions of the building were wantonly pulled down less than a century ago, and the materials sold for a few pounds to defray certain parish expenses. Other alterations have been made in the interior to suit the more severe taste of Presbyterians. "The richly carved and gilt oaken ceiling of the chancel," for instance, has been "taken down and replaced with another of lath and plaster!"[8]

The ecclesiastical foundations of the sixteenth century were not limited to Collegiate churches, for there is an instance as late as 1526 of the establishment of a Carmelite Friary in Edinburgh. The Provost and Baillies of the city granted for that purpose the lands of Greenside, at the foot of the Calton Hill, together with the chapel of the Holy Cross there. This is probably the last religious house founded in Scotland during the middle ages, and it is a significant fact that it owed its existence to the chief magistrate of the city.

No reference has been made to the foundation at Aberdeen in 1505 and St. Andrew's in 1512 of Collegiate churches in connection with the universities established in those cities; but although these can scarcely be regarded as private institutions, they are additional evidence to the prestige of the Church at that period, and to the absence of any idea of its speedy overthrow.

As to lesser benefactions, records which have escaped the almost universal wreck at the Reformation give numerous instances of the piety and charity of clergy and laity, displayed in generous gifts to the Church. The Burgesses of Newburgh, a town which owed its origin to the Benedictine Abbey of Lindores, in Fifeshire, were liberal in their donations both to the abbey and to the Chapel of St. Katharine which had been erected in their town by Abbot Cavers in 1508. Many of them burdened their properties with annual payments for the maintenance of chaplains for saying Mass. Thus James Chawmere resigned two roods of land in favor of Sir John Malcomson,[9] one of the chaplains of St. Katharine's, in 1508. Michael Anderson and John Kawe, Baillies of Newburgh, bestowed a further endowment three years later. Archibald Carno, in 1513, gave funds "for perpetual prayers for himself, his father and mother,"[10] and for the late Abbot of Lindores. In 1522 Isabella Hadingtone left a rood of land to the same chapel, and a yearly sum to St. John's altar in the abbey. Alison Tod, in like manner, during the following year, gave land "for the weal of her own soul and the souls of her forbears,"[11] and James Tode did the same, "for the welfare of his own soul and the souls of his father and mother."[12] As late as 1542 Michael Tod, a burgess, conveyed a rood of land to the same chapel for the souls of the founders of the monastery, of the then abbot and his successors, of the donor's father and mother, ancestors and descendants and "for the souls of all the faithful defunct forever."[13]

---

[8] "New Statistical Account of Scotland," Vol. VI., p. 361

[9] It may be remarked here that the ordinary titles given to priests in the middle ages were "master," if he had taken his university degree; "sir," if he had not.

[10] Laing: "Abbey of Lindores," p. 192.

The Carthusian monastery at Perth was enriched in the same way by the inhabitants of the city. Thus John Paull, in 1500, grants a tenement in South street to the Prior and Convent; James Drummond, burgess, assigns an annual payment of forty shillings for seven years; Robert Ramsay, another burgess, grants the Prior, in 1517, "a pound of wax yearly" out of the rent of his garden in Speygate; Sir John Lovel, a priest, grants an endowment in 1526; William Trippis, burgess, bestows on the Convent a tenement near the Turret Bridge, in 1527; Christian Cromby, wife of Andrew Bunch, resigns, in 1530, her right to certain property, in South street, in favour of the same monastery.[14]

A gift made in 1525 by Elizabeth Gray, Countess Dowager of Huntly, to the Black Friars of the same city, exhibits a special love for the offices of the Church. The Countess endows the Convent with half her lands of Littleton "for the salvation of her own soul and the soul of the late Alexander, Earl of Huntly, . . . her most beloved husband, who conferred many benefits upon her."[15] In return she binds the Friars, as she says, "to chant and celebrate solemnly, with a memorial, in their purple vestments, with deacon, sub-deacon and assisting servants, in their choir between the hours of 7 and 9 daily, one Mass of repose for the comfortable rest of my soul, and of the soul of the late Alexander, my husband."[16] The same generous lady had already contributed towards the restoration of the buildings of the convent, and required in return a special daily prayer from the Friars after their midnight office at her own tomb and that of her husband.

The Carmelites also of the same city were the recipients of numerous benefactions from the citizens. Thus Robert Esson, John Simpson and Finlay Reid, in 1500, each bestowed one of their tenements on the Friary; in 1514 John Mathison, burgess, renewed a previous annual grant of twenty shillings,[17] and in 1519 the Friars became possessed of a tenement in North street.[18]

---

[11] "Abbey of Lindores," p. 192. [12] Ibid, [13] Ibid, p. 196. [14] *Vide*, Lawson: "Book of Perth," p. 50-52. [15] Ibid, p. 24. [16] Ibid, p. 25. [17] In estimating the value of this and other similar donations, it must be borne in mind that taking into account the difference between Scottish and English money, it would represent about three or four times the value of money at the present day. [18] "Book of Perth," pp. 38-39.

The "Necrology" of the Friars Minor of Aberdeen recounts many instances of a like generosity. In 1520 is recorded the death of Master John Flescher, Chancellor of Aberdeen. Besides a large sum of annual revenue, he is said to have contributed twenty pounds towards the buildings. In 1552 Master Duncan Burnet, rector of Methlick, is extolled for his annual payment to the convent of ten marks, and for the gift of "a vestment of scarlet for the high altar,"[19] besides another vestment. Among other benefactors mentioned in the same record are Dame Margaret Chalmer, in 1532, Dame Jonete Patersone, relict of Sir Alexander Lauder, knight, in 1534, and Lady Egidia Blair, in 1537, all of whom contributed liberally towards the buildings.[20]

As examples of the devotion of parishioners towards their parish church may be instanced the various benefactions made during the sixteenth century to the famous Church of St. John the Baptist at Perth. Robert Clark, burgess of the city, for example, founded and endowed an altar in honor of St. Severus in 1504. Alexander Tyrie, Provost of Perth, founded the chaplaincy in honor of St. Christopher at St. Clement's altar in the church in 1511. Patrick Wallis, burgess, bestowed a tenement in 1513 on the altar of the Annunciation, previously founded by him. In 1518 Sir John Tyrie, Provost of the Collegiate Church of Methven, founded from the revenues of the Confraternity of the Name of Jesus, of which he was dean, the altar of the Holy Name, bestowing upon it a yearly revenue. In like manner the dean of the Confraternity of the Holy Trinity, Master John Ireland, founded the Trinity altar in the same year. In 1523 Finlay Anderson, burgess of Perth, founded and endowed the altar of St. Fith or Fithie the Virgin.[21] In the same year Master James Fenton, Precentor of Dunkeld, founded the altars of St. Mungo and St. Bridget, bestowing on each an annual revenue. In 1525 Sir John Tyrie founded the altar of St. Michael, and Sir Simon Young, another priest, that of St. Barbara. The latter benefactor added in 1529 another foundation—the chaplaincy of St. Gregory and St. Augustine. These and the other altars of that glorious church were continually receiving minor benefactions from the generous citizens.[22]

Sir John Tyrie, whose liberality has been more than once alluded to, was also founder in 1523 of St. Katharine's Chapel in Perth. Besides endowments for the perpetual support of a chaplain to say Mass and of "one poor man to minister in the Masses daily to be celebrated in the same chapel," there was provision for the lodging and entertainment of poor travelers. The foundation charter is worth quoting. It begins thus: "Whereas, by pious prayers and celebrations of Masses wherewith the Son is offered for sins, we believe that sins are remitted, the pains of Purgatory mitigated and the souls of the deceased frequently liberated and placed in the joys of Paradise," etc., etc.[23] This unequivocal expression of Catholic belief is a witness not only to the sound faith of the donor, but also to the general acceptance at the time of the doctrines referred to in the charter. There may, even then, have been sympathizers with Protestantism in Perth—a city which in less than forty years was to become notorious from its connection with the leaders of the Reformation—but, as a whole, it must have been still sound in the Faith to have counted amongst its citizens so many generous donors to the Church and her ministers.

---

[19] "Vestimentum de scarleto pro summo altari." "Spalding Club Miscellany," Vol. I. p. 65. [20] Ibid, pp. 68-77. [21] The writer has been unable to identify this saint. The name may possibly be a corruption of that of St. Faith, virgin and martyr. [22] "Book of Perth," pp. 66-70.

The last group of benefactions which will help to serve as proof of Scotland's Catholicity just before the Reformation is that connected with the Collegiate Church of St. Giles, Edinburgh—a building destined to become later on the centre of reform. In 1502 Richard Hopper, burgess, bestows an annual rental upon the altar of Our Lady and St. Roch; Robert Vaus, three years later, makes a like donation to the high altar; Jonete Elphynston, in 1508, gives to the chaplain of the altars of All Saints, St. Thomas and St. Apollonia a portion of her lands for an annual endowment; Alexander Rynde in 1512 similarly benefits the altar of Our Saviour; Sir Alexander Lauder de Blith, Provost of the burgh, makes in 1513 a new bequest to the altar already founded by him in honor of Our Lady and St. Gabriel; while Walter Chepman bestows an annual rental, in 1513, upon the altar of St. John, whose chapel he has recently founded.

These are comparatively early bequests, but later ones are not wanting. Thus in 1523 John Patersoun, burgess, and his daughter Jonete become benefactors of St. Sebastian's altar; Sir Robert Hoppare, a priest, gives in 1527 to the altar of St. Roch some of his property; John Quhite, another priest, benefits the altar of the Holy Blood in the same year; Walter Chepman endows, in 1528, the altar of Jesus in the chapel below the cemetery; Adam Ottirburne, of Reidhall, bequeathes various rents to Our Lady's altar in 1536; John Chepman endows a chaplain for St. John's altar in the following year; while Sir Thomas Ewing, the chaplain, bestows an annual revenue upon the altar of the Holy Blood in 1542.

Lest these examples should seem to belong exclusively to the wealthier citizens, a few more must be added, at the risk of wearying the reader, to illustrate the Catholicity of another class of society.

---

[23] "Book of Perth" p. 80.

The trade guilds of the middle ages bore a very important part in the social and religious life of the period. They were intended for mutual encouragement and assistance in the carrying out of their respective crafts by the members of such societies, and for affording aid in poverty and sickness. Each guild had, moreover, its specified religious and charitable obligations which the members bound themselves to fulfil. The various associations of the kind in the city of Edinburgh seem to have been connected with the Church of St. Giles. Each one as it was formed claimed a special altar in that church, and the brethren became bound to provide for its decent maintenance and the support of its chaplain. The Guild of Surgeons and Barbers, who were responsible for the altar of St. Mungo, were legally bound over in 1505 to demand from each burgess an entrance fee of five pounds, to augment the necessary funds, and a weekly payment of one penny from a master or a halfpenny from a workman. The Cordwainers, who supported the altar of St. Crispin and St. Crispinian, were bound to exact from each servant his weekly halfpenny, from each master his weekly penny, to provide ornaments for the altar and "to sustain the priest's meit."[24] In 1518 the Merchants were granted the Holy Blood Aisle, "to haif the octave of Corpus Christi to be thair procuration day."[25] In 1520 the Walkers,[26] Shearers and Bonnet-makers had the altar of St. Mark allotted to them. The Candle-makers obtained in 1522 the altar of Our Lady of Pity. The Tailors received that of St. Anne in 1531.

Besides these examples of the Catholic life which was bound up with the great Edinburgh church, its records illustrate that apparent sense of the security of Catholicity to which allusion has already been made. Additions, improvements, restorations of the fabric of St. Giles' seem to have been constantly in progress up to the very epoch of the Reformation. In 1513 a new aisle was built by the Provost of the burgh, Lauder de Blith; in 1518 the Holy Blood Chapel was erected; in 1530 mention is made of a "Chalmer new biggit"[27] in connection with the churchyard; in 1543 Thomas Watson is appointed by the Provost to take charge of the windows of the "Kirk of Sanct Gele Yearlie;" in the following year the Dean of Guild is instructed to repair the "sang scule;" and "Andro Mansoun, wricht," has a pension awarded him for ten years for his work on the stalls of the choir. The most striking instance, however, is the restoration of the Lady altar, for which various benefactors provided the requisite adornments and were allowed to have their arms engraven upon their respective gifts. Among these were several costly pillars of brass. The work was finished just three years before the Reformation, at which period the aforesaid pillars were carried off and made into cannon.[28]

---

[24] Cameron Lees: "St. Giles, Edinburgh," p. 79. [25] Ibid, p. 80. [26] i. e., the Fullers of Cloth, *vide* Jamieson's Scottish Dictionary. [27] "A chamber new-built."

These instances of the generosity of Catholics towards the Church and its services are merely a few culled from sources which were easy of access to the writer. They by no means exhaust the supply. They refer to benefactions from nobles, commoners, clergy and laity to a Benedictine Abbey, a Carthusian house, Dominican, Carmelite and Franciscan Friaries, a parish church and a collegiate institution situated in the widely distant regions of Aberdeen, Edinburgh, Perth and Fife, and may therefore serve as typical instances. We have every reason to suppose that the records of other religious houses, collegiate and parish churches, hospitals and nunneries would have furnished us with similar examples; it is impossible to prove the fact, for those records in most cases have perished. The hundreds of such churches and institutions scattered over the country must have been able to point to examples quite as edifying and probably even more striking than those which are here adduced.

Another fact to be borne in mind is this: Some of these gifts were made at a period posterior to the English Reformation—after Henry of England had practically made himself Pope for that country. But what is still more striking, the Lady Chapel in the Church of St. Giles was actually undergoing restoration just one year before the Earl of Argyll demolished the altars of the collegiate churches of Holy Trinity and St. Mary's in the same city in 1558. From all this it is evident that Protestantism was not unknown to these generous benefactors of the Church; yet they had no fear of its ever becoming an enemy to be dreaded. We may well suppose that in the security of their own steadfast faith they regarded the upholders of the new religion as mere raving fanatics, unworthy of consideration.

With so great a weight of presumptive evidence in favor of the thoroughly Catholic spirit of at least a considerable number of the people, and especially of the middle classes—always the staple strength of a nation—it would seem only reasonable to conclude that the Scottish people had not become in 1561 so demoralized that the "greater portion . . . had become Protestants."

It is time to turn our attention now to the other side of the question, and to examine to what extent the people of Scotland, in the early part of the Reformation movement, became attached to the religion forced upon them as a substitute for their ancient Faith. Many there were, of course, who were ready to embrace the new doctrines from conviction, led astray as they were by the vehement denunciations of Catholicity made by the reforming preachers, and possessing little solid religious instruction in the doctrines of the true Church. Others would, doubtless, be influenced by the example of the nobles and gentry who had joined themselves to the Reformers. Many more, we may well believe, would conform to escape the inconveniences of Presbyterian persecution. Yet it is evident from various proofs that the Protestant party, even after the Reformation had become a *fait accompli,* were much dissatisfied with the general result of their persistent efforts to spread the new religion. In 1581, more than twenty years after the Reformation had been effected, it was complained "that the 'dregs of idolatry' existed in sundry parts of the realm 'by using of pilgrimage to some chapels, wells, crosses . . . as also by observing of the festival days of the sancts,' " etc.[29] An Act of Parliament was therefore passed, condemning such practices and punishing them severely by fines and imprisonment. In 1583 the Assembly complained to James VI. that converts were actually being made to Catholicity: "Many," they said, "who from their youth were nourished in the Kirk of God, had become maintainers of Popery and the Man of Sin."[30] In 1586 the same body lament the fact that "Papistry abounds in the north for the want of qualified ministers."[31]

---

[28] "St. Giles, Edinburgh," *passim*.

The fact was that the unhappy state of Scotland had already begun to attract zealous missionaries from the continent to sustain the faith of those who had kept staunch to Catholicity and to bring back those who had wandered away from it. The Catholic gentry kept in their houses Jesuits and other missionaries, who said Mass for the people and administered the sacraments. In some cases the ruined churches were made use of. Thus at Christmas, 1585, Mass was sung openly in the old collegiate church of Lincluden, near Dumfries, at the instigation of Lord Maxwell, and so eager were the people to take part that to escape the guards posted on the bridge to prevent them, they waded through the Nith, and wet through up to the waist, took part in the sacred offices.

The favorable disposition of a large body of the people to the Catholic religion and their hatred of the Reformed Church had attracted the serious attention of the Protestant authorities previous to the meeting of the General Assembly of the Kirk in 1588, and by means of circulars which had been addressed to the various Synods with the object of gaining accurate information on the subject, a statement was drawn up and presented to the Assembly in question. From the statistics then produced we are able to form a true estimate of the state of religion at that period—nearly thirty years after the Reformation had been brought about by Parliament. The report still exists in the "Booke of the Universall Kirk of Scotland,"[32] the official collection of the acts of the General Assembly. A summary of it will give an unbiased picture of the power which the Catholic Church still possessed over the minds and consciences of a large section of the community in many different districts of the country.

---

[29] Chambers: "Domestic Annals of Scotland," Vol. I., p. 147. [30] "Booke of the Universal Kirk of Scotland," Part II., p. 631. [31] Ibid, p. 659.

In the neighbourhood of Dumfries "Mr. Johne Durie, Iesuite," is said to be "corrupting, seduceing and practiseing to and fro under the name of Mr. William Leing," and saying Mass in the town of Dumfries. Lord and Lady Herries, with several other persons of rank and position, are denounced by name as open followers of the Jesuit. Protestant Kirks are not properly established there, and the people refuse to hear the Word of God.[33]

In the districts of Buchan, the Garioch, Mar and Aberdeen six Jesuits are incessantly at work, corrupting the people. The Laird of Leslie has "public Mes" in his chapel where there are "two idoles above the altar." The aforesaid Jesuits assemble the Papists in Aberdeen and distribute books and *Agnus Dei* to whom they will. The destitution of the chief Kirks and the want of pastors and provision form "a special common greiffe through all the country."[34]

In Ross, where John Leslie had been made bishop, there had been "great coldness amongst all gentleman and commons since the Jesuits had liberty to pass through the country under the Earl of Huntly's lieutenantrie."[35] The Kirks are said to have been demolished and left in a ruinous state.

In Caithness the Earl of Sutherland and his lady and friends are staunch Papists, the ministers being few and destitute of provisions.

In the west of Angus are many Papists, of whom a long list is given. They are denounced as constant receivers of Iesuits and Seminary Priests. William Douglas, son of the Laird of Glenbervie, in another part of the same county, is accused of lying in wait for the ministers with a band of armed men in order to drive them from their duty.

In Fifeshire there is "superstitious keeping of Yoole (Christmas) Pasche, etc." The Earl of Huntly, to whom has been granted the abbacy of Dunfermline, brings thither "flocks of Papists, Iesuits, etc." There is no resorting to the Kirks, and in many parts these are destitute of pastors.[36]

In Lothian "sundrie Papists and Seminary Priests" have confessed that they have said Mass and preached the Faith, and when imprisoned for the same have been released without punishment—a striking proof of the feeling of the majority, especially of those in high places. The destitution lamented in other districts is emphasized here by the fact that Papists make use of the neglected Kirks for their own worship.

---

[32] Published by the Maitland Club (1839-45.) [33] "Universall Kirk," Part II., p. 716. [34] Ibid, p. 717. [35] Ibid, p. 718. [36] Ibid, p. 719.

In the Merse and Teviotdale the "haill peiple are readie to revolt from the Evangell, because they see the Prince careles therof, as they say."[37] This covert rebuke to James VI. for his leanings towards episcopacy was probably inserted with the hope of rousing him to assert his staunch Protestantism in punishing offenders.

There is no minister in the town of Lanark; for no residence can be obtained for even one. In the presbytery of Stirling scarcely three Kirks have ministers. "Walter Buchanan, son of the Goodman of Auchinpryour, and a Flemis woman his wyfe" are denounced as "indurat Papists." The people are said to be given to "superstitious ceremonies, pilgrimages to Chrysts well, fasting, festives, etc."[38] In the presbytery of Dunblane the Catholic bishop, "who latelie came home," has brought with him a foreign priest, either a Frenchman or an Italian, who "draweth all with him to the old dance." The ministers are despised and the Kirks left ruined and desolate. In Glasgow "the whole ministers" are said to be "dissapointed of their livings." There are many who receive and entertain Iesuits.[39]

In the presbytery of Dumbarton the people despise the ministers, "menace them and boast in their faces." The common people have been led away by popish ceremonies. "The Ladie Marr intertaineth in the place of Arsken an excommunicated priest, Sir Andrew Nesmith." Of this priest it is related that his "messe cloathes (vestments) were once apprehended, but (he) is sincesyne of new well provided therein and in messe books (*i. e.*, missals).[40] In the district of Lennox, although there are twenty-four Kirks, there are not four ministers to serve them. In Ayr there are many Papists, and a long list of them is furnished for the information of the Assembly.

Surely, no better proof could be adduced of the loyalty of a considerable portion of the people of Scotland to their ancient Faith than this open confession of the failure of the Reformers to force upon their countrymen a newly manufactured religion. From the reports of their own agents scattered throughout the country it is manifest that the Scottish people as a body were not taking kindly to the changes which had been imposed upon them. It is striking that not even one of the districts reported upon can furnish proof of even moderate success. This is a fact worthy of notice; for the Reformers would only have been too glad to produce any evidence in their own favor. Nothing of the kind is attempted. On all sides the same lamentation rises up. Empty and ruined churches, ministers despised by the people and in some parts contemptuously resisted and driven away, the doctrines of the Reformation openly rejected: such are the results of nearly thirty years of persistent persecution. On the other hand, Catholicity is gaining new adherents, priests are boldly ministering to their flocks, supported and defended by rich and poor alike.

---

[37] "Universall Kirk," Part II., p. 720. [38] Ibid, p. 721. [39] Ibid, p 721. [40] Ibid, p. 722.

This, however, is not the last confession of failure made by the reforming party. The same lamentation continually resounds in their reports of the state of religion all through the century. In 1593 the Reformers complained that "Popery" was still on the increase.[41] In the following year the Kirk was declared to be in danger on account of "the erection of the Mass in divers quarters of the land, and among others in the Earl of Huntly's houses at Straithbogie and Aberdeen, and the Earl of Errol's houses at Logyamount and Slaines."[42] In 1596 further complaints arose because "the wives of Papists" were "coming home again to Scotland."[43] Again in 1601 the Privy Council Record relates that "sundry Jesuits, seminary priests and trafficking papists, enemies to God's truth and all Christian government," were "daily creeping within the country (seeking) by their godless practices, not only to disturb the estate of the true religion, but also his hieness' awn estate, and the common quietness of the realm."[44]

One more proof of the strength of the Catholic party, whose religion had already nearly thirty years before been declared illegal, is to be found in a paper in the handwriting of Lord Burghley, drawn up for the guidance of James VI. It is still preserved in the State Paper Office. From this document we gather that in 1589 all the northern part of Scotland, including the counties of Inverness, Caithness, Sutherland, Aberdeen and Moray, together with the sheriffdoms of Buchan, Angus, Wigton and Nithsdale, were either wholly or for the greater part in the Catholic interest; Perth, Stirling, Fife, Lanark, Dumbarton and Renfrew[45] were chiefly Protestant; Ayr and Linlithgow were doubtful.[46] From this it would appear that the followers of Catholicity and Protestantism were at that time nearly equally divided.

Sufficient evidence has been adduced to show that up to the end of the sixteenth century a considerable portion of the nation, far from being attached to Protestantism, had never given up the old Faith, and that the increase in their numbers gave constant alarm to the reforming party. But it may be asked how it came to pass that the Reformation triumphed in the end. A Protestant historian shall give the answer. Mr. Andrew Lang, alluding to the ill success of the Catholic persecution of heretics under James V., gives as a reason its half-heartedness—the king himself and even some of the clergy being anxious for an excuse to avoid exacting the extreme penalty. "A cruel punishment like burning," he says, "can only be effective if practised on a very large scale, and with mechanical ruthlessness. Effective persecution, like that instituted by the Reformers as soon as the yoke was off their own necks, must work evenly, universally and, as it were, mechanically. Imprisonment, confiscation, exile, death denounced and inflicted in successive grades on all practising Catholics almost stamped out Catholicism in Scotland after 1560. Sporadic burnings and confiscations under James V. could not put down the nascent Protestantism."[47] This, then, was the secret of the eventual success of the Scottish Reformation. Persecution, ruthless and systematic, became the lot of all who, having dared to brave the prohibitions of Protestant bigotry, fell into the hands of the Reformers and their agents. History gives abundant examples, a few of which shall be here recorded.

---

[41] "Booke of the Universall Kirk," Part III., p. 798. [42] Ibid, p. 830. [43] Ibid, p. 873. [44] Chambers: "Domestic Annals," Vol. I., p. 349. [45] An exception, as will be seen later on, must be made for the city of Paisley, which was still intensely Catholic. [46] Fraser Tytler: "History of Scotland," Vol. IV., p. 175.

The laws against Catholic worship were promptly acted upon. In 1562 Sir James Arthure, a priest, was apprehended for "breking of ye Quenis grace Act and ordinance, made in hir last Parliament . . . and for Baptissing of ye fassion of ye Papistry Iohne Milleris barne . . . ane barne, callit William Lichbody . . . ane barne callit William Boid," and three other "barnes" and for marrying Iohn Thomson and Margaret Whitlaw, "in ye alde and abhominabill Papist maner."[48] In May, 1563, no less than forty-eight persons were brought to trial for "attempting to restore Popery." Among them were more than thirty priests, together with Archbishop Hamilton, of St. Andrews, the Prior of Whithern, the Succentor of Glasgow and other clerics of importance. The sole charge brought against them was "the controventioune of our Soverane ladies Act and Proclamatioune" against making "ony alteratioun or innovation of the Stait of Religione;" this they had been guilty of by saying or hearing Mass and administering the sacraments in the old Catholic manner. The Archbishop and several of the priests were specially charged with hearing confessions—"in ye moneth of Apryill last by past, in ye towne of Paslay, Kirk, Kirk-yard, and Abbay Place thairof (they) openlie, publiclie, and plainly tuke auricular Confessioun of ye saidis personis."[49] The Archbishop and several of the clergy and more important layfolk were imprisoned in different towns; others, who bound themselves not to offend again were discharged. The irony of charging the accused in the name of the Catholic queen shows the height of power to which the Reformers had attained.

---

[47] "History of Scotland," Vol. I., p. 431. [48] Pitcairn: "Criminal Trials," Vol. I., p. 420.*
[49] Ibid, p. 429.*

Knox, in an account which he gives of the treatment dealt to a priest illustrates the spirit of bigotry which was abroad. The incident occurred in Edinburgh at Easter, 1565. "As some of the brethren," says the Reformer, "were diligent to search such things, they having with them one of the Bayliffs, took out Sir James Carvet riding hard, as he had now ended the saying of the Masse, and conveyed him, together with the Master of the house, and one or two more of the assistants, to the Tolbuith, and immediately revested him with all his Garments upon him, and so carried him to the Market-Crosse, where they set him on high, binding the Chalice in his hand, and himself fast tyed to the said Crosse, where he tarried the space of one hour; During which time, the boyes served him with his *Easter* egges."[50] On the following day the priest and his assistants were brought to court and tried and convicted of the offense against the Act of 1560. "And albeit," says Knox spitefully, "for the same offence he deserved death, yet for all punishment, he was set upon the Market-Crosse for the space of three or four hours, the hang-man standing by, and keeping him, the boyes and others were busie with egges casting."[51]

This affair may have suggested to the Regent Moray, a few years after, the commutation of the capital sentence with regard to four priests of Dunblane, condemned to be hanged at Stirling for the sole crime of saying Mass in 1569. By command of the Regent they were banished the realm after undergoing the like ignominious and disgraceful treatment. They were "bund to the mercat-croce, with thair vestmentis and challices in derisioun, quhair the people caist eggis and uther villany at their faces be the space of an hor, and thairefter thair vestmentis and challices were brunt to ashes."[52]

All the priests seized for similar offenses against the law did not escape so easily. Allusion has already been made to Archbishop Hamilton.[53] In 1573 Thomas Robison, a priest, formerly master of Paisley School, suffered death for saying Mass, having been twice previously accused of the same breach of law.[54] In the following year another, whose name is not recorded, suffered a like fate: "Upoun the fourt day of May (1574) there was ane priest hangit in Glasgow callit—for saying of Mes."[55] Other priests at about the same period escaped punishment by flight to the continent.

The unwearying zeal of the Protestant party against any person who might give the slightest cause for suspicion is illustrated in the case of John Lowrie, a tavern keeper, accused in 1588 of treasonably maintaining, intercommuning with and supplying with meat and drink Mr. Robert Bruce, "confessit and avowed Papist and seminarie Priest, commoun enemie to Goddis truth and Cristiane government." The accused declared in defense that the person in question had merely taken food in his house and had paid for the same, he himself "nocht knawing him to be ane Priest."[56]

---

[50] Knox: "History of Reformation," lib 5. [51] Ibid. [52] "Historie of King James the Sext," p. 66. [53] *Vide, American Catholic Quarterly*, July, 1900. [54] Buchanan: "Hist. Rerum Scotic," f. 242. [55] "Diurnal of Occurrents," p. 341.

The laity were often made to suffer for their opinions. Thus Mr. William Murdo was accused in Aberdeen, in 1592, of being "an open railer against the ministry and truth preached."[57] He was banished from the burgh and threatened with having his cheeks branded and ears cropped should he return. One David Calderwood, of Glasgow, having in his possession a copy of Archbishop Hamilton's "Catechism," came under the notice of the Kirk authorities as a suspected Papist. Another Glasgow citizen was severely taken to task for having in the exercise of his profession as a painter depicted crucifixes in the houses of some of the citizens. Even those who merely associated with Catholics were punished. Thus, in 1595, Gabriel Mercer was accused of entertaining for three days one Elphinstone, "an excommunicated Papist," and was ordered to make a public acknowledgment of his offense from his seat in church.[58] Alexander Crighton of Perth received a similar punishment in 1610, being "convicted by his own confession of haunting and frequenting the company of Robert Crighton, excommunicate Papist, eating and drinking with him in taverns, and walking on the streets."[59] As Alexander, a month later, had not obeyed the injunction, he was ordered to be imprisoned.[60]

It might be thought that such vigilant persecution must have relaxed in course of time; such, however, was not the case. Not only in the century which saw the Reformation set up, but during the course of the two that followed, the laws against Catholics were persistently upheld, and continually enforced with more or less rigor. If at times there seemed to be a lull, some more than usually flagrant example of Papist boldness would rouse anew a tempest of bigotry. Thus in 1601 Protestant zeal was stirred afresh and many gentlemen connected with Dumfries and its neighborhood—a district always troublesome to the Kirk—were denounced for hearing Mass and entertaining priests; some were imprisoned and others who failed to answer the summons proclaimed as rebels. In 1605 Gilbert Brown, Abbot of Sweetheart, who had for many years escaped them, fell into the clutches of the Protestants, "not without peril from the country people, who rose to rescue him."[61] He was imprisoned and banished. About two years later a priest was brought from his prison in Edinburgh and subjected for ten or twelve hours to the same brutal treatment at the Market-Cross as that meted out to the Dunblane priests. His vestments and chalice were afterwards burnt, and he himself led back to prison.[62]

---

[56] Pitcairn: "Criminal Trials," Vol. I., p. 167. [57] Chambers: "Domestic Annals," Vol. I., p. 343. [58] Ibid, p. 337. [59] "Perth Kirk-Session Records," 1610. [60] Ibid. [61] Chambers: "Domestic Annals," Vol. I., p. 390.

James VI.'s efforts to introduce bishops into the Scottish Kirk stirred up anew the persecuting spirit of the Presbyterians against Catholics. The successful capture by Archbishop Spottiswood in 1615 of the illustrious Jesuit, Father John Ogilvie, and his subsequent execution, was an opportunity to that prelate of proving that Episcopalians had no sympathy with Papists. The dauntless courage of that glorious champion of the Faith, who under the most inhuman torture refused to incriminate any of the Catholics to whom he had been ministering, and met death with positive gaiety, only tended to spread Catholicity among the laity and strengthen the resolution of the clergy.

In 1620 two other priests were apprehended, Father Patrick Anderson and Father Edmund Cana. Two years later Father Mortimer, a Jesuit, barely escaped capital punishment and was banished. In 1628 so strong had Catholicity become in the north that severe measures were taken to repress it. A long list of "excommunicated" persons was drawn up, together with an enumeration of the various priests known to be in the country, and a proclamation forbade any person to "supply or furnish meat, drink, house or harboury" to either Catholic priests or laymen.[63] Paisley, which up to Archbishop Hamilton's death had "steyked" its doors against the ministers and continued to uphold the Mass and Catholic rites generally, is described about this period as a very nest of papists.[64]

It is remarkable that James VI. was in the latter part of his reign inclined to be more lenient in his treatment of Catholics; hence at that period many priests were merely banished the realm. It is said that he would have been glad to have spared the life of Father Ogilvie had he been left to follow his own inclinations, and as a matter of fact he did not suffer another priest to be put to death. It is not unnatural to suppose that the conversion of his queen, Anne of Denmark, by Father Abercromby, about the year 1600, had something to do with this leniency. The fact of the queen's conversion is proved beyond a doubt by contemporary evidence.[65] It may be noted here that at the solemn coronation of the king and queen as sovereigns of Great Britain, in 1603, Queen Anne gave great offense to the Anglican bishops by refusing to partake of the Protestant

---

[62] Chambers: "Domestic Annals," Vol. I., p. 390. [63] Ibid, Vol. II., p. 22. [64] Cameron-Lees: "Paisley Abbey," pp. 239-247. [65] Forbes-Leith: "Narratives of Scottish Catholics," p. 272 *et seq.*

Sacrament.[66] In the light of Catholic evidence it is easy to understand the reason of the refusal.

Under Charles I. and Charles II., the old bigotry was again stirred up at intervals. Under the Catholic King James VII. (or II.) a Catholic chapel was fitted up at Holyrood Palace, and the event caused some rioting and tumult. At his abdication a mob plundered the chapel and burned the books and furniture in the court-yard. Some of the more zealous were minded "to go to all the popish houses and destroy their monuments of idolatry, with their priests' robes, and put in prison [the priests] themselves."[67] This was accordingly done in the case of Traquair, where altars, relics, crucifixes and sacred objects generally were wantonly desecrated and destroyed; many of the articles were carried to Peebles and "solemnly burned at the cross."[68] About the same time a like scene was enacted at Dumfries with the spoils of the chapel of the Maxwell family.

When Queen Anne came to the throne, the Assembly awoke to fresh vigor; for a royal proclamation called for more strenuous efforts. A census of all the Catholics in the kingdom was taken, with the intention of putting the laws in full force. From the lists then made, and from Catholic reports to the Holy See, it appears that there were in Scotland in 1703 thirty-one priests; the laity, scattered about the south of the country, according to Protestant reports numbered about a thousand, but the Highlands are stigmatized as thoroughly "Papist." The people of almost all the Western Isles were Catholic to a man, and in the northern counties many faithful Catholics still clung to their religion and practised it publicly under the protection of the Gordons, the Huntlys and other orthodox believers. In spite of renewed search for priests and occasional banishments and confiscations, the Protestant authorities were unable to make much way against the Faith in the districts where it was most firmly established. This state of things lasted till the passing of the Catholic Relief Bill in 1793, when systematic persecution ceased.

In so slight a sketch as this many important events have necessarily been passed over—such as the brutal treatment measured out to Highland Catholics and the like; enough, however, has been said to show that the Scottish people were from the first reluctant to give up their Faith, that in spite of severe and continued persecution, a great number still clung to it, and that in certain districts—notably of the Highlands and the Hebrides—no other kind of Christianity ever gained a hearing. All honor to the heroic souls whose glory it was to preserve intact and hand down through many generations the Faith which had rescued their fathers from paganism, and to which they themselves clung tenaciously in face of persecution, spoliation and exile—a Faith which even death itself would have been powerless to wrench from its stronghold in their loving hearts!

---

[66] Strickland: "Queens of England," Vol, VII., p. 409. [67] Chambers: "Domestic Annals," Vol. II., p. 499. [68] Ibid, p. 500.

Such is the story of the Scottish Reformation. It but repeats with variations the tale of the Church's overthrow in every land in which heresy has seemed to men to triumph—a tale of man's fickleness, avarice and lust of power pitted against an adversary undying and invincible. For a time the human opponent may appear victorious, but sooner or later the words of Eternal Wisdom must needs be fulfilled: "Whosoever shall fall on this stone, shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it shall grind him to powder."

Dom Michael Barrett, O. S. B.

Fort Augustus, Scotland.

PROPOSED REFORMATION OF THE CALENDAR BY THE RUSSIAN ASTRONOMERS.

IN a late issue of the *Russian Orthodox American Messenger* we find the following:

"The revision of the Julian Calendar. (A report by Professor Glasenapp, published in the 'Novoye Vremia'.)"

The Russian Astronomical Society appointed a special commission, containing representatives of the different state departments and scientific societies, to examine into the question of the revision of the Julian calendar. This commission appointed Professor Glasenapp to make a report of the results of their conferences. The professor in his report gives the following reasons for a reformation:

First. "The Julian calendar in use in Russia is a heathen one. The light of Christianity never touched it at all."

Second. That its intercalation is incorrect to the extent of one day in 128 years.

Third. That the Gregorian calendar is also imperfect in allowing three days in 400 years for the accumulated error in the Julian, instead of three days in 384 years (3 x 128).

Fourth. That the dates of the calendar should be so changed as to have the date of the vernal equinox conform to the date on which it fell at the birth of Christ, namely, the 23d of March.

Fifth. That the names of the months should be changed because they are of pagan origin.

As the Russian Church refused to acknowledge the Pope's supremacy after the completion of the Greek schism, under Michael Cerularius, in the middle of the eleventh century, Russia did not fall into line like the other Christian States in adopting the Gregorian calendar; consequently their calendar (the Julian) is still in vogue in all those countries adhering to the Greek Church (Russia, Greece, Servia, Bulgaria, etc.), and their vernal equinox is thirteen days ahead of ours, 1900 being a leap year according to the Julian calendar.

Before examining the claims put forward by the Russian astronomers for a revision of the calendar it is necessary to give a brief history of this calendar with reference to chronology, showing the gross errors made by those ancient "time keepers."

The eminent astronomer, Herschell, in speaking of chronology, or the calculation of ancient observation, says that "it may be compared to that of a clock, going regularly when left to itself, but sometimes forgotten to be wound up; and when wound, sometimes set forward, sometimes backward, either to serve particular purposes and private interests, or to rectify blunders in setting."

If the Russians adopted the Gregorian calendar now, on the eve of a new century, as had been recommended in 1830 by their Academy of Sciences (it is actually in use to-day by her scientific men), all this difficulty of revision and confusion of dates could be avoided, as the Gregorian clock will be correct to a day until the year 4905—thirty centuries hence. May we not hope that long before that remote period is reached the true skin underneath the hardened Russian cuticle (alluded to by Napoleon) will become Roman, not Tartar?

The most savage and barbarous nations in the earliest periods of the world's history could not fail to see, from mere observation, that the natural units of time were the day, the month and the year. Neither could they fail to observe the regular return of the seasons, and the necessity of providing against the inclemency of winter or the burning heat of summer. This knowledge, which might be called "observational astronomy," must have compelled them, in a manner however rude, to ascertain the length of the year.

The period at which each season began was at first measured by the motions of the moon, and hence we find that all the nations of antiquity adopted a year of twelve lunations, or twelve monthly revolutions of the moon about the earth.

We find that Romulus, to whom the Roman calendar owes its origin, divided the year into ten months, the year beginning on March 1. Romulus conceived that the sun completed his course through all the seasons in 304 days, six of the months having thirty days (April, June, Sextilis, September, November, December), and the other four thirty-one days (March, May, Quintilis, October), making in all 304 days. The year of Romulus was evidently not lunar.

This calendar of Romulus was reformed by his successor, Numa Pompilius, who at first intended to make a complete lunar year of 354 days (29½ x 12). The length of the year, according to the calculations of Numa, was fifty days longer than the year of Romulus, equal to twelve lunations of twenty-nine and one-half days each.

From each of six of the months of thirty days, according to Romulus, Numa borrowed one day each. These six days were added to the fifty already mentioned, and from these fifty-six days he composed two months—January and February—of twenty-eight days each, and transferred the beginning of the year from March 1 to January 1. He afterwards added one day to January, making the year to consist of 355 days, and adjusted, as well as he knew how, the months to the seasons. The sequence of the months as given by Numa has never been disturbed.

The calendar of Numa was a purely lunar calendar, the seasons being either disregarded or kept roughly in place by the occasional intercalation of a month or the dropping of a month. The Jews and the Mohammedans still use a lunar calendar, the Mohammedans having a year of twelve months, containing alternately 354 and 355 days. From the time of Numa no revision of the calendar was attempted for more than six centuries.

Julius Cæsar, finding that the seasons and months did not coincide as they had been adjusted by Numa, undertook to rectify the calendar. He was assisted by Socigenes, a celebrated Alexandrian mathematician. He fixed the length of the tropical year at 365 days six hours, which was ten and one-quarter days longer than the year of Numa. The seasons therefore were ten and one-quarter days ahead of the month every year, and in thirty-five years would run the round of the whole year. Julius added those ten days to the year, one each to April, June, September and November and two days each to January, August and December, and decreed that an intercalary day should be added every fourth year to the 23d of February—that is, the 24th of February (6th of the calends) should be reckoned twice, hence bissextile *(bis sexta dies)*. To the great Julius, therefore, we owe the contrivance of two years of 365 and 366 days and the insertion of one bissextile after three common years. This change took place 45 B. C., which he ordered to commence on the 1st of January, being the day of the new moon immediately following the winter solstice of the year before; and this was the first day of the first year of the Julian calendar. The 25th of December of his 45th year is the date of Christ's nativity; and the 46th year of the Julian calendar is counted the first of the Christian era. The year preceding the birth of our Saviour is called by chronologists B. C. 1, and in historical dating of events there is no year A. D. 0.

In order to do this he enacted that the previous year, B. C. 46, should consist of 445 days, which was called the "year of confusion." The year was so thoroughly out of joint that Cicero speaks of being delayed on a journey by an equinoctial storm in October; thus showing the deplorable state into which the reckoning of time had fallen.

The Julian year, however admirably adapted to common use, was still imperfect; because the time in which the sun performs his annual revolution (from equinox to equinox) is not 365¼ days, but 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes and 46 seconds; the civil year therefore must have exceeded the solar by 11 minutes 14 seconds, which in the space of 128 years would amount to a whole day, and consequently in 46,720 years (365 x 128) the beginning of the year would have advanced forward through all the seasons, and in one-half that interval of time the summer solsticewould have fallen in the middle of winter, and the earth would have been covered with frost when the bloom of vegetation was expected.

When the Julian calendar was introduced the equinox fell on the 25th of March, in the following year it occurred 11 minutes 14 seconds earlier, and so on. In the year A. D. 325 the Council of Nice decreed that the festival of Easter should henceforth be kept on the first Sunday after the first full moon next following the vernal equinox, which in that year fell on the 21st of March. The Council fixed that date (21 March) as the date of the vernal equinox. In the year A. D. 1582 the equinox had retrograded to the 11th of March.

Among the first to discover the imperfections of the Julian calendar was the Venerable Bede, about the year A. D. 730. He observed that the true equinox preceded the civil by about a day in 130 years. This constant anticipation of the equinox having become too considerable not to be noticed, was first formally represented to the Councils of Constance and Lateran by two Cardinals, Petrus ab Alliaco and Cusa, who showed the cause of the error and the means of correcting it.

In the year 1474 Pope Sixtus IV., being convinced of the necessity of a reformation, sent for Regiomontanus, a celebrated mathematician of that period, in order to engage him in the undertaking. The premature death of Regiomontanus prevented his assistance, and no one being thought worthy to be his successor, the project was suspended. Nearly 100 years elapsed, when Gregory XIII. had the high honor of accomplishing what several preceding Pontiffs and Councils had attempted in vain.

Pope Gregory invited to Rome a considerable number of mathematicians and astronomers for the rectification of the calendar. He employed ten years in the examination of their several formulæ, and finally gave the preference to the plan proposed by two brothers of Verona—Antonius and Aloysius Lilius. He also sent for Clavius, of the Society of Jesus, a celebrated astronomer, to supervise the work.

The first object of the reformers was to correct the errors of the Julian method of reckoning and to make the length of the year agree more exactly with the course of the sun. For this purpose it was agreed that the ten days which had been gained by the old account should be taken from October of the current year, and the vernal equinox brought back from the 11th of March to the 21st (as it had been fixed by the Council of Nice). This was done on the 4th of October, 1582, by eliminating ten days; calling the day after the 4th of October the 15th and making January 1 "New Year's Day." And as the error of the Julian intercalation was found to amount to about three days in 400 years, it was ordered that the intercalations should be omitted in all the centurial years, excepting those that are multiples of 400.

According, therefore, to the Gregorian rule of intercalation every year whose number is divisible by 4 without a remainder is a leap year, with the exception of the centurial years, which are only leap years when divisible by 400. Thus 1700, 1800, 1900 are common years, whilst 2000, 2400, 2800, etc., are leap years.

A council of the most learned prelates was convened by the Pope, and the subject having been finally settled, a brief was published in March, 1582, by which the use of the Julian calendar was abrogated and the new one substituted in its stead, called from the Pope's name the Gregorian calendar, or New Style.

Immediately after the promulgation of the new calendar nearly all of the Christian States adopted it, with the exception of the followers of the Greek Schism, and those Protestant nations who refused to be "dictated" to by Rome. England adhered to the "Old Style" until 1752, when an act of Parliament was passed adopting the new calendar. There was then a difference of eleven days between the old and new style, and so the day after the 2d of September, 1752, was called the 14th of September. The people could not understand the change, and there was considerable disturbance in London, where mobs paraded the streets shouting: "Give us back our eleven days," and complaining that their lives had been shortened by that time. The beginning of their year was changed from March 25 to January 1, to comply with the "New Style." The year 1752 was a short year of 270 days, from March 25 to December 31, less eleven days.

Notwithstanding the confusion of dates, as exemplified in this short sketch of the calendar, it is wrong to suppose that any time has been lost or gained in chronology. One cannot annihilate time. The length of the solar day and solar year has hardly undergone any change during recorded time. These may be regarded as constants. The solar year, according to astronomers, loses 6-10 of a second in a century; the earth keeping schedule time to the fraction of a second in her diurnal and annual revolution. Consequently it is only a question of mathematics to find the exact date of any well-marked phenomenon. For example, the eminent Greek astronomer, Thales, calculated, many years before its occurrence, the total solar eclipse which put an end to the battle between the Kings of Media and Lydia, B. C. 610, May 28, and the late Mr. Baily made a similar calculation of that eclipse, reckoned backwards, and found the dates to correspond.

Sir Robert Ball, late Irish Astronomer Royal (now of Cambridge University, England), is responsible for destroying our faith in the poet Wolfe's vivid picture, in the following beautiful and familiar lines, on the death of Sir John Moore:

> "We buried him darkly at dead of night,
> The sods with our bayonets turning;
> By the struggling moonbeam's misty light,
> And the lantern dimly burning."

Ball, it seems, made a calculation which resulted in the discovery that the moon on that particular hour and night could not be shining, either strongly or mistily; and was, in fact, below the horizon at the time of Sir John's hurried interment.

The vernal equinox, or First of Aries (21st March), fixed by the Council of Nice, is the point on the celestial equator crossed by the sun's pathway (the ecliptic), and is made the starting point for many celestial measurements. It is sometimes called the "Greenwich" of the celestial sphere. This point is not fixed, but moves westward on the ecliptic about 50.2 seconds every year, as if advancing to meet the sun at each annual return. Hipparchus, in the second century B. C. called this westward motion of the equinoxes "The Precession of the Equinoxes," and this vernal equinoctial point makes a complete circuit of the heavens in about 25,000 years ($\frac{360^\circ}{50.2''}$). Now, since the tropical year is the time included between two successive passages of the vernal equinox by the sun, and since this equinoctial point moves westward 50.2 seconds every year, corresponding to about 20 minutes of time, it follows that the tropical year (the year of the seasons) is about 20 minutes shorter than a sidereal year—or the year of a complete revolution of the sun from any fixed star to the same star again.

The length of this tropical year is 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, 46 seconds,[1] and this is the year used by all astronomers in determining the number of intercalations to be made so as to make civil time correspond to solar or tropical time. It is called the year of chronology and civil reckoning.

Let us now find the mean leangth of a Gregorian year. By the Gregorian rule there are 97 leap years in 400 years. Take for illustration the 400 years included between January 1, 1601, and January 1, 2001. In these 400 years there are 100 leap years, less the three centurial years 1700, 1800, 1900; those years not being divisible by 400 are common years. This would leave in every 400 years 97 leap years (100 minus 3) and 303 common years.

$\left.\begin{matrix}303\times365\\97\times366\end{matrix}\right\}=146097$ days in 400 years,

Which, being divided by 400, gives the average length of a Gregorian years as 365.2425 days, equal to 365 days, 5 hours, 49 minutes, 12 seconds. This Gregorian year exceeds the length of a tropical year by 26 seconds (365 days, 5 hours, 49 minutes, 12 seconds less 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, 46 seconds), an error which will amount to a day in 3,323 years, $\left(\frac{24}{26}\,{}^{\text{hrs.}}_{\text{sec.}}\right)$, so that civil reckoning will know no change until the year 4,905. (1582 plus 3323.) Up to that date the equinoxes and solstices will fall on days similarly situated; the seasons will always correspond to the same months, and the vernal equinox (used by the Church in calculating the time for the celebration of Easter) will fall for the next thirty centuries on the 21st of March, as the Council of Nice fixed it nearly sixteen centuries ago; which is surely more than sufficient for all human purposes.

Yet again, the slight error of one day in 3,323 years may be still further reduced by making the year 4000 and its multiples—8000, 12000, etc., common years; and this extension, we have no doubt, was intended by Clavius, as it agrees with his rule of 4's. By adopting the last correction the commencement of the present year would not vary a day in 100,000 years. Clavius successfully defended the plan of the Gregorian calendar against Scaliger and Vieta, the most profound scholars of their time.

In order to discover whether the coincidence of the civil and tropical year could not be restored by a different method of intercalation, we proceed as follows:

---

[1] For extremely exact mathematical work, the length of the mean tropical year as given by Harkness is 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, 46.067 seconds in terms of the mean solar day. This day is slightly variable in length, on account of the action of the tides, the slow shrinkage of the earth by loss of heat, its growth by deposit of meteoric matter and the disturbance of its form and the distribution of matter on its surface by earthquakes, rivers, ocean-currents, etc. Some of these causes tend to lengthen the day, and others to shorten it; an exact balance is infinitely improbable. Copernicus, the father of modern astronomy, determined the length of the tropical year to consist of 365 days, 5 hours, 49 minutes, 6 seconds. Since his time more accurate determinations have been made, as the following, in which we give only the excess above 365 days, 5 hours. 48 minutes: Ticho Brahe (A. D. 1602), 45½ seconds; Kepler, 57.6 seconds; Flamsteed, 57.5 seconds; Halley, 54.8 seconds; Delambre, 51.6 seconds: La Place, 49.7 seconds; Bessel, 47.8; Hansen and Olufsen, 46.15 seconds; Le Verrier, 46.5 seconds.

The difference between the tropical year (365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, 46 seconds) and the common year (365 days) is 5 hours, 48 minutes, 46 seconds, equal to 20,926 seconds. The number of seconds in a day is 86,400. Therefore the difference between the tropical year and the common year is $=\frac{20926}{86400}$ part of a day. This fraction of a day, if reduced to a continued or chain fraction will be represented by the following approximations: $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{7}{29}$, $\frac{8}{33}$, $\frac{31}{128}$, $\frac{163}{673}$, $\frac{10463}{43200}$.

			h.	m.	s.	d.	h.	m.	s.		
(I)	$\frac{1}{4}$	of a day	=6.	0.	0	365.	6.	0.	0	=	Lgth. of civil yr.
(II)	$\frac{7}{29}$	“	=5.	47.	35$\frac{5}{29}$	365.	5.	47.	35$\frac{5}{29}$	=	“ “
(III)	$\frac{8}{33}$	“	=5.	49.	5$\frac{5}{11}$	365.	5.	49.	5$\frac{5}{11}$	=	“ “
(IV)	$\frac{31}{128}$	“	=5.	48.	45	365.	5.	48.	45	=	“ “
(V)	$\frac{163}{673}$	“	=5.	48.	46$\frac{2}{673}$	365.	5.	48.	46$\frac{2}{673}$	=	“ “
(VI)	$\frac{10463}{43200}$	“	=5.	48.	46	365.	5.	48.	46	=	“ “

In the (I.) approximation (the Julian) the difference between the tropical year and 365 days amounts to less than one day every four years. In the (II.) to a little more than seven days in twenty-nine years. In the (III.) to a little less than eight days in thirty-three years. (It is an interesting fact that the addition of eight days every thirty-three years of 365 days each was proposed by the Persian astronomers nearly seven centuries ago.) In the (IV.) approximation to a little more than thirty-one days in 128 years, and so on; each approximation alternately greater and less, and each closer to the value of the fraction than the preceding one, until the difference between the last approximation and the length of the tropical year becomes smaller than any assignable quantity.

The (IV.) approximation of thirty-one intercalations in 128 years is evidently the one the Russian reformers have now proposed to adopt. According to the Julian calendar there are thirty-two leap years in 128 years($\frac{128}{4}$); the Julian calendar has therefore one leap year in 128 years more than the (IV.) approximation, and agrees with the proposed Russian revision, namely: "Every year divisible by 4 is a leap year, except such years as are divisible by 128, which are normal years" (365 days). This intercalation makes the length of the Russian civil year 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, 45 seconds, about one second less than the tropical year; and this difference amounts to a day in about 86,000 years; whereas, by the Gregorian rule extended, the error would not amount to a day in 100,000 years. This being the chief point of assault of the astronomical Cossacks against the entrenched Gregorian calendar, plainly shows its pitifulness, its absurdity, and that the change was conceived in a spirit of bigotry inconsistent with the erudition of its framers.

If the reformers required mathematical exactness, why not adopt the (V.) or (VI.) approximation, which will bring the civil year still nearer the length of the tropical year?

What a confusion of dates this reformation will bring. Instead of Russian dates being thirteen days behind ours, as they are now, they will be two days ahead. Christmas Day will be celebrated on the 27th of December, and so on.

And what an amount of annoyance and inconvenience to the Russians themselves this change will entail. "Letters to foreign countries, orders for shipments, times of departure of steamers and sailing vessels, news from abroad, etc., etc., must have two dates. The mariner cannot read the nautical almanac nor the merchant accept a draft from abroad, nor the broker determine foreign exchange without having two dates at hand. Advices cannot be understood, bills of lading cannot be made effective, telegrams cannot be comprehended without an extra labor, small in each instance, but large in the aggregate, which this revision will not impose." "Does he mean the Gregorian or the revised style?" is a question that will be asked in St. Petersburg and Moscow thousands of times a day.

The Russian astronomers must know (as we have shown) that their revision is an undertaking not admitting of perfection. Even at present in the Russian dominions Sunday at Moscow is Monday in Kamschatka, and the Russian children in the Klondike call it Saturday; and it is a well-known fact that when Alaska was annexed to the United States the official dates had to be changed by only eleven days, one day being provided for by the alteration from the Asiatic date to the American. At present the difference between the two calendars is thirteen days. Thus in Russia the 15th of August is reckoned the 2d, and their scientific men write it August $\frac{2}{15}$.

Another objection is that the names of the months are of pagan origin. True, but are not the names of the days of the week named after *Woden, Thor, Saturn,* etc. (Roman and Scandinavian gods)? Are not the words *earth* and *calendar* as pagan as Nero or Domitian; and are not the astronomical terms zenith, alucantar, azimuth, nadir, etc., etc., derived from the language of the congeners of the "unspeakable Turk," the polished and scholarly Moslem of Bagdad and Cordova?

Astronomy and religious knowledge from the earliest ages went hand in hand. The pagan priests of India, China, Egypt and Chaldea were the keepers of all astronomical knowledge, and used the flat roofs of their temples as observatories; and in the higher dispensation of Christian civilization we find the Church, the supreme teacher, from its first general Council of Nice, where it fixed the starting point for the celebration of Easter, down through the centuries, keeping a watchful eye that month and season should not slip their moorings.

And when the vocal Memnon, awakened by the morning beams of the ever-constant sun, moans out to the gray desert, complainingly it will tell of how little man, with his petty jealousies would change the horology of time, because he failed to observe the finger of the Church, which like the gnomon on the dial keeps an unerring record.

D. O'Sullivan.

Philadelphia.

VIRGINS CONSECRATED TO GOD IN ROME DURING THE FIRST CENTURIES.

When the Gospel was first announced in Rome the Empire was at the summit of its power, and its rule extended over many nationalities, of every degree of civilization and culture. As in the present day we look upon the expanding dominion of the great civilizing powers over barbarous or decayed populations in distant continents, which were unknown to Rome, as a means under Providence for bringing them to a knowledge of Christian Truth, so the destination of Rome, when it was the capital of the world, to be the seat of the earliest activities of the new teaching and the centre from which numberless influences were to radiate for its propagation, is to be regarded as a particular disposition of the same Providence. Rome at that time was rich in intelligence, practical ability, personal courage and endurance, transmitted as an inheritance down a long line of famous ancestors: politics, commerce, industry, literature and the arts drew to Rome the most enterprising and intelligent from the subject provinces. The teachings of the new faith appealed to the better instincts of man's spiritual nature, and it was fitting that they should be presented without delay to those whose higher instincts and development prepared them to accept them. Natural virtues are the substratum of the supernatural; the formation of a perfect Christian follows the bent of individual character, which is not obliterated, but purified by religion and elevated to a sphere which is not nature alone, but nature and grace. The uprightness, the fortitude, the high spirit of a Scipio, a Fabius, a Camillus or a Regulus, and the dignified grace and nobility of a Cornelia were the foundation of the virtue of a Lawrence, a Sebastian, a Cæcilia and a Marcella, examples of the highest forms of Christian heroism. It was the proud boast of the

Roman bravely to do and to bear: becoming a convert to the new faith he was not required to lower his motto.

But the Roman suffered from a great want. He had no religion, if by religion we understand a belief in the being and perfections of God, in man's obligations and responsibilities and in the practical acknowledgment of these in his conduct, regulated by a moral code furnished with sufficient sanction. The moral perceptions of the Romans could only be debased and obscured by their conception of the Divinity as represented in their mythology. Their religious and moral instruction, if we can give it the name, was chiefly influenced by schools of philosophy. Of these the Stoics, and particularly the Epicureans, were the most influential. The Stoics were pantheists, admitting no spiritual as distinguished from material substance. God and Nature they considered to be the same. Man's chief good is to live in harmony with the whole of which he is a part. The Epicureans held that happiness was the supreme good, and consisted in pleasure, the wise man taking care to seek pleasure that endures, not what is transient and may afterwards entail sorrow. The highest expression which these philosophies could give to their ethical principles was the motto, "*Sustine et abstine*," "Bear and forbear." It is apparent that no efficacious system of morality could be drawn from such abstractions. Although they exercised considerable influence on a certain class of cultivated men, they met with little sympathy in the mass of the people. The popular belief was rooted in polytheism, and no moral code by any ingenuity could ever be extracted from that. In all the fabulous hierarchy of the pagan divinities there is not one who ventures to pose as a teacher of morality, by word or example.

The absence of fixed and recognized principles of right and wrong could only have one result, a degradation of the moral sense. It would, however, be a mistake to judge of the condition of Roman society from the accounts given by ancient writers of the profligacy and licentiousness of individuals in high places. Nor are we to take too literally the highly colored pictures of the satirists, when they discourse of the follies and depravity of the women of their day. But it must be admitted that a great degeneracy of morals began to be noted soon after the first century of the Empire. The evils of a long period of peace and the great increase of wealth produced idleness and luxury and many vices in their train, which prepared the decrepitude of the State, masked for some time under a fallacious ostentation of temporal prosperity, to be rudely shattered in the first invasion of the Goths.

All through this process of decay the integrity of ancient manners was still preserved in many Roman houses. Examples of vicious lives are on the surface of every community, and in their notoriety are perpetuated in history; while virtuous lives, passed in obscurity, are seldom recorded. When the first messengers of Christianity came to announce it in the City, they found hospitality and ready audience in this remnant of ancient Roman virtue, eager not only to accept its teachings and conform their lives to its precepts, but capable, too, of appreciating the higher perfection of the Gospel counsels, and brave enough, if the call which does not come to every one, came to them, to obey at once, and generously sacrificing ease and possessions, detach themselves from family and friends, and literally leave father and mother to follow Christ.

The Divine Founder of the Church sets before us two types of venerable womanhood: one modelled in the person of His Virgin Mother, the other in the faithful matrons who followed Him to the last. Imitators of one class and of the other have never failed in the history of the Church. In two parallel lines of uninterrupted descent we have, on one hand bands of sacred virgins, consecrating their hearts and affections and whole being to the service of God, choosing with Mary the better part, and shedding a halo of purity over each succeeding age; and on the other hand matrons like Monica, and Helen, and Clotilda, and Margaret, who in every rank of society, in the retirement and seclusion of their own homes, or amid the activity and splendor of a throne, displayed the perfection of womanhood elevated by Christian virtue. There never was a gap in the succession of the two types; and wherever the Gospel came to be preached, young maidens bore with honor the virginal wreath, and virtuous matrons spread the edification of their example in a holy widowhood. It is of the earliest manifestations of the former type, maidens consecrated to God, in the city of Rome, that we shall now treat. We shall seek these chiefly in the epitaphs, inscriptions and pictorial representations found in the catacombs, illustrated by the contemporary language of ecclesiastical writers of the first three centuries, and later monuments of equal authority, which bring us into the period when monastic life began to take regular organized form in the West. In prosecuting any inquiry among epigraphic and monumental remains of Christian antiquity there is only one field of research, the results of the labors of the Commendatore De Rossi for more than half a century, contained in the volumes of his "Roma Sotterranea," his "Christian Inscriptions," the "Bullettino of Christian Archæology," edited by himself unaided for more than thirty years, and his numberless dissertations published separately, or enriching the Proceedings of Learned Societies in Rome and elsewhere. The mine he explored is doubtless not exhausted, but the present generation cannot hope to see another explorer with his talent, experience and untiring energy, assisted by an unerring instinct always pointing the way to new discoveries, a sure judgment, and a vast, universal erudition. From these sources much of the first part of the present article is substantially drawn. It is also indebted to the valuable study of this particular subject by Monsignor Wilpert,[1] a distinguished scholar of De Rossi, well known for his critical observations on the cemeterial paintings and for several independent discoveries of considerable importance.

In the very incunabula of the patristic writings, fragmentary as they mostly are, allusions are incidentally made to the class of sacred virgins set apart and watched over with special care. St. Ignatius of Antioch salutes them in his epistles to the churches of Smyrna and Philippi.[2] Pseudo-Ignatius tells Hero to guard them "as the Sacrament of Christ."[3] Later we have a succession of appropriate exhortations addressed particularly to them. Tertullian devoted two books to their instruction, one of which is now lost. St. Cyprian wrote for them *De Habitu Virginum,* St. Chrysostom an eloquent treatise. No less than five works of St. Ambrose were composed for them; and St. Jerome found time, in the busy activity of his engagements in Rome and in the engrossing study of the Holy Scriptures in Palestine, to occupy himself in their training and instruction, by word of mouth or by letter: among his Epistles nearly forty are addressed to them.

We need not, therefore, be surprised, when we examine the collections of inscriptions discovered in the subterranean cemeteries of Rome, to find epitaphs to maidens with appellations indicating that they were in a special way vowed and devoted to God. "Virgines sacræ, sanctæ, venerabiles," Sacred, holy, venerable virgins; "Virgines Dei, Christi," Virgins of God, of Christ; "Sponsæ Christi, Domini," Brides of Christ, of the Lord; "Famulæ, Ancillæ Dei, Christi," Servants, Handmaids of God, of Christ; "Templum Dei," God's Temple; "Puella Dei, Grata Deo puella, Puella Deo placita, Virgo sublimis," Maiden pleasing to God, Maiden sublime. These epitaphs all belong to the first four centuries of our era, and as is to be expected, are in perfect harmony with the expressions of veneration and esteem used by contemporary Fathers when they speak of the class of consecrated women. St. Cyprian calls them the flower of the Church's garden, the noblest portion of Christ's flock.[4] St. Athanasius calls them Brides of Christ, and the Empress Helen was proud to serve them at table with her own hands. St. Jerome in a letter to Eustochium addresses her by the style of Lady, for, he says, "that title is due to the Spouse of our Lord."[5]

---

[1] "Die Gottgeweihten Jungfrauen in den ersten Jahrhunderten der Kirche." [2] "Ep. ad Smyrnaeos," xiii. Ad Philipp. v. [3] "Ad Heronen," v. [4] De habitu virginum. [5] Ep. xxii.

It can be easily understood that it was impossible for Christian maidens in time of persecution to live openly in community, under a uniform rule and wearing a distinctive habit. It was in the privacy of their own homes, in the protection of their family, that they passed their lives. Their devotion might be unknown outside this circle; they mingled in the society of their friends, preserving a modest demeanor, without betraying the secret of the King. We may still read the instructions given to them in such difficult circumstances, and the words of warning of St. Cyprian and St. Ambrose, or going farther back, the sterner reproofs of Tertullian. It sometimes happened that they were asked in marriage, and their refusal was the first clue to suspect their religion; and we have historic instances, like those of St. Agnes, St. Agatha and St. Lucy, when pagan suitors resenting their rejection, revenged themselves by denouncing them to the tribunals, which condemned them to death, doubly martyrs, "in una hostia duplex martyrium, pudoris et religionis."

The state of celibacy alone did not give the name and privileges of a sacred virgin. Tertullian distinguishes the "virgines hominum" who are free to marry, from the "virgines Dei" who resolve to consecrate themselves for ever to their heavenly Spouse. As soon as circumstances permitted, a separation into two classes was observed: those who continued to live in their own homes and those who lived in common apart. But for admission to either rank the essential condition was a voluntary act which vowed the maiden to her chosen state. Naturally this promise was contained in a formula, although not always pronounced in public, and Tertullian praises the reserve of the unostentatious virgin, whose consecration is "sibi soli et Deo nota," known to herself alone and to God."[6] There were also two forms of consecration in use, beginning from the earliest times, and continued under one name or another down to the present day: one by simple vow and change of habit, the other by the imposition of the hands of the Bishop and the veil. So early as the second century a public ceremony is mentioned by Tertullian, who with his usual rigor sees danger to the humility of the candidate in the pomp and publicity of the function, and the friendly congratulations that followed. When the act of dedication was private, the virgin was her own consecrator, but the public consecration of virgins was always reserved to the Bishop, although simple priests were allowed to consecrate widows. The solemn profession only took place on great festivals, particularly Easter, when the newly baptized were introduced to the church for the first time. A decree of Pope Gelasius (492-496) appointed the Epiphany,

---

[6] De virg. velandis, xv.

Easter, Pentecost and the feasts of the Apostles for the public ceremony, but permitted vows to be made at any other time in case of dangerous illness, lest those who aspired to this gift should depart without it, "ne sine hoc munere de sæculo exeant."

Before candidates were admitted to this solemn profession, they were obliged to pass a term of probation. Their dispositions were tested by the Bishop, and their acceptance depended on his decision. Previous to the fourth century no particular limit of age was prescribed. This was determined by local custom and the discretion of the Bishop. St. Basil requires the age of sixteen or seventeen. St. Ambrose, while he admits the necessity of caution, is strongly in favor of early vows in the freshness of innocent childhood, and concludes: "Nolite, ergo, a Christo arcere infantes. Vocat eos Dominus, et tu prohibes?" St. Jerome says that at the age of seven the youthful virgin should begin to learn the psalter by heart. At that age, of course, she had received only the first consecration. For the second consecration a council of Carthage prescribed the age of twenty. Other early particular councils fixed it at twenty-five, and subsequent canons raised it to forty. To trace later fluctuations would carry us beyond the period under review. Examples of consecration at ten, twelve, fourteen and sixteen years are attested by epitaphs in the catacombs. St. Agnes and St. Soteris, St. Eustochium and Demetrias were dedicated when ten years old. Even tender children were sometimes promised to God in their infancy, subject to their own ratification when they came to years of discretion. Among inscriptions to children dedicated and dying in their infancy, we have one to Severa, a child of nine, one to Olympia, "Ancilla Dei," handmaid of God, a child of five, and another to an infant three years old, a victim offered to God, "Hostia dicata Deo." Dedications at this tender age must not have been rare, for we read in the writings of several of the Fathers instructions to parents for the education of children so set apart. From a variety of provident dispositions ordained by the Church on this important subject we glean that while parental authority was respected, and its consent usually required before solemn profession, care was also taken to prevent a child being forced to embrace the state against her inclination. On the other hand, examples are not wanting of maidens, who, then as now, had to wait long to obtain the consent of their parents or guardians. We are told that they were often threatened with the loss of their inheritance, and St. Jerome, who let nothing escape him, says that in his day mothers could be found ready enough to part with ungainly daughters, but bitterly opposed to letting their better favored children enter the cloister. A touching story is related by St. Ambrose of a young lady, "once noble before the world, now nobler before God," who was pressed by her parents and friends to marry, and was at last driven to take refuge from their importunity at the foot of the altar. "What place," says the holy Bishop, "more fit for a virgin than where the virgin sacrifice is offered? She dared yet more; for she first seized the hand of the priest and pressed it on her own head, to invoke the blessing of his prayers, then she hid her head under the sacred table anl cried: "What can protect me better than my veil, except the altar itself, which sanctifies the veil?"[7]

The veil was the chief distinction of a virgin. It was called "Velum, velamen, flammeus, mitra, mitella," and the expressions "Velare, velum accipere" described the ceremony which accompanied the act of profession. It was given to the candidate when she pronounced her vow, with the solemn words of the Bishop: "Receive, daughter, the sacred veil, and carry it without spot before the judgment seat of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom every knee doth bow." The veil was sometimes ornamented, usually with two purple bands or links of *calliculæ*, or embroidered circles, from end to end along its length. Many representations of virgins veiled in this manner are to be seen in the catacombs, some painted on the walls, others carved on the tombstones; and frequent mention of the veil itself is made in the epitaphs. There is a very touching one on the grave of a certain Juliana, who was admitted to her vows on her death-bed:

Hanc dum corporei premerent vicinia leti,
Sponsa diu nubit sacra vela Deo.

The veil was worn by those who made their vows in private as well as by those who made them in the Bishop's hands. Both were under the same obligations, but while infraction of a simple vow was visited by severe canonical penalties, infidelity after receiving the consecration of a Bishop was punished by perpetual excommunication, only relaxed at the hour of death.

Besides the veil, which was of wool, the Christian virgin wore nothing distinctive before the middle of the fourth century. About the year 350 the ordinary dress was exchanged on profession for the sacred habit, "Habitus Deo dicatus." This consisted in a tunic or stola of coarse material unadorned, of a dark grey color, "pulla tunica," with a dusky cloak, "furvo pallio," to be thrown over it when necessary. It was the dress of the lower orders, in striking contrast with the bright garments of purple and gold worn by ladies. The habit was presented to the virgin at her consecration with these words, as we find them in St. Ambrose: "Take this garment and put on Christ; and be renewed in His understanding. Do thou, therefore, as Christ's chosen one, put on mercy, sweetness, humility, modesty, charity, which is the bond of unity."

---

[7] De Virg. xi.

Beneath the veil the virgin wore her hair unshorn, "intonsos capillos." The custom of cutting off the hair was long unknown in the West, although it was occasionally practised in the spirit of penance, and was not introduced into the ceremonial of profession until long after the time of St. Jerome and the first regular monasteries of Rome. That saint tells us in one of his letters that in Syria and Egypt it was the custom for virgins at their profession to offer their tresses to be cut off by the mother of the monastery.

No ring was given to the bride at her consecration. Martène can find no ancient testimony for this rite, now inseparable in our minds from the solemn and final profession of a nun. There is no trace of it in any of the ancient sacramentaries. St. Germanus of Auxerre forbade St. Geneviève to wear any sort of ornament either hanging from the neck or on the hand. The oldest reference to such a rite is an account of the consecration of some nuns by St. Bernward of Hildesheim (ob. 1022), who placed crowns upon their heads and rings on their fingers."[8]

The consecration took place in presence of the faithful in full assembly during the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice. After the Collect, or after the Lesson, the Archdeacon led the candidates to the altar and presented them to the Bishop, who addressed to them a suitable discourse.[9] After a prayer made by the Bishop, the virgin pronounced the formula of her vow, the Bishop laid his hands on her head with another prayer and placed the veil over her, the whole congregation as witnesses of the solemn act responding Amen. Mass was then resumed and the virgin received Holy Communion; at the end the Bishop consigned all who had received the veil to the care of their parents or guardians, if they were to live at home, or to the superior, the "mater monasterii," if they were to live with others in common. The Bishop accompanied this act with a solemn admonition to the guardians on the sacred charge committed to them over the newly consecrated, of whom an account would have to be rendered at the tribunal of Christ, the Judge, their Spouse.

In the cemetery of Priscilla we have a pictorial representation of the veiling of a virgin. In one of the most ancient chambers of that cemetery, which itself dates from the end of the first century, in a lunette over a tomb a venerable grey-haired man is seated on a chair of state. In front of him a youthful female figure stands erect, holding in her hand what looks like a white linen veil. Somewhat behind, in attendance on the seated personage, a man is holding a tunic. We have here a Bishop, with his deacon, and a maiden about to receive the sacred veil. On the opposite side of the lunette the Virgin Mother is seated with the Divine Infant in her arms. Towards this group the Bishop is pointing, as if saying to the candidate: "My child, there is your model." In the centre, between the two groups, is a solitary figure of the now consecrated virgin, veiled, and vested in a gorgeous robe, the virginal tunic, richly embroidered, with hands stretched out in the attitude of prayer; a veiled nun, "Virgo velata," in the splendor of her immortal reward.

---

[8] Martène, De antiq. Eccl. ritib. Vol. II., l. ii., c. vi. [9] Saint Ambrose has preserved for us the discourse delivered by Pope Liberius in St. Peter's at the midnight Mass of Christmas, when St. Marcellina received the veil. (De Virg. ad Marcellinam sororem, l. i., c. iii.)

In the Ostrian cemetery there is a fresco allusive to the parable of the virgins. In the lunette of an arcosolium, divided into three compartments, we are shown in the centre an orante, the virgin occupant of the tomb; in the compartment to her left, the five wise virgins bearing lighted torches; in the compartment to her right, the five virgins seated at the marriage feast.

A more remarkable fresco introducing the same parable was discovered in 1863. Unfortunately it no longer exists. The Campo Santo or modern graveyard of Rome extends over the site of the ancient cemetery of Cyriaca, *in agro Verano,* which surrounds the extra mural basilica of St. Lawrence. During operations for enlarging the burial ground, in the hill behind the basilica, the workmen came upon many galleries and sepulchral chambers of the ancient catacomb, which were ruthlessly destroyed. Among the frescoes which perished was one that adorned the grave of a sacred virgin. In the arcosolium of the tomb our Lord was placed between two groups, on the right five virgins, on the left other five. They are ranged symmetrically in two rows on either side. All are youthful and clothed alike, in a long flowing tunic reaching to the feet, with short but ample sleeves. The virgins on our Lord's right hold torches in their right hands, the others in their left. The torches of the first group are burning and rest on their shoulders; the torches of the others are extinguished and turned towards the ground. We cannot doubt the meaning of the fresco: it is again the parable of the wise and foolish virgins, with our Lord in the midst: "Behold the Bridegroom cometh." Lower down, on the face of the wall enclosing the tomb, another scene was painted. From side to side a rod is stretched on which a curtain hangs, divided in the middle and held apart by two youths, one on each side. In the opening of the curtain a maiden is standing, robed in a rich tunic and wearing a veil. Her hands are stretched out as an orante. This was certainly the grave of a sacred virgin; the parable has already indicated it, and in this second scene the virgin is admitted into the heavenly court. In ancient records and in the Acts of the Martyrs mention is often made of the *velum* or curtain which separated the body of the judgment hall from the inner tribunal, *secretarium,* where the judges sat. In courts there was sometimes an inner besides an outer veil, and so also in the audience chambers of princes and magistrates: it was the custom for the judge to retire within the veil to dictate the sentence. To stand within the veil was therefore to be in the immediate presence of the supreme judge, and accordingly the maiden introduced by the two youths represents a soul which has been judged, and is now by the favor of her heavenly advocates received into the dwelling and into the company of God.

The same cemetery is singularly associated with the rise of religious life in Rome. During the restoration of the neighboring basilica under Pope Pius IX. many interesting remains and fragments of important inscriptions were brought to light, and still further illustrated by the discoveries that continued to be made as the extension of the Campo Santo proceeded. About fifty epitaphs originally taken from the ancient catacomb and from the Christian cemetery which in the fourth and fifth century superseded the subterranean galleries gradually disused, were recovered. What at once struck those directing the work was the extraordinary number of epitaphs to sacred virgins found among the rest. Out of fifty inscriptions excavated five belong to that class, ten per cent. of the whole, a proportion far exceeding anything found in similar collections of epitaphs. In a situation almost identical around the basilica of St. Paul, out of a thousand epitaphs only six belonged to graves of sacred virgins, a proportion of little more than half per cent. There must have been some special reason for the interment of so many in this particular cemetery near St. Lawrence's, and the most probable explanation is that there existed in the immediate vicinity of the basilica, at the date of these inscriptions, a community of religious women, one of the "monasteria suburbana" that we read of in the correspondence of St. Jerome. The dated inscriptions found at this spot are all of the fourth and fifth centuries, a time, as we shall see later, when regular community life for women had come to be fully recognized in Rome.

The oldest of the inscriptions found in this group of Cyriaca, and bearing a consular date, is of the year 381. It is to Rufina, who lived twenty-one years. The next is to Lavinia, "Virgo Dei inimitabilis." Without date, but belonging to the same period, is an epitaph to Nigella, another to Victoria and the following, which is remarkable for its diction:

ADEODATÆ DIGNÆ ET MERITÆ VIRGINI
ET QUIESCIT HIC IN PACE JUBENTE CHRISTO EJUS.[10]

The original is in the Lateran museum. In the centre of the slab is a *crux hastata,* a cross encircled by a wreath, supported on a fluted column, under a canopy, with the inscription carved on two small tablets right and left of the cross. It marked the grave of the virgin Adeodata, who departed this life "at the call of Christ her Spouse." In digging the foundations of the entrance to the Campo Santo an epitaph of 434 was found, and in the same place the following inscription:

QUIESCIT IN PACE PRÆTEXTATA
VIRGO SACRA DEPOSITA D. VII
ID. AUG. CONS. RUSTICI ET OLYBRI.

The consulate fixes the date in 464. The Prætextata to whom it is inscribed is mentioned in another epitaph of unknown origin, which long lay at Santa Sabina on the Aventine, and is now in the Lateran museum. She was in all probability a daughter or near relation of Prætextatus, who was Prefect of the Palace in 472. The absence of the epithet *clarissima* is no difficulty, for it was considered unbecoming to give titles of nobility on their epitaphs to those who had relinquished for God their honors and position in the world. "Neminem Christianum decet, et maxime virginem non decet claritatem ullam computare carnis et honorum." It is unbecoming for a Christian, and especially a virgin, a nun, to parade her descent and rank.[11] We know that the Prefect was a Christian and died in 472, and that a daughter of his, also a Christian, died in 486. About a hundred years before there was a Vettius Agorius Prætextatus, prominent among the last champions of expiring paganism, and a determined enemy of Pope Damasus.[12] The prestige of the pontificate was already beginning to overshadow the representatives of imperial authority in the city, and in one of his altercations with the Pope, who was pressing him to embrace the Christian faith, the Prefect exclaimed: "Make me Bishop of Rome, and I will become a Christian." Another Prætextata, a member of the same family and a contemporary of St. Damasus, wife of Festus Julius Hymetius, pro-consul in Africa, distinguished herself by her opposition to the celebrated virgin Eustochium when she wished to take the veil. To find a hundred years later a Prætextata, a sacred virgin, among the descendants of these bitter enemies of Christianity, need not surprise us; it is a proof of the sincerity of the conversions wrought in those noble houses, for nothing could be more repugnant to the traditional notions of that class than the humility and renunciation of a Christian life of sacrifice.

Another inscription from the cemetery of Cyriaca suggests a very interesting inquiry. It is in verse:

CLAUDIA NOBILIUM PROLIS GENEROSA PARENTUM
HIC JACET HINC ANIMA IN CARNE REDEUNTE RESURGET
ÆTERNIS CHRISTI MUNERE DIGNA BONIS.[13]

---

[10] De Rossi, Bulletino, 1863, p. 77. [11] S. Cyprian. De Habitu virg. 6. [12] S. Hieron. Contra Joan. Hierosol, 8.

The Commendatore De Rossi at once associated the Claudia of this epitaph with a vestal of the same name, who became a Christian and retired to an *ascceterium* or monastery near the basilica of St. Lawrence. Prudentius alludes to her in the lines:

Vittatus olim pontifex
Ascitur in signum crucis,
Ædemque, Laurenti, tuam
Vestalis intrat Claudia.[14]

The epitaph and the verses seem to throw light on a discovery made in 1883 in the heart of the Forum. In the atrium or court of the House of the Vestals a series of pedestals may still be seen, mostly denuded of the statues which they once supported, but retaining inscriptions recording the merits and virtues of the most distinguished high-priestesses in the succession. One of these pedestals attracts attention by the evidently deliberate abrasion of the name of the dignitary to whom it had been inscribed. The epitaph reads:

OB MERITUM CASTITATIS
PUDICITIÆ ADQ. IN SACRIS
RELIGIONIBUSQUE
DOCTRINÆ MIRABILIS
. . . . . E V.V. MAX.
PONTIFICES VV. CC.
PROMAG. MACRINIO
ROSSIANO V. C. P. M.

On the base of the pedestal is the date of the dedication: V. IDUS JUNIAS DIVO JOVIANO ET VARRONIANO CONSS. That is A. D. 364. In that year therefore the College of Pontiffs dedicated a statue in honor of a priestess, whose memory for some reason came to be execrated and her name cancelled from the inscription, in conformity with the law *De memoriæ damnatione*. Quite recently a further discovery was made at a short distance from the pedestal, under the pavement of the atrium, of a buried statue evidently placed there for concealment, similar in every respect to the other statues of vestals, but decapitated, in all probability the maimed effigy of the condemned priestess. Professor Marucchi was the first to suggest the opinion, now commonly accepted, that the vestal was condemned on account of her conversion to Christianity. Whatever her offense was it must have been committed after 364, the date of the inscription which records the esteem in which she was held for her virtues and for her faithful service of the goddess. In that year Rome was on the eve of the final struggle between paganism and Christianity. As is well known, the ancient superstition and idolatrous worship did not at once cease when Constantine emancipated the Church from the penal legislation of his predecessors, and

---

[13] De Rossi. Inscript. II. Bullettino, 1881, p. 19. [14] Peristeph, II., vv. 525 sqq.

Rome itself became the chief centre of resistance to the encroachments of the new religion. Its numerous temples, in the magnificence of their structure, and rich abundance of memories of the glorious past connected with their history, were made to appeal to the gratitude of the Romans to keep them loyal to the gods. The last defenders of paganism strove to exalt in the popular mind its political importance and identify its preservation with the continued prosperity of the State. Among all the heathen sanctuaries of the city, no one more aptly and visibly represented this sentiment than the shrine and temple of Vesta. There, in the keeping of the six vestal virgins, themselves under the jurisdiction of the College of Pontiffs, presided over by the Pontifex Maximus, the Palladium, symbol of the safety and prosperity of the Eternal City, was guarded. This explains how it happened that the worship of Vesta was publicly maintained down to the latest years of the fourth century, and how even the title of Pontifex Maximus was retained by Constantine and his successors till Gratian indignantly refused its insignia. It may be said with perfect truth that it was only after the last spark of the sacred fire was extinguished on the altar in the Forum that paganism confessed itself overthrown.

When paganism was passing through this crisis, many of its priests made their submission to the Church, and the frequency of conversions from their ranks is evident from the lines of Prudentius quoted above. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the poet's allusion to a vestal who became an inmate of a community of Christian virgins, living in the neighborhood of St. Lawrence's basilica, should receive confirmation both from inscriptions found close to the church and from the ruins of the Vestals' court in the Roman Forum. For the defaced statue and mutilated inscription—evidence of a *memoriæ damnatio*, attaching infamy to the name of a high priestess of Vesta, in the period of religious change—and the contemporary record of the poet, all point to a conversion from paganism to the faith, as the offense visited by the execration of the vestal's name. Supposing this to have been the offense, it was natural for the Pontiffs, ardent supporters of idolatry, to mark their protest against this latest victory of the new religion in the only way now in their power; they could not punish her defection in her person, but they did all they could to obliterate her memory or render it infamous to the surviving votaries of paganism by cancelling her name from the monumental roll of Vesta's high priestesses.[15]

If the Vestal, whose memory after such high encomium on her modesty and integrity of life and religious observance of her duties in the temple of a pagan worship, was so utterly anathematized by the Pontiffs, is not to be identified with the Claudia celebrated by Prudentius, at all events we have the evidence of the poet that one, at least, of the Vestal Sisterhood exchanged a life of noble self-sacrifice to a false ideal for a life dedicated to the service of the Divine Spouse of virgin souls in the end of the fourth century of our era.

---

[15] The college of Vestals was finally abolished by Theodosius the Great, at the end of the fourth century.

Our retrospect has brought us down from Apostolic times through the stormy period of persecution into the first century of the Church's freedom. Before the third decade of the era of peace had closed the institution of sacred virgins, associated together under a common roof, with a common discipline, obeying a superior, the "Mater monasterii," was already established and began to spread, not in Rome alone, but over all the provinces of the Empire. It is to be remarked, however, that the marvelous development of monastic life after the peace was not a simple outgrowth of fervor born of the happier conditions of the Church, but likewise a protest of earnest souls against threatening relaxation. For the Church issuing from persecution found herself exposed to a new danger. Paganism, practically overcome, sought to avenge itself by every means in its power. Its spirit was still strong in a variety of institutions, customs and laws. The upper classes, degenerate, selfish and servile, sought satisfaction in unbridled luxury. All this must have had a pernicious effect on Christian society, numbers were contaminated and the Church had to bewail many scandals. This deplorable condition was not that of Rome only, but of every province where the officials, civil and military, had introduced the manners and vices of the capital.

Against the deterioration that menaced the Christian community a reaction first began in the East. The great monastic creations of Egypt and Palestine opposed to the invading corruption an exhibition of self-denial and marvels of penitential austerity. The revival was taken up in Rome, and in a most unexpected quarter, the homes of the aristocracy; and the signal was given by women. Interest in the religious movement of the East was first roused by St. Athanasius, three times exiled from Alexandria and three times a fugitive in Rome. He had spent seven years in the Thebaid, where he had intimately known the great pioneers of the cenobitic life, Antony, Pachomius and Hilarion. Full of what he had witnessed in the desert, he gave glowing accounts of St. Antony, which seized the imagination of his friends and spread over the West the fame of monasticism. During one of his visits to Rome he was the guest of Albina, sister of the pagan Pontiff Albinus, but herself a Christian. She had a daughter Marcella, an ardent enthusiastic character, on whom the conversation of Athanasius made a deep impression. She wished at once to devote herself to a life after the examples he described, but having been previously engaged, out of deference to her mother, she consented to marry. In seven months she was a widow. Many suitors sought her hand, and in particular the Senator Cerealis, one of the foremost men in the State, allied to the family of Constantine; but she firmly declined every offer. She cut herself off from society and lived retired in her house on the Aventine, which she made her solitude and never left unless to visit the poor or pray in the churches, accompanied by her mother. She laid aside her jewels and accustomed dress, and was the first patrician lady to give the example of publicly wearing the despised plebeian garb of the monastic profession. For a time her singularity was decried, but soon she had a crowd of imitators. A stimulus was given to the movement by the example of Melania, another noble lady, daughter of Marcellus, Consul in 341, who losing her husband and two of her children in one year, made provision for her surviving son and started for the East. She saw St. Athanasius in Alexandria, visited many of the monasteries of Egypt, went to Palestine and built a monastery on the Mount of Olives, where with other devout companions she led a life of great austerity. Of her imitators in Rome some continued to live in their own houses, like the widows and virgins of the first centuries, others preferred companionship and began a sort of community life without as yet any fixed rule. The centre of these religious establishments, the first convents of Rome, was the house of Marcella.

The history of the primitive community on the Aventine can be clearly traced from its first inspiration in 341 for nearly seventy years to 410, when Marcella, in extreme old age, was called to her reward. That this first foundress possessed in a singular degree all the gifts that qualify for direction, St. Jerome's letters leave us in no doubt. Brilliant mental power, coupled with energy and untiring devotion, alone do not explain her success; she had from God also the grace of an irresistible attraction. Her penetration perceived the dispositions and bent of each of her children; she quickly won their confidence; her prudent counsel, now used to restrain, now to urge on, moulded them to her will, and always with the gentle persuasive hand of a mother, setting the model in the community of the Aventine of that religious family spirit which in the not distant future was to be the bond of union and the mainspring of all their power in the monastic communities that arose and spread under the legislation of St. Benedict.

The rule followed was an application of the observance in the monasteries of the Desert. The occupations of the inmates were prayer, study and labor. The foundations of the life were obedience, poverty and chastity. The order of their day may be gathered from what St. Jerome tells us in his life of St. Paula. They were called in the morning by the chant of Alleluia, and an immediate response was expected from all; the first arrivals hastening to the office which was to begin the day, waiting for the others, and modestly challenging by their example the promptness of the rest. At early morning, at tierce, at sext, at none, in the evening and in the middle of the night they sang the psalms in order. Every Sister had to know the Psalter and learn a portion of Scripture each day. Only on Sundays they went to church, and then processionally. It was close at hand, and a separate portion was reserved for their use. Each group was accompanied by its own Mother, and when they returned, in the same order, they resumed the work assigned to each. No one was allowed to have an attendant; all wore the same garb. If any one came late for the psalms or was remiss in her work she was corrected. Besides food and raiment nothing was allowed to any one. The Mother composed their little differences, imposed a rigorous fast on the unmortified, rebuked any rising vanity. Those who gave trouble with their tongue, the forward and quarrelsome she admonished once and again; the incorrigible were put last among the Sisters, made to kneel in penance at the door of the refectory and take their food alone.[16]

Among the companions of Marcella in this work was Marcellina, daughter of a former Governor of Gaul and sister of two famous brothers, Ambrose, the youthful Prefect of Liguria, chosen to be Archbishop of Milan, and Satyrus, immortalized by his brother's eloquent affection. The mother of these three children came to establish herself in Rome on the death of her husband. Marcellina, attracted to the religious life by the dominant spirit, received the veil from the hands of Pope Liberius on Christmas night in the basilica of St. Peter, in the year 352. She lived in her mother's house, and under her care the two holy brothers grew up. An ancient tradition fixes the site of the family mansion at the monastery and Church of St. Ambrose, in Massima. On the death of her mother Marcellina began to frequent the Aventine, taking part with Marcella's children in the religious exercises and studies of Holy Scripture which busily occupied them, and when St. Ambrose, in the See of Milan, became the eloquent apologist of the virginal life which his sister followed, she persuaded him to send a transcript of his discourses to Rome for the edification of her companions in religion. It is to the pious importunity of Marcellina that the Church owes the admirable treatise of the great Doctor on the high state of holy virginity. So persuasive were these discourses that the mothers of

---

[16] Hieron, In vita Paulæ, 19.

Milan were afraid to let their daughters assist at their delivery. Marcellina afterwards joined her brother at Milan, continuing her life of retirement and prayer under his direction, and surviving him barely a year, followed him to her reward in 398.

Another imitator of these holy examples was Asella. She was ten years old at the time of St. Athanasius' last visit to Rome, and was drawn under the spell of his influence to emulate the heroines he described. Her parents would not allow her to put on the sombre garb of her choice, but one day she contrived to sell a gold necklace which had been given her to wear, and with the price purchased a dark habit, which she put on and presented herself in the midst of her family. She was made to wait two years for her consecration. "Then," as St. Jerome tells us, "this child of twelve, nurtured in luxury and accustomed to every delicate attention, began to shut herself up in her chamber away from the eyes of all, only going out in the strictest privacy to visit the martyrs' tombs, making a desert for herself in her seclusion. Her bed was the bare ground, her days were spent in prayer, psalms and manual work. Fasting was a pleasure to her; bread and salt, with water, was all her food. She fasted all the year, at times for two or three days together, and in Lent for a week. Yet she reached the age of fifty without an ailment, sound in body and spirit, bright and joyous, grave at once and amiable, simple without affectation. Her silence was speech, her speech silence; she was always even-tempered, neat, but disdaining elegance, refined without study. Such was Asella, a pearl prized by Rome for its worth, the ornament and veneration of her sex; maidens, widows and women of the world vied with each other in their demonstrations of respect."[17]

Space will not now permit more than an allusion to the many other companions of Marcella who pass before us in the pages of St. Jerome. Most of them joined her in the freshness and innocence of youth, some after disappointment and sorrow. Lea, a noble widow, after a life of distraction, renounced the world, surrounded herself with a band of kindred souls and founded a community on the lines traced by Marcella, who took it under her care after her death and established it in one of her suburban villas converted into a monastery. Fabiola, another matron of the highest rank, to expiate a fault of inexperience, conquered the repugnance of her proud Fabian blood and humbled herself prostrate on the pavement of the Lateran basilica, in sight of the full assembly, to implore the absolution of Pope Damasus, and then withdrew to spend the rest of her days among the Sisters of the Aventine and rival with them in austerity and good works.

---

[17] Ep. xxiv. De laudibus Asellæ.

Highest of all in the esteem of St. Jerome were Paula and her daughter Eustochium. He can find no words to praise Paula as she deserves. Born in 347 of an ancient Christian family, she was carefully brought up under the combined influence of the old Roman spirit and the primitive Christian tradition. At fifteen years of age she was given in marriage, but her real history begins with her widowhood, in her thirtieth year. She accepted that state in its Christian sense, understood God's call and put herself in the hands of Marcella. She, stricken herself in her youth by the same calamity, found without effort words to rouse the spark of Paula's inspiration into a flame. The transformation of her life was sudden and complete. She assumed the insignia of widowhood, never more to put them aside. She prolonged her prayer far into the night; her happiness was to chant psalms with Marcella's virgins in the oratory of the Aventine. Accustomed as she had been to be borne in a litter by attendant slaves, who never allowed her feet to touch the dust of the streets, she now went out alone or in the company of a fellow-worker in charity to visit the slums of the Esquiline and the Suburra and alleviate the misery of the poor. We have learned to feel no surprise at a heroism with which the lives of the saints has familiarized us, and the daily self-sacrifice of delicately nurtured women, voluntarily devoted to the meanest offices in the various forms of religious vocation, keeps it constantly before our eyes; but it was a new and a strange example in the selfish, hard and disdainful society of aristocratic Rome.

Paula did not neglect her duties as mother of five orphan children. Marcella took into her house one of the younger daughters, Eustochium, already drawn to a life of consecration. The eldest, Blesilla, for a time gave her considerable anxiety, but her mother's prayers and patience were rewarded in the end. Her other children, a son and two daughters, she saw safely settled in life. Eustochium, sweetness and candor itself, a pearl of innocence and piety, bound to her mother by a most affectionate love, let herself be moulded by her. When Marcella received her from her mother she kept her in her own chamber, and when she was fully mature for the important step, she was presented to Pope Damasus to receive the veil at his hands. She was then about fourteeen years old. After she received the veil she was consigned again to the care of her mother. A conspiracy among her pagan relations was now formed to thwart her vocation. Under some pretext she was conducted to the house of her aunt Prætextata, heaped with attentions, supplied with slaves, fine garments and other allurements and presented to the assembled guests. Eustochium bore all without remonstrance till evening, when she quietly changed her dress, putting on again her black habit, and went home to her mother. Although she lived outside the community, she was in daily intercourse with Marcella and assiduously followed the instructions of her children.

About this time, A. D. 382, St. Jerome arrived in Rome in the company of two Oriental Bishops, who were entertained in the house of Paula. He had heard of Marcella, but he kept aloof, and in his somewhat unsocial reserve never visited the ladies on the Aventine. There was nothing they desired so much as to benefit by the learning of the austere monk who bore the desert in his countenance and whose experience in the life they had undertaken would be so helpful for their training. It fell to Marcella to approach St. Jerome. He excused himself. Marcella redoubled her entreaties and prevailed on Pope Damasus to interpose his authority. Jerome was vanquished and agreed to begin his lectures on Holy Scripture. The joy of the community was great, and virgins who lived in their own houses in the city crowded to hear his lessons.

The instructions of the saint bore directly on the chief occupation of those lives. This work was prayer, which drew its inspiration from Scripture, as the liturgical prayer of the Church did from the beginning, uttering its canticles of joy and praise in the accents of the Holy Spirit. Such prayer, to be perfect, must be coupled with an intelligence of the words in their source, and accordingly St. Jerome exhorted his pupils to a profound study of Scripture, especially of the Psalter. He taught them not to be satisfied with a superficial glance, but critically to analyze all they read. "Intelligas Scripturæ in omnibus sacramentum: margarita quippe est sermo Dei, et exomni parte forari potest."[18] "Totum quod legimus in divinis libris nitet et fulget quidem in cortice, sed dulcius in medulla est. Qui edere vult nucleum, frangat nucem."[19] From the letters of the holy Doctor we are enabled almost to assist at these memorable lessons. He read a text, then commented on its literal sense; on that he built his interpretations; and then, putting together literal and allegorical meanings, drew his applications in unexpected and beautiful surprises. He put in evidence the parallel relation of the two Testaments, and showed how our Lord Jesus Christ was portrayed in both. From the figures he gathered practical truths and practical applications for the life of every day. His auditory was ravished. Jerome discoursed with fire; but newly arrived as he was from the East and for ten years away from his studies, he excused his uncouth accent and his rusty Latin, putting part of the blame on the troublesome Hebrew sounds over which he had labored so long. But all this rather added to the charm of the speaker, with his ready tempestuous eloquence and his very exterior and habit of a monk, his austere aspect worn by penance and bronzed by the sun of Asia. As the fame of these lectures came to spread abroad they were attended by many of the most distinguished priests of Rome, as Domnian and Oceanus, and even fervent laymen like Pammachius the Senator, who had been a schoolfellow of Jerome. But the lectures were addressed to Marcella's nuns, and to them his attention was devoted. Nothing is more touching than the glimpses his letters afford of the familiarity, full of confidence and respect, the pure friendship, the ardor and docility of his audience and the industry and devoted care of the austere monk to assist them in their study.

---

[18] Hieron. Ad. Eustoch

[19] Id. Ep. xlix. Ad. Paulin.

They were not content with his simple statement or to stop at his first explanations. They asked for his reasons and pressed him with new questions. St. Jerome had sometimes to confess that he was not ready with his answer, but they gave him no peace till he had satisfied them. After finding a reason he would sometimes only give half an answer to stimulate their curiosity, and let them find out the rest for themselves. A messenger would arrive at St. Jerome's lodging next morning from Marcella, bringing a fresh list of queries requiring an immediate answer. It happened more than once that the saint, busy with his revision of Holy Scripture or in his refutations of heresy or in official work for St. Damasus, could not spare a moment to reply till, finding that the messenger had been kept waiting all day, he stole an hour from his sleep and dictated his answer by the light of his lamp. At other times, after an oral explanation, they would insist on having it in writing; and more than one of the little treatises that were composed on these occasions have been preserved. These tracts were passed from one to another; St. Jerome intended them for all. One day he wrote to Marcella: "Here are two letters which I am sending to Paula and Eustochium. What I say to them is for you all." In a letter to Paula he tells her to be sure she shows it to Marcella. Marcella was indeed indefatigable in her application; she seemed never to be satisfied. Commenting one day on the psalm *Qui habitat in adjutorio Altissimi, in protectione Dei coeli commorabitur,* St. Jerome had remarked that the expression "Dei coeli," translated from the Hebrew Chaddai, was one of the ten names which God gives to Himself in Scripture. Marcella immediately asked what were those ten names and what they signified, and the saint next day sent her the explanation which we now have in treatise *De decem nominibus Dei.* Another time he was commenting a passage where there were some Hebrew words which the Seventy Interpreters had left in their original. Marcella requested an explanation. St. Jerome gave it, but not so complete as Marcella desired. He was busy at the time over the Greek text of Aquila, and neglected the two words Ephod and Theraphim, because he did not want to be drawn into a long description of the priestly vestments. Marcella attacked him when he next came to the Aventine, and got her explanation. Still next day she wrote again to St. Jerome, sending her note by a messenger with instructions not to come back without an answer. In reply he wrote a letter beginning in a bantering way by complaining that Marcella, deep in her own studies, could not write a line to him that did not give him plenty of work and force to read once more his Bible. He then proceeds to give a complete explanation of the mysterious signification of each vestment of the High Priest.

The most ardent of his pupils, more penetrating even than Marcella, was Paula. She found in Holy Scripture all that could console, strengthen and enlighten her, and plunged into it with all her native energy. She was delighted at her own discoveries; hidden meanings came to surprise her in a passage which she had read twenty times before without discovering them. The exegesis of St. Jerome charmed her, and she pressed him more and more with her questions. "In vain," he says, "I tried to resist. I had to yield and resign myself to teach her what I had learned from the great masters of the Church. When sometimes I hesitated and professed my ignorance, that did not save me. Paula required me to say at least what other commentators thought, and tell her what interpretation satisfied me best." Comprehending that the key to the interpretation of Scripture is the language in which it is written, Paula did not shrink from the study of Hebrew. "I confess," St. Jerome says, "that the Hebrew language, which cost me so much labor in my youth and which I am still compelled to study every day not to forget what I have learned, was mastered by Paula with such success that she spoke it with purity, and could recite all the psalms in Hebrew, as did also her daughter Eustochium."

What was of chief importance to his pupils was the Psalter, those hymns into which David poured all his joys, his tears, his aspirations, his enthusiasm, and which lend themselves to express every emotion of the human heart, becoming the everlasting poetry, the eternal voice of the soul's prayer. St. Jerome made Marcella and her daughters give to them a special study, in their literal, spiritual and prophetic sense. He taught them to chant the psalms in alternate verses from opposite sides, a custom he had learned in the East. He introduced the frequent use of Alleluia, which the Roman Church reserved for Easter. In a letter to Læta, daughter-in-law of Paula, he lays down the order in which he desires the sacred books to be taken. "First let them learn well the Psalms, then draw lessons of life from the Proverbs of Solomon. Let them learn patience from Job, then take up the Gospels, which are never to be laid aside. After these the Epistles of the Apostles, then the Prophets and historical books of the Old Testament. Last of all they may read the Canticle." The saint was most particular about the reading he allowed to the nuns. Only authors generally approved were permitted. He recommended the works of Origen, Ambrose, Athanasius, Tertullian, Cyprian and Hilary. But when Marcella wanted to read a commentary of Rheticus, Bishop of Autun, which contained some doubtful matter, for the sake of certain brilliant passages, he forbade her: "Non necesse habes aurum in luto quærere."[20]

From this remarkable programme we see that the piety which St. Jerome recommended to religious was not narrow and unintelligent, but broad and enlightened. He had no patience for the dull rusticity that in his time some mistook for holy simplicity. "Sancta rusticitas sibi soli prodest." Holy rusticity only profits itself. His mission in Rome for the three years of his stay was to make the movement begun by Marcella and her companions an engine to oppose the corruption and excess of pagan degradation and to direct and defend the chosen souls who had started in pursuit of the Christian ideal. He had all the necessary qualities for the work. Besides being a master in the Scriptures, the Doctor Maximus, he was a still greater master in the spiritual life, a director of souls. He was one of those great minds that are filled with sadness at the sight of human miseries, with disgust at everything perishable and aspirations after the infinite and eternal. The times in which he lived brought into strong relief all that can strengthen such impressions. The Roman world was perishing before his eyes, the barbarians were at the gates. "Romanus orbis ruit."[21] What he had seized with his powerful intellect was not so much the dogma and metaphysics of the Christian faith as its practical applications in the moral life. He had seen its force in the victories over sense that he admired in the solitaries of the East and that cost himself so much; and he came to Rome an impassioned propagator of the sublime virtues which are commanded to no one, but yet are the natural outcome of the highest tendencies of Christianity and the perfection of its spirit.

A movement of this kind naturally met with opposition. It came from all enemies of religious life and was not confined to the pagan faction. Its bitterest opponents were to be found in the ranks of a portion of the Roman clergy. St. Jerome had provoked their venom by his vigorous denunciations of the irregular lives of worldly priests and false monks who disgraced the habit they wore.[22] Those who recognized themselves in his scathing portraits turned upon him and attacked him in chorus, posing as martyrs of his defamation and heaping back on him accusations of the basest kind. They did not dare directly to attack the institution on the Aventine, they contented themselves with vilifying its director. A personality like St. Jerome's is never safe from the envy and hatred of mediocrity. If it possessed every talent of genius and every gift of holiness it would not escape the conspiracy of mean implacable rivalries. These were held somewhat in check during the pontificate of St. Damasus, a true friend of the religious movement and a staunch supporter of St. Jerome. But after his death in 384 the band of intriguers became more audacious and their slanders more odious. The saint, whose absence from his beloved solitude had only been prolonged in deference to the Pope, thought that the time was now come for him to return to the East. Still he would not leave Rome like a guilty fugitive, but as a tired victor who has earned his repose. He penned one of his masterpieces of indignant sarcasm and unmasked without pity the hypocrisy and falsehood of his detractors. This parting manifesto he embodied in a letter to Asella, one of the nuns of the Aventine, concluding with a touching farewell to his spiritual children.

---

[20] Ad Furiam.

[21] Ad Heliodorum, xxxv.

A few months later Paula and Eustochium followed his example and set out for the East. On their arrival in Jerusalem they joined themselves to Melania, the pioneer pilgrim from Rome who had preceded them, and founded the monastery at Bethlehem, where St. Jerome continued the course of instruction he had begun on the Aventine. Marcella herself could never be induced to leave her charge. Paula and Eustochium pressed her with repeated invitations to abandon the "city of confusion" and seek the promised land. They put before her all the attractions of the Holy Places, and dwelt with rapture on the marvelous development of monastic life in Jerusalem, surpassing anything known in the West, and described the variety and order of the many monasteries, already peopled by monks and nuns from Gaul, and Britain, and Egypt, Macedonia and all the East, speaking different tongues, but praising God with one heart. St. Jerome, too, added his entreaties, appealing to her love for the sacred studies, which she could pursue with greater advantage in the land where the Scriptures were written and their language spoken. All these reasons failed to persuade Marcella, and she continued to govern her monastery on the Aventine till her eightieth year. Meantime all her first companions had passed away, a new generation of sacred virgins had taken their place, emulating like the younger Paula and Principia the virtues of the novices of fifty years before; and so powerful was the effect of her holy example and direction that monasteries came to be multiplied in the city and in the suburbs to such an extent that St. Jerome himself had to confess that from the accounts he had in the East Rome had become another Jerusalem.

---

[22] Ep. xviii.

This was all quite true, but there was another side to the picture, known both to Jerome and Marcella. Perhaps a presentiment of coming danger, an intuition of St. John's prophetic vision of the fall of Babylon, had a part in determining Marcella not to abandon her flock. Lactantius brought down to his own day the chronicle of God's visible judgments on the persecuting Emperors,[23] and closed it with the overthrow of Maxentius and the triumph of Constantine; but it was not the guilt of rulers only that cried for vengeance. Rome itself, living throbbing Rome, whose millions had revelled in every license and made itself drunk with the blood of the saints, had filled up the measure of its iniquity. A vast number, probably the great majority, were still impenitent idolaters and hated Christianity with a deadly hatred, cursing it in their hearts as the cause of every reverse that happened to the State and ready to recommence persecution by fire and sword, if they had not been held in awe by the Christian Emperors. On these the justice of God was about to fall.

In 408 Alaric, with his Goths, appeared before the walls of Rome, which was only saved from pillage by the payment of an enormous ransom; but two years later, irritated by the bad faith of the Romans, he again laid siege to the city. Reduced by famine it could oppose no effectual resistance, and the barbarians forced an entrance on August 24, 410. They spread devastation as they advanced, marking their path by smoking ruins and heaps of slain. They plundered the palaces and heathen temples of everything valuable. It was Alaric's command to respect the churches, and this order was in part obeyed. He enforced the inviolability of asylum, particularly in the basilicas of the Apostles. It is related that in their search for treasure a sacred virgin, advanced in years, was found guarding the sacred vessels in her habitation near a church. The soldiers demanded the deposit; she refused to surrender it, and dared them to touch it. Alaric was consulted. He ordered the vessels, with their aged custodian, to be taken to St. Peter's, escorted through the tumult of the streets between a double line of guards.

Marcella had taken precautions for the security of her children. She dispersed the community, distributing them in the houses of devoted Christian families. She remained in her palace alone with

---

[23] De mort. Persecutorum.

Principia, the youngest, and the child of her predilection, who would not be parted from her, trusting for protection to the power of her mother's love. With blood-stained hands some soldiers invaded the house.[24] Incapable of fear, Marcella stood intrepid. They required her to deliver up her treasures. In vain she told them she had none; her gold and silver had been given to the poor, and she pointed to her coarse tunic, the sign of her poverty. In their disappointment and rage they brutally fell upon her and beat her with scourges. Mindful even then only of her charge, she cast herself on her knees at their feet, imploring them not to separate her from Principia. Her courage and her dignity overawed the barbarians, their fury gave way to respect and admiration, and, as St. Jerome says: "Compassion was found with dripping swords."[25] Marcella and Principia were honorably conducted under the protection of an armed escort to the basilica of St. Paul, where they were left in safety. Marcella did not long survive the catastrophe of Rome, and her eyes were closed by Principia.

St. Jerome received in Palestine in quick succession the news of the sack of Rome and the death of Marcella. In the desolation of so many sad memories of vanished friends and fallen greatness his grief was long too great for words. He kept silence for two years, and at length, in the inspiration of a night of watching, he gave utterance to his feelings in the magnificent eulogium of Marcella which he dedicated to Principia.[26] To her was left the continuation of the foundress's work. In Rome it suffered for a time from the effects of the invasion, the slaughter of so many patrician families and the voluntary exile of others. But the dispersion of so many who had learned the principles of religious life at the feet of Marcella, or were fired by her example, carried their knowledge and practice into distant regions in East and West. Albina and Melania the younger went to the monastery of Bethlehem, Demetrias to Africa, and the seed carried by other exiles, become missionaries of monasticism, spread it in Gaul, and Spain, and Italy, preparing the way for its further development in the fifth century, first under the rule of St. Augustine, then under the rule of St. Benedict. Everywhere the monastic movement was active after the death of Marcella, the monasteries of Rome long outlived her successor, Principia, and the spiritual race of these parents was not unworthy of its beginnings. "By the prayers and mortified lives of the nuns of Rome, Italy was saved from the sword of the Lombards."[27]

J. A. CAMPBELL.

Rome.

---

[24] S. Hieron. Ep. Ad Principiam. [25] Ibid. [26] Marcellæ Epitaphium ad Principiam. [27] S. Gregorii, De Virg.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN ITS RELATION TO MATERIAL PROGRESS.

A RECENT writer of considerable erudition and undoubted ability, whose writings have a wide circulation in England, and I imagine are not unknown in America, has recently published a volume[1] in which he challenges the claims of the Catholic Church on the ground that everywhere it is the enemy of material civilization and material progress. He seems to think, as we shall see presently, that he has satisfactorily disposed of its claims by showing that the Protestant countries of Europe are more progressive and more enterprising than the Catholic; that they are able to show a more brilliant array of men of genius; that they have been less troubled with revolutions; that they are more successful in colonization; more wealthy and more free; superior alike in war and in the arts of peace. The argument is not a new one, and it is one to which it is important that Catholics should have a ready answer; and it is for this reason that I propose in the present article to make one or two suggestions as to the direction in which I believe the true answer lies.

But first of all, I should like to accentuate one fact which is too often left out of sight by Catholic writers, and that is that in all things human, whether ecclesiastical or civil, there is no such thing as absolute perfection. There is always something to be said on both sides of the question. There are advantages; there are also disadvantages. The gain is not all on one side, but everywhere it is a matter of balance between gain and loss. This is the case not merely with every institution looked at in its entirety, but with almost every detail of its administration. Those of my readers who are familiar with Sir George Cornewall Lewis' "Dialogue on the Best Form of Government" will remember the perplexity into which it is liable to throw the unprejudiced enquirer who is seeking to form his judgment as to what the ideal form of constitution really is. The fact is that there is no ideal in the matter at all; it is merely a question as to the form of government, which in any given instance combines the most solid benefits to the nation with the least number of countervailing evils. It is just the same in the case of every institution connected with religion, when regarded in its concrete form as a working institution, conducted by fallible and imperfect men. Every law and enactment of the Catholic Church has its pros and cons, its drawbacks as well as its advantages. Even the code of laws which have relation to natural right and wrong have something to be urged against them. The very worst vices have a certain attractiveness. They confer a passing and transitory benefit on those who are guilty of them, and though these benefits are infinitesimal in comparison with the after evils that they entail, yet they must exist, else there would be no such thing as temptation. And if this is the case with the vices that are condemned by the consensus of mankind, and are in direct opposition to the law of nature, how much more must it be the case where there is no immediate question of natural right and wrong at all, but only of the preponderance on one side or the other of certain indirect and perhaps rather remote consequences, some of them tending ultimately to good and others to evil? Take, for example, the question of the marriage of the clergy. The celibacy of the Catholic clergy is a purely ecclesiastical institution. It was not ordained by our Lord or His Apostles. It is not universal in the Catholic Church; the priests of the Uniate Greek Church are allowed to marry. The Pope forbade the marriage of the Latin clergy, and the Pope could, if he pleased, permit priests to marry. When we come to weigh the arguments on both sides, we shall find that there is a great deal to be said in favor of their being married. God has said that "It is not good for man to be alone." The celibate is exposed to many temptations and dangers, from which the married are comparatively free. He is exposed to the danger of selfishness and of a self-centralization which is practically impossible for one who has a wife and children to think of as well as himself. The paternal instinct which becomes strong in a man as life advances, and the natural affections, the outflow of which has a great influence in softening character, lack the opportunity of coming into full play. A celibate, living by himself, is prone to a painful sense of loneliness, especially if, as is often the case with a Catholic priest, he is stationed in some country place, where society of his equals he has none. Add to this that a clergyman's wife is often quite invaluable in her husband's parish. She is almoner, nurse, adviser and district visitor all in one, and exercises a moral influence in all the country round, to say nothing of the social and material benefits that she is able to bestow. Yet with full consciousness of all this, the Church has decreed the celibacy of her clergy, and every fair-judging man who has had a sufficient opportunity of comparing the two systems in their practical working is compelled to confess the superiority of the work done by a celibate clergy, especially in the mission field. A married clergy, taken as a body, sink to a lower spiritual level. St. Paul has settled the question, once for all. "He that is not married is solicitous for the things of the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he that is married is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife, and he is divided." (I. Cor. vii., 32, 33.) Ask the Indian, officer or civilian, who are the most successful and devoted missioners, and he will tell you that the Protestant missioner, cumbered with wife and children, is at a very considerable disadvantage. Too often he is simply despised by the natives, as comparing unfavorably with their own celibate Buddhist priests.

---

[1] "Catholicism, Roman and Anglican." By A. M. Fairbairn, D. D., L.L. D., principal of Mansfield College, Oxford. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

In America and England the disadvantages that beset a married man who works among the poor are scarcely less marked. It is almost unreasonable to expect him to run the risk of infection and contagion, when he has to think, not of himself only, but of the peril to the lives of his wife and children, and though there are numbers of married clergymen who incur the risk in full confidence that God will keep safe the dear ones at home, yet such a course of conduct would scarcely be regarded as prudent by the generality of men. Besides this, there are other priestly duties which, if they are not absolutely incompatible with the married state, are at all events difficult for a married man to perform as he ought. For these reasons the Catholic Church, with a full cognizance of both sides of the question, has wisely decreed that there is an enormous balance of advantage in favor of a celibate clergy.

Or, to take a very different and a more fundamental question, and one that brings us directly on to the field of topics treated of by Dr. Fairbairn, the principle of authority in matters of religion is one in which there is certainly much to be said on both sides of the question; I mean, of course, by authority ecclesiastical and human authority having Divine sanction, and investing some individual man or some body of men with the right to be absolutely obeyed, not only in matters of practice, but also in regard to beliefs which are to be accepted as true. I mean that supreme authority which has a right to give a command which is binding in matters that concern human action, and the infallible authority which has a right to pronounce an infallible sentence in matters of human belief. Whether final decision rests with an individual or with some central tribunal consisting of a body of men does not matter to my present purpose. It is of the principle of authority of which I am speaking, and this principle is, and always has been, an essential element in the constitution of the Catholic Church.

Now the principle of authority and the necessity of submission to it is not an unmixed good. In matters of practice it may possibly expose the individual Catholic to the danger of having to submit to a sentence which is wrongful and unjust. For while obedience really strengthens the will, and when wisely exercised does not at all diminish, but only safeguards the initiative of the well-ordered mind, it is quite possible so unwisely to enforce obedience and to multiply unnecessary commands as to impair that most desirable element of human character which prompts a man to elaborate for himself and to carry into execution the course of action which right reason leads him to adopt. This is especially the case when civil rulers encroach on the ecclesiastical order and exercise an all-pervading despotism. It has been said (though I should be sorry myself to endorse the saying) that if it had not been for the Catholic doctrine of submission to authority, the French people would never have tolerated the long years of "privilege," oppression and tyranny which culminated in the revolt from all authority in the French Revolution. Be this as it may, we must allow that the principle of spiritual authority, though it does not in any way hinder, yet does not of itself promote even a legitimate craving after national independence. It does not stimulate mere material progress or the desire for a wider empire or more extensive schemes of colonization. We are sometimes told that the Protestant cantons of Switzerland enjoy a greater material prosperity than the Catholic. Even if this is so, the argument would prove too much, for there is, I believe, no community in the world so materially prosperous as the Mormons of Utah. We are also told that the Northern and Protestant nations of Europe enjoy a greater degree of material prosperity than the Southern and Catholic nations. I do not believe that this is true, unless we take the words material prosperity to be identical with the accumulation of wealth. The accumulation of wealth in Protestant England is greater than that which exists in Catholic Belgium, or in the Tyrol. But if we take the expression in a wider and truer sense, and explain material prosperity as identical with material well-being, the enjoyment by the people at large of the good things of this life, the scale would certainly turn in favor of the two Catholic countries that I have just mentioned. "Godliness has promise of the life that now is, as well as of that which is to come."

I think we may also make a further concession, and allow that the throwing off of the spiritual yoke gives a certain temporary and ephemeral stimulus to individual enterprise and to mere worldly activity. I remember many years ago asking a dear and valued friend of my youth, who had lately thrown off the yoke of religion, whether the change had not left him discontented and unsatisfied. "No," he answered; "on the contrary, I rejoice continually in my new found liberty." Now, indeed, in his old age, after many years of bitter suffering and fruitless search after his false and imaginary ideal, he sings a very different song, and confesses that he has learned to envy those who live content in the fold of the Catholic Church, but at first I am sure that he spoke truly in expressing his satisfaction at his emancipation from all control in matters of religion. And what is true of the individual is often true of the nation also, and there follow on its emancipation from the Church's yoke conquests abroad and increased wealth at home, an advance in all that seems to one who takes but a superficial view to tend to the material prosperity and even what is regarded as the "greatness" of a nation—more men of genius, more poets, more great writers, more philosophers (if we can call those philosophers who put forward false and plausible hypotheses in the place of the eternal truths of Catholic philosophy), more brilliant statesmen, more successful speculators, more gilded princes of the commercial world, more of all that dazzles the eyes of men and rouses in them a foolish and short-sighted envy. All this I would freely confess, and I see in it an exact fulfilment of the words of our Lord that "the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." Yes, in their generation and not in view of any life to come; in their generation and not in the generations that shall come after them, which will sooner or later reap the bitter fruit of the showy upas tree that their forefathers have planted.

But in making this comparison between Protestant and Catholic nations three important points have to be borne in mind. The first is that whatever material prosperity and worldly advantage may accrue to a nation from the fact of its having substituted religious independence for submission to the yoke of the Church will, in the course of time, be followed by misfortune and decay. This follows from the very nature of things. The natural virtues are bound, as time goes on, to fade away if they are not supported by the supernatural. The temporary stimulus given by the abandonment of Catholicity will bring about a reaction, or perhaps will induce a prosperity which however brilliant for a time, and even apparently solid, will gradually bring about the ruin of the nation where it is found. It has for its foundation the sand, and not the rock, or if not wholly sand, yet has mingled with whatever is solid in it an element of sand that will in time cause its destruction. Look at Mahometan civilization. At first it carried all before it. It was almost everywhere victorious. It conquered Christian Spain and made inroads on the whole of Southern Europe. It was dominant for some hundreds of years, and for nearly a thousand was the formidable rival of Christian civilization. It is only since the battle of Lepanto that it has ceased to threaten the countries bordering on the Mediterranean. But after all it has proved itself utterly weak and rotten to the core. And what is true of the Moslem must in God's good time prove true of every religion that is in revolt against the religion established by Jesus Christ. In the case of Protestant countries the process of decadence is a slower one on account of the

Christianity which they still nominally retain and the Christian principles which they have inherited, in spite of themselves, from the Catholicity that they have displaced. The end must come sooner or later. The struggle may be a long one, far longer than the struggle between the early Christian Church and the power of imperial and pagan Rome. But in the end come it must, even in this world, since the nation, unlike the individual, exists only for time, and not for eternity, and therefore in time it must receive the due reward of its deeds.

The second point to be borne in mind is that all this undeniable prosperity and this brilliant material civilization which exists in nations which have shaken off the yoke of the Church is not a true prosperity or a true civilization. It is but a counterfeit, and not the genuine article. Under the surface, as we shall presently see Dr. Fairbairn himself confessing, there lurk "depravity, destitution, utter and shameless godlessness." Nowhere, save in the Christian and Catholic State, where the Church occupies her proper place, will true civilization be found.

Pope Leo XIII., in his Encyclical "Immortale Dei" (November 1, 1885) enumerates a number of the advantages that belong to States of which the organization is Catholic Christian, and to these only. He reminds us how in these alone the sanctity of family life is secured by the indissolubility of marriage and by the rights and duties of husband and wife being equitably and justly defined; how in the Christian state alone the laws are directed by the strict principles of truth and justice, and are not subject to party interests or the caprices of the fickle mob; how in it only the authority of those in power is recognized as having a sanction higher than human, and at the same time is kept within due bounds, and how party spirit is tempered by mutual charity, good will and generosity; how, in a word, "the abundant benefits with which the Christian religion, from its very nature, endows even this mortal life of man upon earth are acquired for the whole of the community and for civil society. And, finally, he quotes the challenge which St. Augustine throws down before the advocates of godless states: "Let those who say that the teaching of Christ is hurtful to the State produce armies in which the soldiers have such a spirit as Christian teaching has produced; such Governors of provinces; such husbands and wives; such parents and children; such masters and servants; such rulers; such Judges; such collectors, and such payers of the very taxes of the State as the Christian doctrine commands them to be, and then let them dare to say that such teaching is hurtful to the State; nay, rather will they not openly acknowledge that obedience to Christ is a mighty source of safety to the State."[2]

---

[2] St. Aug. ep. 138 ad Marcellinum 2, 1.

For we must never forget that material civilization, however brilliant, has, unless it is founded on Christian principles, a germ within it which must work by slow degrees utter moral deterioration, social degradation, and as the ultimate consequence of its internal disorders a final ruin which must, as we have said, in the end cause the destruction of its showy greatness and its imposing splendor. But here there intervenes a third principle which must not be forgotten.

Although the life of the State differs from that of the individual in that the latter is only commenced in this world and finds its consummation in the next, while the former begins and ends here below, yet the two have this in common, that even when they are both preparing themselves for final destruction, the one in the next world and the other sooner or later in this, yet God in His justice and liberality never fails to richly reward both the one and the other for whatever good is to be found intermingled with the prevailing and predominant evil. This is, of course, still more the case with nations in this life than with individuals on account of their existence being confined to this life. To quote the words of Pope Leo XIII. in another Encyclical ("Exeunte jam anno," December 30, 1888):

"The impartial and unchangeable justice of God reserves due rewards for good deeds and fitting punishment for sin. But since the life of peoples and nations does not outlast this world, these necessarily receive their retribution on this earth. Indeed, it is not a strange thing that prosperity should be the lot of a sinful nation; and this by the just designs of God, who rewards with benefits of this kind actions worthy of praise, since there is no nation altogether destitute of worth. This St. Augustine considers to have been the case with the Roman people."

Hence when we see long prosperity accompanying a rebellion from the yoke of the Church we may reasonably conclude that there still remains within it a large element of natural and perhaps also of supernatural virtue. The rebel nation may cast off the central principle of the Church, but at the same time may retain a great amount of Catholic doctrine, and even of the Catholic spirit. It is impossible to cast off all at once the traditions of a thousand years, and when a nation revolts from the Church there lingers on a great deal that is Catholic, which has become engrained in its institutions and in its laws. It of necessity retains certain virtues which were an inheritance from its Catholic days and which at the same time had the advantage of being more in accordance with the temper of the nation than the virtues which were discarded. In the northern nations the active virtues remain, the passive disappear. Justice, truthfulness, courage remain, while submission, reverence, obedience fade away. God rewards them for the former by a career of prosperity, in which they have played an important part, even though the corruption resulting from the absence of the latter is slowly working its way. I do not hesitate to say that the absence of the passive virtues has even given a temporary stimulus to national greatness in the material order, inasmuch as the active virtues, taking to themselves a serviceable ally in the newly gained independence which was the result of rebellion, were able to act more freely, though at the same time they lost their supernatural character and their chief value in the sight of Almighty God. They became effective means of a highly developed though transitory degree of national greatness in the material order.

But if you ask me whether all this undeniable stimulus given by rebellion to worldly greatness and material prosperity in any way weakens the firmness of my adherence to the principle of ecclesiastical authority, I answer that so far from weakening it they confirm my conviction of its supernatural origin and of its being the means appointed by our Lord for the salvation of souls. If all this were not true, the contrast that our Lord draws between the kingdom of this world and the kingdom of heaven as realized on earth would have no point or significance. I find in the Catholic Church an exact realization of all that He and His Apostles laid down respecting the "kingdom of heaven" which He came to found among men. I find in her a number of characteristics fatal to immediate worldly success, all of which are predicted or foreshadowed in the New Testament. Those who live her life most perfectly are to be poor in spirit, meek, despised and hated and misunderstood by those outside the pale; they are to have a contempt and even hatred for riches and material prosperity; they are to be subject to continual persecution even from well-meaning and God-fearing men. Those who are to tread in the footsteps of the Apostles are to be men living separate from the world and at variance with her spirit, and for this reason to draw down upon themselves its contempt and dislike. At the same time there was to arise in the Church that Christ founded, in spite of its ideal and perfect beauty, an element of weakness by reason of the continual presence in its midst of those who while they were nominal members of it had nevertheless lost its spirit and taken to themselves the spirit of the world instead. As an object lesson in this respect, one of the Apostles was possessed by a spirit of criticism, by love of money and private judgment, the last mentioned leading him to what would be called in the present day honest doubts. This spirit was to spread as time went on; faith was to become feeble and charity to become cold. The net was to contain bad as well as good fish, the servants of the family were to neglect their duty and to seek their own private advantage instead of their Master's interest. Iniquity was to abound and intellectual scepticism to go hand in hand with moral depravity. Men were to arise who were to walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, to be daring and self-willed, to despise authority and to sew the hidden seed of sects and heresies. The spirit of the world was to make its way into the Church of Christ, and the result would be that large numbers would throw off the yoke. Yet there will always be some who will remain faithful to the sweet yoke established by Christ on earth, but they would find themselves in direct antagonism with the world. On the other hand, the world would applaud those who, under pretence of asserting their rights to independence of thought and action, had emancipated themselves from the dominion of the Church. They were to be recognized by the fact that they would not accept from those whom our Lord had left to be His representatives on earth the faith as taught by them, of whom He had said: "He that heareth you heareth Me, and he that despiseth you despiseth Me." They would insist on their own interpretation and their own views of what had been laid down by Christ and His Apostles. They would boldly assert their liberty of judgment in matters of religion and would regard as a sort of slavery the submission of the intellect to the authority of the Church.

Now these men are in the very nature of things far more progressive and therefore more likely to succeed in worldly and material things than the children of the Church. The very essence of submission consists in a passive and receptive attitude to all in whom any sort of authority is recognized, whereas it is of the essence of resistance to be active. Boldness in action and a sort of audacious self-reliance is one of the qualities most valuable as means of attaining worldly success. The passive temper and the spirit of dependence, the acceptance of one's opinions ready made, instead of a gradual process carving them out for oneself, does not promote enterprise or that love of speculation which is one of the most attractive, and at the same time one of the most dangerous forms of intellectual activity. The consciousness of being liable to be checked at any moment by the voice of an authority which must be obeyed is rather discouraging to a venturesome boldness, whether in matters of theory or of practice. Hence arises that stimulus to activity of speculation, those brilliant achievements in the field of literature, that sudden development of individual as well as of national enterprise of which Dr. Fairbairn speaks in the following paragraph, and trom which he draws a plausible, but at the same time an utterly fallacious argument in favor of Protestantism and of Protestant civilization:

"The centuries that have elapsed since the fifteenth ended have been without doubt the most eventful, fruitful, momentous in the history of man, and their history has been the history of Christian peoples. The record of their material progress has been a record of marvels. America has been discovered, colonized, peopled; Asia has been opened up, almost conquered and annexed; Africa has been explored, and is being pierced and penetrated on all sides, and in the Australasian continent and islands the seeds of new States have been plentifully sown. The European States, with certain significant exceptions, are mightier than they were four centuries ago, better ordered, more moral, more populous, freer, wealthier; and the poorest of the countries has become rich and full of comforts as compared with Europe at the time of the Black Death. But what part has Christianity had in the making of modern civilization? Not much, if it and the Catholic Church be identical. The conquests and colonizations effected by Catholic States have, so far as order, progress and human well-being are concerned, been chapters of disaster and failure. The progressive peoples have been the non-Catholic. From them have proceeded the noblest of the ameliorative principles and actions of the period. They have been the least troubled with revolution; have had the most happy, well-ordered commonwealths; have enjoyed the most freedom; have most successfully labored to temper justice with mercy, to make judgment remedial, to enlarge the area of rights and to raise the ideal of duty. And the same peoples have been preëminent in the realms of thought and of spirit, been most deeply and devoutly exercised by the problems concerning man and his destiny. God has not been sparing of His gifts of great men to those who sit outside Catholicism. The Elizabethan dramatists, greatest of moderns in their own order, were the poets of the English people in the heroic moment of their reaction against Rome. Milton was the poet of a still more radical revolution. Cowper and Burns, Wordsworth and Coleridge, Tennyson and Browning, Scott and Carlyle represent the inspiration and aspiration of the same people. Herder and Lessing, Schiller and Goethe were not products of Catholicism. The most splendid cycle of thinkers since the Platonic age in Greece was that which began with Kant and ended with Hegel, sons of Protestant Germany." (Pp. 195-7.)

This is forcibly and skilfully put, and Catholics will do well to look it boldly in the face. They need not shrink before it, for it is just what will be expected by those who have penetrated to the inner spirit of the religion of Jesus Christ. It tells of earthly glories, and He said: "My kingdom is not of this world." It sings the praises of certain natural virtues, and He esteemed the most brilliant of the natural virtues as of no value whatever in comparison with the supernatural. The beatitudes have no place in the praises of Dr. Fairbairn so long as they remain purely natural and are not raised to the supernatural order. The showy exploits that he extols may have increased the riches, the power, the comfort, the external decorum of Protestant nations, but they have gone hand in hand with the gradual waning of Faith, the corruption of social morality, and, above all, with the continuous growth of self-assertive pride and with an ever-diminishing sense of our continual dependence on God. What place is there in Dr. Fairbairn's list of the choicest virtues for those which the Apostle describes as the "fruits of the Holy Spirit," and therefore to be esteemed before and above all else? "The fruit of the Spirit," says St. Paul (and I suppose that Dr. Fairbairn would accept him as representing the mind of Christ Himself), "is love, peace, joy, benignity, long-suffering, meekness, faith, modesty, continency." (Gal. v., 23.) Are these the virtues of the conqueror and the explorer; of the man whose ambition is to bring under his country's sway large tracts of far off lands, and to spread modern civilization, with its vices as well as its virtues, among tribes that before lived in barbarism? Are these the virtues which render a nation great and glorious, as the world esteems greatness and glory? The catalogue strangely omits all mention of the active virtues dear to the heart of the ordinary Englishman of the present day. There is not a word about self-reliance, or the spirit of enterprise, or a desire of renown, or of patriotism, magnanimity(*μεναλοψυχια.*) Why are these latter ignored? Simply because, in spite of their intrinsic excellence, they are primarily natural, not supernatural, virtues. They are virtues which are to be found in a high degree in those who have flung off the yoke of Christianity altogether. They are virtues, many of them most beautiful virtues, but they are not distinctively Christian virtues. Some of them are liable, if they are exclusively cultivated, to overshadow and obscure the beauty of the supernatural virtues, and even to thrust them aside altogether. They are, moreover, liable to degenerate into vices where the Christian spirit of submission and humility is absent. They lead to the spread of a civilization which is not a distinctly Christian civilization. Those who glory in them above all others are prone to share the old Roman tactics which adapted the civilization they introduced to whatever religion was prevalent in the country annexed or subdued. What has been the policy of Protestant England in India, in Egypt, in Africa itself? It has been everywhere to introduce civilization without Christianity. I know that I am liable to the retort that if this is so it amounts to a condemnation of the Christian virtues. So it does, if a passing worldly greatness and worldly success is the chief end of life for the individual or the nation. The retort is a perfectly successful refutation of my argument in the mouth of the Agnostic or Deist. But in the mouth of a Christian it is a virtual denial of the fundamental principles of Christianity. It proclaims in contradiction to the words of Christ Himself that His kingdom is of the world. It declares the temporal to be of more value than the eternal. It sacrifices the kingdom of heaven to worldly dominion. It is true that men who profess to be followers of Jesus Christ do not assert this in so many words. But the fact that they urge the various successes of non-Catholic nations in the temporal order as an argument against Catholic Christianity proves that they regard worldly prosperity and greatness as valuable in itself, whereas Christianity proclaims that it, like all else, is valuable only in so far as it spreads the kingdom of Christ on earth and opens the door of heaven to those who otherwise would still sit in darkness and in the shadow of death. And this, I maintain, modern conquest and modern civilization does not do. Perhaps I shall be told that modern conquest opens the door to the Christian missionary. This is perfectly true, but it is due partly to the spirit of toleration, not to say indifference, which is of the essence of Protestant civilization, partly to the sense of justice which is, thank God, a characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon race, and to its appreciation of the self-denying charity of the Catholic missioner. But at the same time I cannot help thinking that the most brilliant triumphs of the Cross have been for the most part separate from and independent of conquests by the State. The Christianity of England was not introduced by the Roman conqueror, and though Roman missionaries carried the Gospel into all parts of the earth, and thus made Roman sovereignty indirectly help on the spread of Christianity, yet Roman prefects and Roman governors were the bitterest enemies of the faith in almost every country in Europe. The State may civilize, and a Christian State may, but very seldom does, smooth the way for the preachers of the Gospel. But it is the missioner who, carrying his life in his hand, enters on the field of his labors alone and with no human power to back him, who has been the most effective agent in evangelizing the dark places of the earth and of spreading the only Christian civilization that deserves the name.

But if the modern spirit and the Protestant form of Christianity that has been dominant in America and England and Germany during the last three hundred years has been powerless to bring under the dominion of Christ the foreign lands that have come under the sway of Protestant countries, much more has it been a complete failure in really doing the work of Christ at home. When Dr. Fairbairn says in the passage I have quoted above that the modern Protestant States are "more well-ordered, freer, more populous, more moral, more full of comforts than they were four centuries ago," I am willing to concede the material and social improvements of which he speaks; but he must be strangely ignorant of the true state of the masses in Protestant countries if he asserts for them a higher morality and a more Christian spirit than that which prevails in countries which have remained faithful to the See of Rome. Take any country town (to say nothing of the modern Babylon) in England or Protestant America and compare it with one of the same size in Catholic Ireland, or Belgium, or Westphalia, or the Tyrol. In the one you will find good order, I allow, great external respectability, at least in the upper and middle classes. But beneath the surface you will find a seething mass of destitution and pauperism, of degradation and godlessness among the old and of corruption and immorality, especially among the young; an utter godlessness; an almost entire absence of all the virtues that are distinctively Christian, no faith, scarcely any realization of the world unseen, a sad neglect of prayer, very little humility, very little purity, a state of things heathen rather than Christian; the world and worldly success and worldly riches and worldly comforts the end and object of human life; paganism instead of Christianity. Indeed, Dr. Fairbairn himself confesses this to be the case in the early pages of his book. After speaking of the various benevolent agencies at work in England, he continues:

"Grant the facts and the inference to be alike true, ought they to satisfy the Christian conscience, or ought not that conscience—in the face of the destitution, depravity, utter and shameless godlessness which exist in spite of all the expenditure and efforts of the churches—to be filled with deep dissatisfaction? For what do these evils mean? That our society is to the degree that they exist not only imperfectly Christian, but really un-Christian." (P. 5.)

Now what will you find in a similar town—say in Ireland? You will find a firm faith, a solid piety, a purity which seems almost incredible to those who are only acquainted with corrupt England. You will find prayers said regularly every night and morning, regular and devout frequentation of the sacraments, almost every inhabitant of the town present at Mass every Sunday morning. You will find a sweet simplicity and innocence among the young, an honesty and uprightness, based on supernatural motives and on a heartfelt loyalty to their religion, that can scarcely be overstated. "Why, I could leave my portmanteau in the middle of the street, and no one would touch it," was the testimony of an English officer who had been stationed in a town in the west of Ireland to the honesty of its inhabitants. Froude also has a testimony like this. [See Young's "Protestant and Catholic Countries Compared."] A still more satisfactory witness to the morality of the people was that of a priest who had just been giving a mission in some Irish country town, who assured me that a large majority of those who lived there never committed a mortal sin from one year's end to another. I do not say that the same high standard prevails everywhere, even in Ireland, but I am quite certain, both from my own experience of the country and the testimony of others, that the standard of piety, obedience to the laws of God and of the Church, of honesty, mutual charity and, above all, of purity, is a thousand times higher in Catholic Ireland than in Protestant England.

I daresay that Dr. Fairbairn would not find much to admire in such simple and honest Catholics. He would pronounce them ignorant, unprogressive, priest-ridden, uncivilized. But he would nevertheless find them modeled after the likeness of Christ, full of love to Christ and very dear to His Sacred Heart, and an utter contrast to the godless and too often degraded inhabitants of the towns and villages of Protestant England.

There is another charge brought by Dr. Fairbairn against the Catholic Church which at first sight seems rather remote from the one that I have been challenging, but which is really very closely connected with it. He is not able to find in the religion of the New Testament any trace either of "sacerdotalism" or of "politico-monarchical organization." If this were true, it would follow as a matter of course that the Catholic organization which has inaugurated the Catholic State would be a departure from the intention of Christ, and that it would be necessary to organize society on some such natural principles as are the basis of the civilization of distinctively Protestant countries, without any formal unity, without any corporate existence, without any sort of hierarchy on the part of the religion which is to be the recognized creed of the citizens. Dr. Fairbairn says, and says with perfect truth, that all development in religion must be a gradual development from an original "germ," but that there must be found from the very beginning an unmistakable trace of the existence of this germ, else the development will be a corruption, and not a true development. Now his position is that in the religion of Christ and His Apostles, as laid down in Holy Scripture, we find no trace either of sacerdotalism or of any sort of "politico-monarchical organization." But I had better quote his own words:

"Measured by the standard of a sacerdotal religion, Jesus was not a pious person; He spoke no word, did no act that implied a priesthood for His people. He enforced no sacerdotal observance, instituted no sacerdotal order, promulgated no sacerdotal law; but simply required that His people should be perfect as their Father in heaven was perfect. . . . But Catholicism is here the precise opposite of this aboriginal religion, this Christianity of Christ and His Apostles. The priesthood is essential to it; without the priesthood it could have no existence, no Saviour present in its services, no Mass, no sacraments, no confessional; in a word, no worship for God, no comfort or command for man." (Pp. 168, 170.)

And again:

"There is no evidence that Jesus ever created, or thought of creating, an organized society. There is no idea He so little emphasizes as the idea of the Church. The use of the term is attributed to Him but twice—once it occurs in the local or congregational sense, and once in the universal, but only to define His own sole activity and supremacy; His familiar idea is the kingdom of God or of heaven; but this kingdom is without organization and incapable of being organized. Indeed, though the ideas may here and there coincide, it is essentially the contrary and contrast of what is now understood as the Catholic Church, whether Roman or Anglican. Further, in the Church of the New Testament the politico-monarchical idea does not exist; there is no shadow or anticipation or prophecy of it. The Churches are not organized, do not constitute a formal unity, have a fraternal, but no corporate relation; have no common or even local hierarchy; they are divided by differences that preclude the very idea of an official or infallible head. Supremacy belongs to no man; there is no bishop in the modern sense, over any church, or over the whole Church; no recognition of Rome as the seat of authority, the only holy or preëminent city being Jerusalem. The question as to Peter is very significant. He may be the rock on which the Church is to be built; the promises made to him may be taken in the highest possible sense; but what then? There is no evidence that what was promised to him was assured to his successors, no evidence that he had any successors, least of all that his successors, if he had any, were the Bishops of Rome, or that Rome in any way entered into the thought of Jesus." (Pp. 176-7.)

All this is good, straightforward argument, and would be a very telling argument if only its premises were founded on fact. But the complete ignoring of facts which underlies Dr. Fairbairn's various contentions is really scarcely credible. We will begin with the extraordinary assertion that our Lord never thought of creating an organized society. Why, the very idea of a society without organism is a contradiction in terms. It would be about as reasonable to talk of a living body that had no organism. Organism is just as necessary to life in the social as in the material order. We suppose that Dr. Fairbairn belongs to some religious body, and we should like to ask him whether it does not possess some kind of organism.

It must have certain conditions of membership and some form of government. It must contain those who teach and those who are taught, those who hold some sort of office and those who are simply members of it, and nothing more. Without this it would be no society at all, or else a mere home of anarchy and disorder. Moreover our Lord constantly applies to the society He founded the name of kingdom, and a kingdom implies not merely a King, who rules it, but Ministers and officials who carry out the King's commands and have a delegated authority from Him. It implies a corporate and duly organized society. Beside this, He calls it "the kingdom of heaven," which implies that the society He founded on earth is the earthly counterpart of the kingdom over which He rules in heaven. Now the kingdom of heaven is essentially an organized society. It contains all the Nine Choirs of Angels enumerated in Holy Scripture. It contains archangels as well as angels. It contains Princes, who rule over countries and kingdoms (Dan. x., 14), as well as the ministering spirits to whose guardianship are committed individual men. Dr. Fairbairn's ideal, whether on earth or in heaven, seems to be one of chaos instead of order. But our Lord employs other metaphors to describe His kingdom on earth, which imply that it is to be a corporate, external organized body. It is to be a household, a city, a family, a flock. It is to contain stewards, rulers, servants. It is to contain the evil as well as the good. And as soon as our Lord had ascended into heaven the work of organization commenced under the Apostles. They, if any, must have known their Master's mind. Deacons are appointed to work under the Apostles as sub-officials of the Church. The Apostles assemble in Jerusalem and lay down certain rules for the conduct of those who are received into the Church. St. Paul bears witness that Christ appointed Apostles, evangelists, prophets, pastors and doctors for the work of the ministry. He himself passes a judicial sentence on the incestuous Corinthian and orders the local assembly of the faithful to carry out the sentence. Bishops are appointed to rule the Church of God, and are to reprove, rebuke, exhort. They are to reject heretics (Tit. iii., 10) and to hold to the form of sound words committed to them. (II. Tim. i., 12.) All this implies organization, an organization, it is true, which is in its infancy, but yet sufficient to show that from the first the Catholic Church was an organized body, and that its Founder intended it to be such.

The mistake which Dr. Fairbairn makes is that he overlooks in the Church as it appears in the writings of the Apostles the undeveloped embryo which contains in germinal condition the elements of its subsequent organization. He is not satisfied because he does not find in the early stages of its growth all the fully developed characteristics of its maturity. He forgets that the Church, though in one sense Divine, inasmuch as it had a Divine Founder, was nevertheless a human institution, which according to the ordinary course of the Providence of God was to grow with a human growth and with the aid of its human environment. Our Lord Himself points this out in the parable of the corn: "First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." Dr. Fairbairn expects to find in the ear all that is found in the ripened corn. It is true that our Lord entrusted to His Apostles a complete body of Christian doctrine. But a complete body of Christian doctrine is something very different from a completely organized Christian society. The Christian doctrine was entrusted to a select few. It took years and even centuries before it permeated the mass of the faithful. Some portions of it lay dormant for hundreds of years after the death of those to whom it was originally entrusted. Even the central doctrine of Peter's supremacy, though from the very first it was an essential element of Christian teaching, was at the beginning an implicit rather than an explicit part of the Faith as preached by St. Paul, St. James, St. John the Divine and the other Apostles. The personal infallibility which was bestowed on each and all of our Lord's Apostles rendered the prerogatives of Peter less immediately indispensable than they afterwards became; and the exercise of his supremacy was practically almost in abeyance as long as the Christian communities were only in their infancy, founded by those who had their commission directly from Jesus Christ Himself, and as long as persecution made it necessary for the leaders of the Church, and above all for St. Peter himself, to live in disguise and concealment hidden away from those who were determined to root out the very name of Christian from the face of the earth. Dr. Fairbairn wants the Christian Church to spring into being at once as a perfectly organized body; he wants it to have a regular system of government exercised in its full perfection when it was struggling into being in the face of the most determined and relentless opposition; he does not recognize the fact that God makes use of human agencies and human methods in carrying out his supernatural designs. The Church worked into its system elements which already existed ready-made in previously existing systems. She inherited from the Jewish system what we may call the priestly idea; from the imperial system of Rome she adopted the title and to some extent the idea of the Pope as Pontifex Maximus, the High Priest, as well as the supreme ruler of the Church. For though in the Christian Church as established by Jesus Christ there was contained from the first the Pope with all his prerogatives as the Vicar of Christ, yet the temporal and spiritual powers which were united in the Roman Emperors facilitated and paved the way for the position that was gradually developed and finally recognized as the fulfilment of the idea that was sketched by our Lord Himself, but only came into its complete realization when under Constantine the Church became free and the Pope was able to take his proper place as the inheritor of all the spiritual and some of the temporal prerogatives of the Emperor. Dr. Fairbairn seems to think that this fact is fatal to the claims of the Catholic Church. "The Catholic Church," he says (p. 183), "owes its distinctive organization to Roman Imperialism," and he thence concludes that it is in this respect human and transitory, not Divine and eternal. He gives the history of the genesis of the Catholic system in a paragraph which is very much to the point:

"The principle of development, analytically applied to the Catholic system, proves that the parent form or aboriginal germ—the ideal and society of Jesus—was by its environments modified in a two-fold direction. First, from the ancient religions, Jewish and pagan, it received the notion of the priesthood, with all its accessories, and so became sacerdotal. And secondly, from the Roman empire, working on the material of its primitive Judæo-Hellenic policy, it received the dream and function of Roman supremacy, and so became Catholic, Papal and infallible." (P. 189.)

This paragraph, though it contains an element of truth, makes the fundamental mistake of supposing that what Dr. Fairbairn calls imperialism and sacerdotalism were introduced into the religion of Jesus Christ as something which was not found in the primitive germ; that is to say, in the religion as founded by Christ Himself. To imagine this to be possible is almost an insult to the wisdom and foresight of the Divine Founder of the Catholic Church. It supposes Him to have started an institution which was destined to be perverted and disfigured from the very first. We do not know whether Dr. Fairbairn would venture to assert that the realization of Christ's ideal was to be held in abeyance until He should proclaim to the world what it really was, and should correct the mistaken view that has prevailed among all the saints and doctors of the Catholic Church during the last 1,900 years. If this is so, we can only say that he is a very presumptuous, as well as a very misguided man. At the same time it is perfectly true that Christianity assimilated to itself the previously existing ideas of a priesthood and a monarchy from the systems that preceded and accompanied it. But it assimilated them because they were already in it, at least in embryo, and in something more than embryo. The theory of the Church, or, to speak more correctly, the law that was to be gradually developed in the Church's system, was laid down by our Lord Himself. When He said to His Apostles: "As My Father hath sent me, even so I send you; he that hears you hears me," He decreed that sacerdotalism (in its true sense, not in Dr. Fairbairn's sense) should be the law of the Church that He came to found, that those whom He appointed His delegates and representatives should inherit His sacerdotal powers as the great High Priest after the order of Melchisedech; when He entrusted to them the consecration of the Blessed Eucharist, as He had consecrated it, and the forgiveness of sins, which God alone can forgive, He explicitly committed to them the two most important functions of the sacerdotal office and of its supernatural power. So again when He declared Peter to be the foundation on which the Church was built; when He gave to him the keys which designate the ruling power in house or city or castle; when He gave to him individually the command to feed His flock, He made him sole monarch of the Church in His place. And not Peter only, but his successors also, for how was the house to endure unless its foundation should endure also? How was the flock to be fed unless the first shepherd was to have a line of successors who should in their turn rule the Church of God?

I have said that Dr. Fairbairn's idea of sacerdotalism is an incorrect one. No one could have penned the following passage who had any real acquaintance with the practical relations of the Catholic priest to the faithful in general:

"The greater the emphasis laid on the priesthood and mediation, with their associated ideas and instruments, the less general became His (God's) influence and the less immediate intercourse with Him; and as He lost, the intermediaries gained in reality to faith. The very notion of religion was revolutionized, ceased to have the spiritual immediacy, the ethical breadth and intensity, the filial love and peace, the human purity and gentleness of Jesus; and became more akin to the ancient sacerdotal and ceremonial worships. The great enemy of God is the idea of the Church and its priesthood. Nothing has so estranged men from Him as the claim to be alone able to reconcile Him and them." (P. 203.)

This passage, which, as every Catholic knows, is absolutely at variance with fact, can only be excused (if this can be called an excuse) by Dr. Fairbairn's complete ignorance of the matter about which he writes. He develops it out of his own consciousness, out of what he imagines to be the case, not what is the case. It is the old, and I must say, the stupid Protestant argument: "It must be so, therefore it is so." In the first place, it is false that the priest claims to be alone able to reconcile God and man. On the contrary, he declares that any sinner who makes a genuine act of contrition and of love of God, will be at once reconciled to God without the intervention of any priest or other human intermediary. In the second place, to say that the priesthood destroyed the spiritual immediacy of religion, which I suppose means that it interferes with the immediate intercourse between God and man (the soul), is about as true as to say that the postman destroys the moral immediacy of our correspondence with our friends and interferes with our free intercourse with them. So far is there from being any strength in this monstrous statement that the very reverse of it is true. The one aim and object with which the priesthood exists is to bring the individual soul into a closer and more immediate personal relation to God, to bring man nearer to God, to establish a more intimate friendship between the soul and God, to break down the obstacles that separate them. And as to what he says about religion ceasing by reason of the priesthood to have the ethical breadth and intensity, the filial love and peace, the human purity and gentleness of Jesus, I do not think that there is anything that needs to be said about it except that it is a perfectly arbitrary and empty statement that has no foundation whatever in fact.

Last of all, to say that the idea of the Church and its priesthood is the great enemy of God is in such open contradiction with the oft repeated words of Holy Scripture that we wonder that even Dr. Fairbairn does not see that he is strangely misled by his own wild theories. What can be clearer in the New Testament than the intensity of the love that Christ bears for His immaculate spouse, the Church? What can be more plainly set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews than the doctrine of the Christian priesthood and the Christian altar? And if there is a continuous tradition handed down from earliest days, it is that of the Christian Church, the Christian priesthood and the Christian altar.

One other remark occurs to me regarding Dr. Fairbairn's book. In his case, as in the case of almost all the assailants of the Church, the real cause of their dislike to the Catholic Church, and to what he calls sacerdotalism, is a very imperfect belief, if there is any belief at all, that Jesus Christ, who died on the altar of Calvary, is really consubstantial and co-equal with the Father. With such a belief the following passage seems to me quite inconsistent:

"The affirmation of a new religious ideal was of the essence of Christ's life. Of this ideal the prophets had dreamed, but He made it an articulate reality. God was to Him what He had never yet been to man—a living Father, loving, loved, in whom He was embosomed, through whom and to whom He lived. He knew no moment without His presence; suffered no grief that the Father did not share, tasted no joy He did not send, spoke no word that was not of Him, did no act that was not obedience to His will. Where the relation was so immediately filial and beautiful the mediation of a priest would have been an impertinence, the use of his sacrifices and forms an estrangement—the coming of a cold dark cloud between the radiant soul of the Son and the gracious face of the Father. . . . What God is among His worlds Jesus was among men. He is the mind and heart of God personalized for humanity; His universal ideal realized." (Pp. 26-8.)

Again:

"To Christian men Christ is the normal and normative religious person, *i. e.*, the person whose living is their law, who made the standard to which they ought to conform and who distributes the influences creative of conformity. Now in Him religion was a perfect relation to God expressed in speech and action creative of a perfect humanity, a humanity made through knowledge of God obedient to Him. As embodied in Him, religion was in the presence of sin and sorrow a holy passion, a suffering unto sacrifice due to a love that identified the sinless seeker with the sinner that He sought." (P. 32.)

Now these passages seem to me to have a distinctly Arian ring about them, and I cannot conceive it possible that they should have been written by one who truly realized and believed in the Godhead of Jesus Christ. From such a faulty conception of the central doctrine of Christianity a faulty conception of the Church He founded and of all that pertains to her is a necessary consequence. This is the true source of all Dr. Fairbairn's vagaries, and there is no hope of his understanding the true character of the Church that Jesus Christ founded on earth until he attains to a true conception of its Divine Founder.

R. F. CLARKE, S. J.

Oxford, England.

Scientific Chronicle.

MALARIA AND THE MOSQUITO.

Many theories have been advanced to explain the spread of malaria. One theory held it was a specific poison generated in the soil, and search has been made to discover this poison in the gases generated in swamps or in the vegetable organisms of malarial districts, but without success. The sudden and excessive abstraction of heat from the body under the influence of cold and damp has also been advanced as an explanation. Now, however, the prevalent opinion among scientific men is that malaria is contracted only through inoculation by the mosquito. To prove practically the truth of this theory, Drs. Sambon and Low will live until October in the most malarious part of the Roman Campagna. The observers and their servants will live in a mosquito-proof hut. During the day they are free to go where they wish and they intend to mix freely with the inhabitants. From an hour before sunset to an hour after sunrise they must remain in the hut. The rays of the sun are carefully excluded from the building, which is practically an air tank, designed to collect the cool damp air from the marsh. They will sleep in this atmosphere, but they will be protected from the mosquito, for the parts of the building not made of tongued and grooved boards are carefully protected by walls of very fine wire gauze, through which the mosquitoes cannot pass. The physicians do not intend to take quinine or any other precaution against malaria except avoiding being inoculated by the mosquito. They hope thus to show practically that the latter is the true method by which malaria is propagated.

While it is true that the mosquito exists in malarial regions, it is not yet established that the mosquito acquires the parasite from any other source than from men who, while suffering from malaria, visit these regions. The malaria spreader is not the ordinary or *culex*, but the *anopheles* mosquito. The *culex*, while much more abundant, do not seem capable of transmitting the malaria germ. An interesting description of these two genera is given by Mr. L. O. Howard, Ph. D., in the *Scientific American* for July 7, 1900, from which we select the following points of comparison between the two:

In the adult *anopheles* the palpi are nearly as long as the sucking beak, but in the *culex* they are very short. The *anopheles* has as a rule spotted wings, the *culex* has not. The males of both genera are readily distinguished from the females by the fact that the antennæ and palpi are feathery. The resting position seems to afford a means of distinguishing the two genera. The *anopheles* holds its body nearly at right angles to the surface upon which it rests, while the *culex* keeps the body parallel with the surface. The hum of the female is also different in the two genera. In the *culex* the note is higher than in the *anopheles*. The eggs of the *culex* are placed endwise on the surface of the water and joined together in a raft-like mass. The eggs of the *anopheles* are loosely placed sidewise on the surface and are not joined together. The eggs hatch in from three to four days in May.

The larvæ of the two genera also differ. That of the *culex* comes to the surface every minute or two to breathe and descends to the bottom to feed. It has to make an effort to rise. The larva of the *anopheles*, on the contrary, until full grown habitually remains on the surface of the water. Its breathing tube is much shorter and is held parallel to and just below the surface film of water. It works the mouth constantly and directs small solid particles floating on the water to the alimentary canal. The pupa of both genera do not differ so widely.

The activity of the larva and pupa of mosquitoes preserves them from the predatory animal life of the stagnant pools in which they live. The life of an *anopheles* is thus summed up from the account of Mr. Howard: Egg stage, three days; larval stage, sixteen days; pupal stage, five days. The adult stage cannot be definitely stated, beyond the fact that in the latitude of Washington they hibernate from November to April.

It has been stated that in Italy alone two million people have malaria every year, and that of that number fifteen thousand die. The extent of the injurous effects of malaria on the human body renders any attempt at solving the mystery of its origin most valuable.

THE PARIS TELESCOPE.

The large telescope of the Paris Exhibition is without doubt one of the greatest attractions in that world of wonders. Sir Norman Lockyer in *Nature* for December 21 last gives a detailed description of this wonderful instrument. At first it was thought possible to construct the telescope on the reflecting principle with a reflector ten feet in diameter. This had to be abandoned when it was found that the glass manufacturers could not furnish the glass for such a reflector. The telescope is therefore a refracting telescope with object glasses 1.25 meters in diameter.

The instrument is mounted in front of a siderostat which has a mirror two meters in diameter. This method of mounting secures greater stability, avoids the expense of a dome and renders the observer's work less fatiguing. The chief feature of this method of mounting is, of course, the siderostat. This apparatus, according to the description of Mr. Lockyer, "comprises a pedestal of cast iron, the north part of which supports the polar axis and the south part the mirror with its frame. The cast iron pedestal, eight meters long by eight meters high, is furnished with six screws which fit in sockets fixed to the stone base 1.70 meters high. The north part of the pedestal supports the polar axis with its divided and driving circles. This axis is driven by a clockwork movement by means of a tangent screw. At the lower end of the polar axis a fork is fixed, to which are adjusted the pivots of the declination circle. The toothed declination wheel is set in motion at the foot of the instrument by a handle placed beside the one which produces movement in right ascension; both of these are near the two telescopes which serve for the reading of the two circles. The mirror with its cell has a total weight of 6,700 kilogrammes. This cell of cast steel is furnished with two pivots; to the back is fixed the directing rod. The interior of the cell is covered entirely with felt in such a way that the mirror has no point of contact with the metal. Being supported by as great a surface as possible, all deformations are avoided. The mirror and its cell are kept in equilibrium by a system of levers and counterpoises; the pivots rest on rollers adjusted at the top of the frame, which permits a circular movement by a vertical shaft and a system of independent rollers between two rails. The base of this frame floats in a cavity two meters in diameter on the south side of the pedestal, containing sufficient mercury to float nine-tenths of the total weight of the movable part, which weighs 15,000 kilogrammes. The clockwork movement is set in action by a weight of 100 kilogrammes. The total weight of the siderostat is 45,000 kilogrammes."

To produce the plane mirror for the siderostat a special furnace capable of holding twenty tons of glass had to be constructed at the Jeumont Works. The cooling of the glass in the annealing furnace after the mould had been filled took a whole month. The difficulty of the whole operation may be gathered from the fact that out of twelve discs only two were successful. The discs for the object glass were cast by M. Mantois and the figuring, polishing and mounting was the work of M. Gautier.

The telescopic tube is made of twenty-four pieces of sheet steel two millimeters thick. The tube has cast-iron supports which can move on rails fastened to stone pillars. Each lens of the object glass is set in a separate cell and they are so mounted on a carriage that moves on rails that they can readily be brought to the end of the tube. The eyepiece end can carry a micrometer, photographic plate or a projecting lens.

The great power of the telescope is clear from the fact that the moon viewed through it will appear to the observer as if it was only 67 kilometers away. At such a distance calculation shows that an object one metre square on the moon should be visible.

THE ENTRANCE TO THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER.

The basin drained by the Mississippi river has an area of 1,244,000 square miles. The annual amount of sediment removed by erosion from this area, according to the experiments of Humphrey and Abbot, is 7,471,411,200 cubic feet. This mass of matter is sufficient to cover an area of one square mile 268 feet deep. If spread out over the whole area drained by the Mississippi it would cover it to the depth of 1-4640 of a foot or a depth of one foot is eroded from the surface of the basin every 4,640 years. These figures serve to give some idea of the amount of material carried yearly to the Gulf of Mexico by the Mississippi river.

As long as the velocity of the river is high the material is transported, but the moment this velocity is checked or reduced material is deposited. When the waters of the Mississippi mingle with the waters of the Gulf or meet the incoming tide they either loose their identity or have their velocity greatly reduced, and therefore deposit this material, forming bars across the entrance to the river.

From the time of the Louisiana purchase in 1803 many attempts were made to render the harbor navigable for large draught vessels, but it was not until May, 1875, that anything satisfactory was begun. At that time the Government awarded a contract to Captain James B. Eads for the deepening of what is known as the South Pass. In the face of many difficulties he secured a channel 26 feet deep and 700 feet wide which has been since maintained. This contract has now expired, and as the draught of vessels has increased new facilities are at present required.

Captain Eads secured the channel by means of jetties or parallel straight walls. The outflowing water confined in this narrow channel moved with greater velocity and hence had its power of carrying material so increased that the material was borne out beyond the channel. There it was deposited, and this necessitated the extension and maintenance of the jetties.

In January, 1899, a Board of Engineers reported that a channel of 35 feet depth could be secured by the plan of two parallel straight jetties placed 2,400 feet apart. This channel would run through the Southwest Pass. These jetties would be seven miles long, making in all fourteen miles of construction, at an estimated cost of $13,000,000. The same amount would be necessary for extension and maintenance, or the latter item would cost the interest on that amount annually.

This report was referred by Congress to another board of four engineers, who reported a different plan. They suggested coffin-shaped jetties to run from the land through shallow water and at a considerable distance from the channel. On account of their great distance apart they would not be effective in making the channel, as in the case of the Eads jetties, but dredging would have to be resorted to for that purpose. The jetties would simply catch the silt and prevent its return after it was pumped out of the channel.

Nothing has been done in the matter yet, and the plan suggested in the *Scientific American Supplement* for August 8, 1900, by Professor Lewis M. Haupt, member of the Franklin Institute, deserves attention. The construction here suggested is called a reaction breakwater. The plan is based on observations made of the natural formation of bars and channels in the beds of rivers. Mr. Haupt points out that whenever a stream passes from a tangent to a curve there is at once a deepening of the channel along the concave side of the curve. The silt is thrown on the convex bank, which shallows gradually from the point of greatest depth. The plan he suggests is the reproduction of this natural action in the Southwest Pass. This he would do by building a single jetty with a curve of proper radius.

"A single, concave, curved jetty so placed as to encroach gradually upon the path of the stream produces a compression which causes deflection of the water and deep erosion of the sand, thereby creating a channel parallel to the axis of the jetty and also building a natural levee by the lateral transportation of displaced material."

It is estimated that a depth of 40 feet would be secured by such a reaction jetty. Such a plan is worthy of trial because it is cheaper than either of the other plans, and nothing stands in the way of its extension to the double jetty later should it prove inadequate.

SOLIDIFICATION OF HYDROGEN.

In 1898 Professor Dewar attempted the solidification of liquid hydrogen under reduced pressure. The liquid hydrogen was placed in a vacuum tube enclosed in a larger vessel of the same kind. The space between the two tubes was filled with hydrogen. The excess of evaporation was mainly from the hydrogen in this space. The inside tube was maintained at the same temperature both inside and outside so as to prevent influx of heat. The hydrogen was evaporated under 10 min. pressure, but the experiment failed.

During the past year Professor Dewar while investigating the reduction of temperature brought about by exhaustion noticed that there was a leakage of air which became apparent by being frozen in an "air-snow" inside the vessel when it met the cold vapor of hydrogen coming off. He first thought that this body was a sponge of solid air containing the hydrogen. But the fact that this solid evaporated at the low pressure without having any solid air led him to conclude that the body must be solid hydrogen. This was confirmed by the fact that if the pressure and temperature of the hydrogen were raised the solid melted when the pressure reached 58 min.

The failure of the first experiments was due to the supercooling of the liquid. The solidification of hydrogen is interesting, inasmuch as it seems to many to settle the question which has long been a matter of doubt, viz., whether hydrogen should be classed as a metallic or a non-metallic element. Up to the present it was most frequently classed among the former; now, however, it must be placed among the latter.

FROST FIGHTING.

Under the above title the United States Weather Bureau has published Bulletin No. 29, prepared by A. G. McAdie, local forecast official at San Francisco. The citrus fruit crop of California, especially of the section south of the Tehachapi, has frequently suffered considerably from frost, and the loss has been considered unavoidable. For the past four years the Weather Bureau office at San Francisco has given much attention to this matter, and the experience gathered, according to Mr. McAdie, warrants the statement that unless extreme conditions—that is, unless lower temperatures by 5 degrees than have ever yet been experienced—occur, the loss can be prevented. Every effort has been made, and successfully, to forecast coming frosts and also to investigate the best methods of protection.

It has been found that the formation of frost is largely a matter of air drainage. When a wave of falling pressure passes southwestward into the citrus belt and is followed by a rise in pressure, it is the forerunner of much colder weather. The warm lower air strata are vigorously displaced by cold dry air, and the cold air settling in a period of quiet, after the drainage has ceased, forms frost. What is true on a large scale for frost belts is also true on a small scale for areas of stagnant cold air. On almost every ranch there are certain cold spots which almost invariably correspond with depressions in the ground. Three conclusions are well established from the study that has been made: First, when the air is in brisk motion the damage from frost is generally light; secondly, stagnant air in depressions favors frost; thirdly, since the coldest air is generally near the ground it is sometimes advisable to drain downwards warm air from above. The ranch owners are advised not only to keep in communication with the nearest weather bureau, but to make a careful study of their own ranches. Whenever frost warnings are sent out they should carefully determine the temperature and dew-point during the late afternoon and night according to the instructions issued to them. Thus will they be prepared to take precautionary measures.

Various methods of protection have been employed, some with considerable success. These methods include those based on mixing the air, warming the air, cloud or fog formation, irrigation, spraying and screening.

The method of mixing the air consists in keeping up a circulation of the air. In this method wind-breaks are often employed. If not so constructed as to prevent a natural circulation or to facilitate behind them areas of stagnant air, they are of benefit.

The method of warming the air usually adopted and considered effective is either to scatter over the ground or suspend a few feet above the ground about forty wire baskets to the acre and to start charcoal fires in them when the conditions indicate frost. By this method the temperature can be certainly raised 3 or 4 degrees. Oil pots have been used for the same purpose, but the deposit of lampblack upon the fruit is objectionable.

The cloud or fog formation is secured by burning damp straw, old wood, manure, etc. When burning briskly it makes a good smoke, and if doused with water, a steamy smoke is formed which serves as a screen to prevent the radiation of heat from the land. It also prevents the too rapid heating of the chilled fruit at sunrise.

Water on account of its high specific heat is an excellent agency for the storage of heat. Hot water pumped into flumes and runs through furrows made in different directions through the ranch. This method and the basket method have given the best results so far obtained in the way of raising the temperature and are in most favor.

The method of spraying is employed chiefly after a frost or just before the frost has ended. Its efficiency consists in preventing a too rapid heating of the chilled fruit.

Canvas, muslin or light wood work have been used as screens to protect the fruit. These screens are, of course, only modified hot-houses, and are undoubtedly effective. Their cost, however, is so great as to prohibit their extensive use.

When we recall that the value of the citrus fruits of the district in question amounted in 1899 to $7,000,000, we can realize the importance of the work undertaken by the United States Weather Bureau.

THE REBUILDING OF GALVESTON.

Were geology consulted it would be adverse to the rebuilding of the ruined city of Galveston on the old site. In common with the whole Atlantic seaboard, the location is continually subsiding.

The evidence of subsidence all along the Atlantic coast is to be found in the advance of the sea even in historic times. Submerged forests and meadows, drowned rivers, half-flooded islands and outlying keys point to recent submergence or a present gradual sinking.

The sinking of the shore on which Galveston stands is a serious matter. The city was built on a sand bank, the highest point of which was only twelve feet above low tide. A subsidence of from one to two feet in a century is fatal to a city so situated. Each succeeding heavy wind and wave storm is bound to work more and more havoc.

The nature of the formation on which the city rose shows how poor the site is for anything like firm and permanent building. The formation underlying Galveston is simply a pile of loose sand, with that compactness only which comes from the occasional beating of a high sea and that which results from the compression due to its own weight. There were no coral formations to hold the mass of loose sand together, as the roots of trees bind and hold the loose surface soil. There was no calcareous or silicious matter to cement the loose granules into a compact stone. To the depth of half a mile there is no such thing as solid rock, nothing but loose mechanical deposit. Therefore it was impossible to secure firm foundations, except at enormous expense, to withstand severe storms. To rebuild on the same site is to expose the new city to another calamity.

It has been suggested to use the old site for a port and connect it by means of a canal about ten miles long with a new city built at the head of Galveston Bay. The number required at the docks and storehouses of the port would be comparatively few, and should such a storm ever again visit Galveston, the loss of human life would be reduced to a minimum.

D. T. O'Sullivan, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews.

THE EVE OF THE REFORMATION: Studies in the Religious Life and Thought of the English People in the period preceding the rejection of the Roman Jurisdiction by Henry VIII." By Francis Aidan Gasquet, O. S. B., D. D. [London: J. C. Nimmo, 1900.]

In the second of the "Lectures on the Present State of Catholics in England," Newman treats of the Protestant Tradition which has Fable for its basis. Writing in 1851 he says: "Trace up, then, the Tradition to its very first startings, its roots and its sources if you are to form a judgment whether it is more than a Tradition. It may be a good Tradition and yet after all good for nothing. What profit though ninety-nine links of a chain be sound if the topmost is broken? Now, I do not hesitate to say that this Protestant Tradition on which English faith hangs is wanting in the first link."[1]

Few statements have been so confidently made or so thoroughly believed as that the cause of the Reformation in England was the low state of religion resulting from an ignorant clergy and a superstitious laity. According to the prevailing Tradition, the light of the Gospel was practically unknown: the whole country was immersed in a gross darkness. So surely was this state of affairs impressed on Englishmen that even Catholics accepted the story, with a sigh, indeed, and regrets that the salt had lost its savor. But when the new historical spirit arose and writers were no longer content to copy one another, but saw the necessity of testing every statement and of hunting down assertions to their sources, enough was speedily found to give them pause and excite their wonder that facts could have been so neglected for fancies. The State papers were opened to the public; and students who spend their days handling old parchments and deciphering, sometimes with the aid of a magnifying glass, faded manuscripts, begin to see that quite another story was told by the Actors who had taken part in the Drama of the Past. Among those compelled, by exact knowledge, to form an opinion is the late Mr. Brewer, who calendared the State papers of the early years of Henry VIII. He warns the student that he will miss the meaning of many things if he starts his inquiry by regarding the Reformation as the creation of Light to illuminate a previous period of darkness, or the evolution of practical morality out of a state of antecedent chaotic corruption. "In fact," says he, "the sixteenth century was not a mass of moral corruption out of which life emerged by some process unknown to art or nature; it was not an addled egg cradling a living bird; quite the reverse." And in another passage he says: "There is no reason to suppose that the nation as a body was discontented with the old religion. Facts point to the opposite conclusion. . . . Nor, considering the temper of the English people, is it possible that immorality could have existed among the ancient clergy to the degree which poets, preachers and satirists might lead us to suppose. The existence of such corruptions is not justified by authentic documents or by an impartial and broad estimate of the character and conduct of the nation before the Reformation."[2]

---

[1] Ed. 1851, p. 84.

The inquiry has been now carried a step farther. Dom Gasquet, the English Benedictine, whose work is a credit to his order, his country and to the Church at large, recently published a profound study on "The Eve of the Reformation." His purpose is a simple one. He does not in any way pretend to write a history of the Reformation or to furnish "an adequate account of the causes which led up to it;" for, at the present moment, the work of the historian is that of analysis, of clearing the ground, of making the crooked straight and the rough places plain. To this solid and most essential work Dom Gasquet, with the true Benedictine instinct of thoroughness, is devoting himself. He has realized that before any one can undertake to discourse to any real purpose upon the history of this period, it is necessary "to ascertain, if possible, what really was the position of the Church in the eyes of the nation at large on the eve of the Reformation, to understand the attitude of men's minds to the system as they knew it, and to discover, as far as may be, what in regard to religion they were doing and saying and thinking about when the change came upon them" (p. 3). We do not hesitate to say that Dom Gasquet, in this new book, has given us a more vitally important work than in any of his previous volumes. If in his "Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries" he freed the monks of England from the Protestant Tradition, in "The Eve of the Reformation" he restores the character not only of the Church in England, but of the nation at large.

We do not propose to give a detailed review of this noteworthy book; we will content ourselves with setting before our readers certain conclusions we have arrived at after a due weighing of the evidence Dom Gasquet sets before us. We are the more ready to pursue this course as, among all the notices and reviews, most of them written by prominent men and specialists and all bearing witness to the great value of Dom Gasquet's work, no one, as far as we know, has grasped what we think is the real and useful lesson the book contains. The author, it is true, does not draw any conclusion from the facts he so skilfully sets before his reader. This would have been beyond the scope of his work, and he is too experienced an artist to overcrowd his canvas. But facts speak for themselves; and he who runs through these pages may listen to them if he have wit enough. We have therefore selected two of the main features of the period and shall confine our remarks to these, passing by much else that is of interest in the volume before us. It will be noted that the points we have selected have a bearing on questions of present-day interest.

---

[2] "The Reign of Henry VIII.;" II., 469-70.

A common Protestant Tradition is that one of the causes of the Reformation in England was the Revival of Letters or, as writers are pleased to call it, "The New Learning." This phrase, "The New Learning," is very dear to them; it is such a convenient weapon of offense: and moreover the very phrase is sixteenth century and can be found in the writings of the most zealous opponents of the Reformation. There can be no doubt that the orthodox champions were opponents of the New Learning. What further proof do we need, cry the Protestant writers, to show that the Catholic Church is an enemy to learning and battens on Ignorance? But softly! Facts knock the bottom out of the Protestant Tradition. In the sixteenth century the phrase "The New Learning" had absolutely nothing whatever to do with the Revival of Letters. It was simply and solely in the Reformation days "a well recognized expression used to denote the novel religious teaching of Luther and his followers. Uncompromising hostility to such novelties, no doubt, marked the religious attitude of many who were at the same time the most strenuous advocates of the renaissance of letters. This is so obvious in the works of the period that were it not for the common misuse of the expression at the present day, and for the fact that opposition to the 'New Learning' is assumed on all hands to represent hostility to letters rather than to novel teachings in re ligious matters, there would be no need to furnish examples of its real use in the period in question" (p. 16). Dom Gasquet proceeds to give from the abundant literature of the day examples of the only sense in which the phrase was used.[3] We will take only one of his witnesses. The preacher Robert Edgeworth praises the simple-hearted faith that was accepted by all "before this wicked 'New Learning' arose in Saxony and came over into England amongst us." If we regard the mere facts of the case, we shall have to agree with our author that: "It would seem, moreover, that the religious position of many ecclesiastics and laymen has been completely misunderstood by the meaning now so commonly assigned to the expression. Men like Erasmus, Colet and, to a recent extent, More himself, have been regarded, to say the least, as, at heart, very lukewarm adherents of the Church, precisely because of their strong advocacy of the movement known to us as the Literary Revival, which, identified by modern writers with the 'New Learning,' was, it is wrongfully assumed, condemned by orthodox churchmen. The Reformers are thus made the champions of learning; Catholics, the upholders of ignorance and the hereditary and bitter foes of all intellectual improvements" (p. 20). There is no difficulty in showing that it was precisely such enlightened churchmen, orthodox and zealous, as Colet, Fisher, Wareham, Wolsey, Erasmus and, above all, the Benedictine monks of the primatial Church of Canterbury that were the foremost and most enthusiastic upholders of the Revival of Letters. The very introduction of Greek is due to Benedictines. Two Canterbury monks, Selling and Hadley, in 1464, with the leave of prior Thomas Goldstone of Christ Church, went to study in Italy at Padua, Bologna and Rome. Selling, who in 1472 became Prior of Canterbury, made his claustral school a centre for the study of Greek. The famous Linacre was one of his pupils; and in 1486 Prior Selling took him "to Italy in order to profit by the teaching of the great humanist masters at the universities there" (p. 28). Grocyn, who taught both More and Erasmus Greek, was a sharer with Linacre in "the benefits of the training in literature then to be obtained only in Italy." A Venetian traveler, who visited England in 1500, puts on record what he had noticed as regards the attitude of the clergy as a body towards learning. He says: "Few, excepting the clergy, are addicted to the study of letters, and this is the reason why any one who has any learning, though he be a layman, is called a *clerk*."[4] As a matter of fact Churchmen had everything to hope from the Revival of Letters. The greatest enemy superstition can have is Learning; and no greater foe is there to true Religion than Superstition.[5] Far from the Reformation being a friend to Learning, the immediate effect in England was its practical extinction. The official Registers of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge bring their silent testimony to this fact. At Oxford, from 1449 to 1459, the average number of degrees taken by all students was 91.5. From 1506 to 1535 the average was 127. In the year 1506 it had risen to 216. When the attack on the monasteries had begun by Henry VIII., the degrees, which in 1535 were 108, fell in the next year to 44, and for the rest of the reign the average was less than 57. From 1548 to 1553, during which period [Edward VI.] the Reformers had a free hand, the average of graduates was barely 33; but as soon as Mary was on the throne it rose to 70. Cambridge tells the same story. In 1545 the university had fallen to such a depth that the scholars petitioned the King "for an extension of privileges, as they feared the total destruction of Learning." In the year 1550 there was apparently no degree of any kind taken at the university.

---

[3] A moment's thought will show that *New Learning* applied to a revival of the *Old Learning* would be altogether a misnomer; whereas, applied to new doctrines, it is a very fit and proper term. Controversialists, sometimes in their hurry, *in excessu suo*, as the Psalmist would say, forget the obvious.

---

[4] In English law members of the three learned professions, the Church, the Law and Medicine, are to-day technically *clerks*. [5] That there were cases of superstition in England More witnesses. There are such cases now here and everywhere else. Newman pertinently remarks: "The religion of the multitude is ever vulgar and abnormal; it ever will be tinctured with fanaticism and superstition while men are what they are. A people's religion is ever a corrupt religion, in spite of the provisions of Holy Church." ("Difficulties of Anglicans," II., p. 81.) It would, of course, be illogical to accuse the Church because men abuse that which is good. Her battle has ever been two-fold, against unbelief from without and against superstition from within.

So once more the veil is torn away that for three hundred years has hidden the features of Truth. But it will take a long time for the light to permeate the prejudices which the Protestant Tradition has brought on men's minds. For instance, in the Church of England newspaper, *The Guardian,* a journal of high literary repute, a recent critic still clings to his use of the term "New Learning" as meaning the Revival of Letters; and in spite of the absolute evidence to the contrary refuses to change his *mumpsimus* for our *sumpsimus.*

In three important chapters Dom Gasquet studies the relation of the Church to the State: and the first of these chapters goes to the whole root of the matter. Indeed, we consider it the most important part of this most important book. Our author *more suo* is simply investigating facts. While showing that England was most thoroughly united to the Pope in all his spiritual attributes and fully and amply acknowledged his primacy, there were "a number of questions mainly in the broad borderland of debatable ground between the two *(jurisdictions, the spiritual and the temporal)* . . . constantly being discussed and not infrequently *(giving)* cause for disagreements and misunderstanding. As in the history of earlier times, so in the sixteenth century, ecclesiastics clung, perhaps not unnaturally, to what they regarded as their sacred rights and looked on resistance to encroachments as a sacred duty. Laymen, on the other part, even when their absolute loyalty to the Church was undoubted, were found in the ranks of those who claimed for the State power to decide in matters not strictly pertaining to the spiritual prerogatives, but which chiefly by custom had come to be regarded as belonging to ecclesiastical domain. It is the more important that attention should be directed in a special manner to these questions, inasmuch as it will be found, speaking broadly, that the ultimate success or ill success of the strictly doctrinal changes raised in the sixteenth century was determined by the issue of the discussions raised on the question of mixed jurisdiction. This may not seem very philosophical, but in the event it proved to be roughly correct. The reason is not far to seek. In great measure at least questions of money and property, even of national interest and prosperity, were intimately concerned in the matters in dispute. They touched the people's pocket; and whether rightly or wrongly, those who found the money wished to have a say in its disposal. One thing cannot fail to strike an inquirer into the literature of this period—the very small number of people who were enthusiasts in the doctrinal matters with which the more ardent reformers occupied themselves" (pp. 51, 52).

As Dom Gasquet in examining the question at issue between the two jurisdictions says his purpose is "to record rather than to criticize," our readers will allow us to take up the threads of the discourse and weave them into a plain and straightforward account of what, as a matter of fact, did cause the Reformation. At least we shall set down the conclusions at which we have arrived after a study of the general state of Europe at that period.

Good and zealous Catholics can make a sharp and clear distinction between the spiritual powers of the Pope and his temporal claims. Taking a broad view of history we find England always acted most generously with him in the matter of these temporal claims. The question of justice was not closely looked into by either side. The Pope had in England a freer hand than anywhere else. Other Catholic nations meanwhile had settled their own difficulties with the Temporal claims of Rome, each in its own way; and each one, be it noted, to its own advantage. England alone never exploited the Papacy in its own interests. "History has shown," says Dom Gasquet, "that most of these claims have in practice been disallowed, not only without detriment to the spiritual work of the Church, but in some instances, at least, it was the frank recognition of the State rights, which, under Providence, saved nations from the general defection which seemed to threaten the old Ecclesiastical system. Most of the difficulties which were, as we have seen, experienced and debated in England were unfelt in Spain, where the Sovereign from the first made his position as to the temporalities of the Church clearly understood by all. In Naples in like manner the right of State Patronage, however objectionable to the ecclesiastical legists, was strictly maintained. In France the danger which at one time threatened an overthrow of religion similar to that which had fallen on Germany and which, at the time, was looming dark over England, was averted by the celebrated Concordat between Leo X. and Francis I. . . . It is to this settlement of outstanding difficulties, the constant causes of friction—a settlement of difficulties which must be regarded as economic and administrative rather than religious—that so good a judge as M. Hanotaux, the statesman and historian, attributes nothing less than the maintenance of the old religion in France" (pp. 76-7).

But in England we are brought face to face with another state of affairs. As we have said, the nation dealt generously with Rome in the matter of these disputable claims. There was in England a special filial love which on the whole refused to scrutinize too closely the actions of the parent. If some doings of the *Curia* caused laws of Præmuniri to be passed in self-defense, yet in practice these regulations were not enforced. In spite of the letter of the Civil Law the Pope was allowed to have his own way, though this was often to the spiritual as well as the temporal detriment of the country. The saying of Innocent IV., which Matthew Paris chronicles, shows the view in which the country was regarded at Rome: "Truly England is our storehouse of delights, a very inexhaustible well: and where much abounds much more can be extorted from many." It was the old story of the Goose that laid the golden eggs. Rome acted towards England in a way unknown elsewhere. The cession John Lackland had made of his crown was treated as a very serious reality by Roman Legists, who, despite the constant refusal of the English people to sanction it, looked upon the country as a mere temporal appendage or vassal of the Holy See. This will account in measure for the attitude adopted by the *Curia* towards England and the manifest disinclination to treat her in the same way as other nations. The *Curia* in one way or another clung to these temporal claims long after the Reformation. The upsetting of Pole's work of conciliation, the refusal to acknowledge Elizabeth, the bull of Pius V., the Armada, the sad and bloody history of the Deposing Power, are all links in the same chain. What was tolerated, say in France, was not allowed in England despite the cruel persecutions such denials implied. So marked had this difference been that when Conn asked Cardinal Barberini why what was lawful in France could not be tolerated in England, the only reply was: "The French do not trouble themselves to consult Rome about such questions; but the English and the Irish do; and Rome, if asked, can only answer according to what fits in with her laws." It seems to us a conclusion based on facts that had England been treated as other countries, and had claims which do not touch vitally the spiritual prerogatives of the Primacy given way to the higher good, there was no reason in the course of things why England, putting aside the question of the Divorce, should not have retained the faith as France and Spain did.

And this conclusion is strengthened by a further consideration. Dom Gasquet shows that the spiritual state of England was good. The Pope's real authority was cordially acknowledged; the clergy, as a body, were neither ignorant nor immoral; the mutual relations of priests and people were normal; the Church was bound up with the national life in a way we can in these days but little realize; the laity had an interest and a right in their parish church which in temporal matters they, along with the clergy, managed and provided for, and with which were connected their guilds and other social undertakings; they were well instructed in the simple and necessary truths of a religion they loved and practised; there was no dogmatic quarrel except under the stress of the Lutheran invasion; there was not even any difficulty [oh, poor Protestant Tradition!] about having the Bible in English provided that it was the Word of God and not that of Wyckliffe or Tyndale. In other words, there was nothing from the spiritual standpoint which needed reformation in the sense which Protestants have attached to that term. And yet England was allowed to drift away. We have noticed the cases of France and Spain; and as to Germany, Jansen, in his "History of the German People," tells us that the religious state of that country was by no means bad.

But if we look to Italy we find a state of spiritual debasement which was the shame of Europe. It was avowed. Paul III. in 1538 appointed a commission of four Cardinals, Contarini, Caraffa (afterwards Paul IV.), Sadoletus and the Englishman Pole, with five others to report upon the state of the Church, that is to say, of the Church in Italy. Their report, known as the *Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia*, is a very frank but painful document. After thanking God, who had inspired the Pope "to put forward his hands to support the ruins of the tottering and almost fallen Church of Christ and to raise it again to its pristine height," the Commission refer to the Pope's orders that they should lay bare to him "those most grave abuses, that is diseases, by which the Church of God and this Roman *Curia* especially is afflicted and which has brought about the state of ruin now so evident." They say boldly that the primary cause has been that the Popes have surrounded themselves with those only who spoke what they thought would be pleasing and who had neither the honesty nor the loyalty to speak the truth. This flattery had deceived the Pope about many things. "To get the truth to their ears was always most difficult. Teachers sprung up who were ready to declare that the Pope was master of all benefices, and as master might by right sell them as his own." Consequently he could not be guilty of sinning. The Pope's will was the highest law and could override all law. "Hence, Holy Father, as from the horse of Troy have so many abuses and most grievous dangers grown up in God's Church," so that it has become a byeword of reproach even to pagans. The commissioners call upon the Pope to begin the cure whence sprung the disease. "Follow the teaching of the holy Apostle Paul: *Be a dispenser and not a lord.*" They then sum up under twenty-two heads the abuses which were disgracing the Church in Italy.[6] One thing is now clear. We are brought face to face with the fact that the temporal claims advanced by the flatterers in the *Curia* and the lust of domination had resulted in the spiritual misery of Italy. Four centuries before had St. Bernard warned Eugenius against the lust of domination, *libidinem dominandi*, as being what he feared the most for him.[7] Alas that the warnings had not been heeded!

To turn back to the history of England, do we not see the same result from the same cause, *i. e.*, Religion allowed to suffer as long as Canonists could sustain the doctrine that the Pope's will was the highest law? We may fairly ask the question: Why was it that the Reformation did not succeed where Religion was at its lowest and did succeed where it was in a good state? Are we to say that in Italy, while the Temporal claims were actively in force, the spiritual state of the people was left to shift for itself, but in England this was sacrificed in a vain attempt to enforce the other? This may not be, as Dom Gasquet would have said, "very philosophical." We may even be accused of putting the question with somewhat of brutal plainness. But is it true?

The Benedictine has some pregnant words at the end of his volume; and they are to our purpose. "It is already evident that the corruptions or the virtues prevailing in one quarter must not straightway be credited to the account of another; that the reason why one country has become Protestant or another remained Catholic has to be sought for in each case, and that it may be safely asserted that the maintenance of Catholicity or the adoption of Protestantism in different regions had comparatively little to do with prevalence or absence of abuses or as little depended on the question whether these were more or less grievous" (pp. 446-7).

---

[6] The whole document can be seen in Le Plat's "Monumenta Concilii Tridentini," Vol. II., pp. 596-605. It is said that the document was drawn up by Caraffa. [7] Migne P. L., Vol. 182, p. 759.

We on our own part have deliberately gone beyond the limits of his book; for we believe the time has come when we should inquire closely what it was that lost England and Germany to the Church and what it was that saved France and Spain. We are concerned more with causes than with results; for we hold there is a present-day significance in the Past and there are lessons, important and vital, to be learnt on both sides.

We must not let this occasion pass without offering our congratulations to Dom Gasquet for this contribution to English history. It is a work of essential importance, which will have to be studied by all who wish to know the Reformation Period. While the impartial student will welcome gladly these results of the Benedictine method of historical research, there are we think two classes of readers who may not like it, as they will feel its power, viz.: Those who, stopping their ears, call out "Great is Diana of the Ephesians;" and those who only care for history as a controversial weapon. And methinks these two classes are wondrously akin.

ETHELRED L. TAUNTON.

FATHER ANTHONY: A Romance of To-Day. By *Robert Buchanan.* 12mo, pp. 261. New York: G. W. Dillingham Company.

The scene is laid in Ireland at the present day. Father Anthony is a young Catholic priest who was in love with the heroine until he learned that his younger and only brother Michael loved her, when he gave her up and studied for the priesthood. He told his parish priest of this love shortly before his ordination, and he was advised not to go on, but he did not follow the advice. He was ordained, and he loved the girl to the end, which, fortunately for him, came soon.

In the meantime his brother was accused of murdering the girl's father, and the real murderer confessed to Father Anthony. The story is taken up principally with clearing the innocent and bringing the guilt home to the proper person. An English doctor, who is visiting the town, undertakes to play the detective, and he does it so clumsily that he is not worthy of a place even in fiction. The only other priest that appears is Father John, the pastor of the village, who is a disgrace to the cloth. He is seen oftenest in taverns, shebeens or in the house of some bibulous friend. On all these occasions he is drinking freely with laymen and in the presence of drunken members of his own parish. On more than one occasion the author plainly hints that he was drunk, and yet he expresses admiration for him.

The writer's ignorance of Catholic terms and practice ought to debar him from this field of literature. We imagine that the Catholic priests of Ireland, and especially those of the district where the scene of the story is laid, will not thank the author for these two pictures of brother priests. They are types that will hardly increase the respect of the public, either Catholic or Protestant, for the Roman Catholic clergy.

THE HISTORY OF THE DEVIL AND THE IDEA OF EVIL FROM THE EARLIEST TIME TO THE PRESENT DAY. By *Dr. Paul Carus.* Large 8vo., pp. 496. Profusely illustrated. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company.

We have the introduction to this strange book, and it contains some remarkable statements. For instance: . . . . "The idea of a personal God is a mere simile. . . . When we speak of God as a person we ought to be conscious of the fact that we use an allegory which, if it were taken literally, can only belittle Him. The God of the future will not be personal, but superpersonal. But how shall we reach this knowledge of the superpersonal God? Our answer is, with the help of science. Let us pursue in religion the same path that science travels, and the narrowness of sectarianism will develop into a broad cosmical religion which shall be as wide and truly Catholic as is science itself." Again he tells us that God is not an individual being, but that He is the prototype of personality. In this spirit he approaches the study of the devil, and speaks of him as the counterpart of the idea of God. He thinks that the devil has been much neglected by philosophers and progressive theologians, and therefore he devotes his attention to him.

It is a curious book, very nicely made. We do not believe that it possesses any real value, because we do not believe that Dr. Carus is fitted to handle such a subject. We do not see what good can come from it except to amuse the curious. The doctor has a peculiar way of quoting text after text and disposing of them in a line, although some of them have puzzled Biblical scholars of deep learning. It is very easy to dispose of difficulties in this superficial manner, and to build up conclusions on such hastily constructed premises, but they are houses erected on sand. We cannot advise our readers to buy this book. It is very expensive and of no practical use.

ST. PETER IN ROME, and His Tomb on the Vatican Hill. By *Rev. Arthur Stapylton Barnes, M.A.*, Priest of the Diocese of Westminster. With thirty full-page illustrations and several text illustrations. Large 8vo, pp. 395. London: Swan Sonnenscheim & Co.

A very important contribution to a long controverted question. But the reverend author does not admit that it is any longer an open question. He claims that it has long ago been removed from the region of doubt, and in that frame of mind he treats it. He confines himself principally to the line of evidence which is drawn from archæology. He does not ignore the evidence of the Sacred Scriptures and of ancient writers, but he passes over them briefly, because they have been treated at length by other writers on more than one occasion, and dwells on the archæological evidence which has been almost entirely neglected hitherto by English writers.

In this field Professor Lanciani, who is by common consent the leading living authority on Roman antiquities, furnishes the safest guide. Our author follows him. The work is very interesting and very valuable. It is really a history of the tomb of St. Peter from the moment of his burial down to the rebuilding of Rome's greatest temple. In the development of this history the archæological proofs of St. Peter's presence and death in Rome are clearly set forth. Without St. Peter in Rome the great church that bears his name loses its significance.

The book furnishes one more link in the chain of evidence which was always complete in itself, but not always known to the general reader. It will be welcomed by all thoughtful persons who are interested in so important an historical truth.

The Life of St. Mary Magdalen de Pazzi. Compiled by Rev. Placido Fabrini. Translated and published by Rev. Antonio Isoleri, Miss. Ap. Rector of the Italian Church of St. Mary Magdalen de Pazzi, Philadelphia. Illustrated. 8vo., pp. 470. Philadelphia: 710 Montrose street.

The reverend translator of this best life of the Seraphic Saint was moved to undertake the work because no adequate life in English was to be found, and because of the great value of such a work. She was indeed a wonderful saint, whose life seems almost incredible. The wonderful ecstasies and the private revelations that were vouchsafed to her, in addition to her extradinary virtues, stamp her as preëminent even in so distinguished a school. The preservation of her body throughout the centuries is another feature of her case that appeals to all devout souls and draws them towards her. There, indeed, is much to edify, much to instruct the respectful reader of any faith. The book is divided into two parts: the first contains the life of the saint, and the second contains her letters and other works. Father Isoleri merits the respect and gratitude of all by this excellent work.

Geschichte der Weltliteratur. Von *Alexander Baumgartner, S. J.* Vol. III. Freiburg and St. Louis: B. Herder, 1900.

In the third volume of his "History of the Literature of the World" Father Baumgartner deals with the interesting subject of the literature of ancient Greece and Rome. He divides his treatise into three books, in the first of which, occupying three hundred and thirty-three pages, or considerably more than one-half the whole volume, he treats of the classical literature of the Greeks. In the second book he gives a survey of classical Roman literature. The third book deals succinctly with Grecian literature in the period of the Roman Empire. We do not hesitate to pronounce this work the most perfect handbook of classical literature which has appeared in any tongue. It is a mine of information on all subjects connected with the literature of Greece and Rome, and will be an invaluable aid to all engaged in the teaching of the classical writers.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

SERMONS ON THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. From the German of Rev. J. B. Scheurer, D. D. Edited by Rev. F. X. Lasance. 8vo, pp. 351. New York: Benziger Brothers.

A MONTH'S MEDITATIONS. By *Cardinal Wiseman.* 12mo, pp. 222. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

LECTURES FOR BOYS. By the *Very Rev. Francis Cuthbert Doyle, O. S. B.* 8vo, Vols. 2 and 3, pp. 414 and 509. London: Washburne & Co. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE PERFECT RELIGIOUS. For the Use of Confessors in Convents, the Inmates of Convents and those who aspire to the Religious Life. Instructions of Monseigneur d'Orleans de la Motte, Bishop of Amiens. 16mo, pp. 242. Price $1.00. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE FOUR LAST THINGS: DEATH, JUDGMENT, HELL, HEAVEN. By *Father Martin von Cochem; O. S. F. C.* 16mo, pp. 223. Price 75 cents. New York: Benziger Brothers.

OXFORD CONFERENCES, Summer Term, 1899. On Grace. By *Rev. Raphael M. Moss, O. P.* 12mo, pp. 109. Price 60 cents in paper. Received from Benziger Brothers.

A DAUGHTER OF FRANCE, 1464-1505. Being Records of Blessed Jane, Foundress of the Order of the Annunciation. 12mo, pp. 145. Price 60 cents. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

LES ENFANTS DE NAZARETH. Par *l'Abbé E. Le Camus.* Paris: 60 rue Madame.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EARLY CHURCH. By *Rev. J. J. Burke.* 12mo, pp. 148. Baltimore: John Murphy.

THE TRUE STORY OF MASTER GERALD. By *Anna T. Sadlier.* 12mo, pp. 321. New York: Benziger Brothers.

LOT LESLIE'S FOLKS. By *Eleanor C. Donnelly.*

'TWAS TO BE. By *Henri Ardel.* Translated from the French by Francis T. Furey.

LITTLE ARLETTE. By *Henri Ardel.* Translated from the French by Francis T. Furey Philadelphia: H. L. Kilner & Co.

A SERIES OF TEN SERMONS FOR A JUBILEE RETREAT. By *Rev. Francis X. McGowan, O. S. A.* 12mo, paper, pp. 155. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

The Church, the Jesuit Order and English Catholic literature have sustained a grievous loss in the demise of the Rev. Richard F. Clarke, of Clarke's Hall, Oxford. One of the brightest, boldest and most erudite of the famous Oxford school, Father Clarke, ever since his reception into the true fold, had done marvels as a champion of the advanced Catholic school. *The Month*, which he edited with rare ability for several years, will particularly miss his trenchant and masterful hand, and our heartfelt condolences are therefore extended to our esteemed contemporary.

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE TORONTO
LIBRARY